

POLITICAL AFFAIRS

A magazine devoted

to the theory and practice of Marxism - Leninism

EDITORIAL BOARD

MAX WEISS, *Editor*; V. J. JEROME, *Associate Editor*

ALEXANDER BITTELMAN, HENRY WINSTON

VOLUME XXV, NO. 11

Contents

NOVEMBER, 1946

- The Soviet Anniversary and the Fight for Peace *Max Weiss* 963
- Problems and Tasks Before Labor Today *John Williamson* 976
- American Imperialist Policy in the Far East *Frederick V. Field* 988
- Economic Trends and Perspectives *Alexander Bittelman* 1001
- On the Recent Expulsions
Statement by the National Board, Communist Party, U.S.A. 1011
- Manifesto of the Communist Party of Spain
Central Committee, Communist Party of Spain 1016
- Communist Work Among the American Jewish Masses
Resolution of the National Groups Commission, C.P.U.S.A. 1025
- The Negro Question *James S. Allen* 1046

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.

STATEMENT OF THE OWNERSHIP, MANAGEMENT, CIRCULATION, ETC.,
REQUIRED BY THE ACTS OF CONGRESS OF AUGUST 24, 1912, AND
MARCH 3, 1933, OF POLITICAL AFFAIRS, published monthly at New York,
N. Y., for Oct. 1946.

State of New York }
County of New York } ss.

Before me, a Notary Public in and for the State and county aforesaid, personally appeared Joseph Felshin, who, having been duly sworn according to law, deposes and says that he is the Business Manager of the Political Affairs and that the following is, to the best of his knowledge and belief, a true statement of the ownership, management (and if a daily paper, the circulation), etc., of the aforesaid publication for the date shown in the above caption, required by the Act of August 24, 1912, as amended by the Act of March 3, 1933, embodied in section 537, Postal Laws and Regulations, printed on the reverse of this form, to wit:

1. That the names and addresses of the publisher, editor, managing editor, and business managers are:

Publisher, New Century Publishers, Inc., 322 Broadway, New York 3, N. Y.
Editor, Max Weiss, 35 East 12th Street, New York 3, N. Y.
Managing Editor, V. J. Jerome, 35 East 12th Street, New York 3, N. Y.
Business Manager, Joseph Felshin, 322 Broadway, New York 3, N. Y.

2. That the owner is: (If owned by a corporation, its name and address must be stated and also immediately thereunder the names and address of stockholders owning or holding one per cent or more of total amount of stock. If not owned by a corporation, the names and addresses of the individual owners must be given. If owned by a firm, company, or other unincorporated concern, its name and address, as well as those of each individual member, must be given.)

New Century Publishers, Inc., 322 Broadway, New York 3, N. Y.
Joseph Felshin, 322 Broadway, New York 3, N. Y.
Isidore Greenbaum, 322 Broadway, New York 3, N. Y.

3. That the known bondholders, mortgagees, and other security holders owning or holding 1 per cent or more of total amount of bonds, mortgages, or other securities are: (If there are none, so state.) None.

4. That the two paragraphs next above, giving the names of the owners, stockholders, and security holders, if any, contain not only the list of stockholders and security holders as they appear upon the books of the company but also, in cases where the stockholder or security holder appears upon the books of the company as trustee or in any other fiduciary relation, the name of the person or corporation for whom such trustee is acting, is given; also that the said two paragraphs contain statements embracing affiant's full knowledge and belief as to the circumstances and conditions under which stockholders and security holders who do not appear upon the books of the company as trustees, hold stock and securities in a capacity other than that of a bona fide owner; and this affiant has no reason to believe that any other person, association, or corporation has any interest direct or indirect in the said stock, bonds, or other securities than as so stated by him.

5. That the average number of copies of each issue of this publication sold or distributed, through the mails or otherwise, to paid subscribers during the twelve months preceding the date shown above is (This information is required from daily publications only).

JOSEPH FELSHIN, Business Manager.

Sworn to and subscribed before me this 5th day of September, 1946.

MAX KITZES, Notary Public.

(SEAL)

(My commission expires March 30, 1947)

THE SOVIET ANNI- VERSARY AND THE FIGHT FOR PEACE

By MAX WEISS

NOVEMBER 7 is the 29th anniversary of the birth of the Soviet Union.

The Soviet Union came into existence as a result of the first victorious socialist revolution in history. Led by the Bolshevik Party, headed by Lenin and Stalin, the Russian workers, in alliance with the poor farmers, overthrew the rule of the capitalists and landlords. They established a socialist Soviet state with power resting in the hands of the working class allied with the poor farmers.

With the aid of this state power, the Russian workers and farmers began to make the transition from capitalism to socialism. They began the hard fight to realize the objectives for which the revolution had been fought—the abolition of all exploitation, the elimination of all exploiting classes, the development of a socialist industry and agriculture, the establishment of socialism.

The big capitalists and landlords were expropriated. The factories, mines, mills, banks, railroads, communications system and the land

were taken over by the socialist state and declared Soviet property.

The socialist state which came into existence was a new and historically higher kind of democracy, socialist democracy, because it was based on the rule of the toilers and not of the exploiters.

The transition to socialism has been completed in the Soviet Union. The collectivization of agriculture and the successful completion of the first two Five Year Plans have eliminated all capitalist elements from the economy of the country in both industry and agriculture. All exploiting classes have been abolished. Only two friendly classes, the socialist workers and socialist farmers, remain and collaborate with each other. This victory of socialism made possible a vast extension of socialist democracy, as registered in the Stalin Constitution adopted by the Soviet Union in 1936.

Today the Soviet people look forward to a new perspective: the rapid restoration of those sections of Soviet economy destroyed by the fascist invader, the manifold expansion of the production of Soviet industry and agriculture necessary for the transition from Socialism to Communism.

Corresponding to these developments within the Soviet Union, and flowing directly from them, the international role of the Soviet Union has grown constantly. Because it is a socialist country in which the economic factors and class forces which breed war and fascism have been completely eliminated, the Soviet

Union is the most consistent fighter for peace and democracy. With its transformation from a backward, preponderantly agrarian country into a leading industrial power, the effectiveness of its fight has increased.

During the war against the fascist axis, the eyes of millions in all countries were opened for the first time to the truth about the Soviet Union. Resting on the moral and political unity of its multi-national state, supported by the powerful socialist economy built up over two decades, and led by the Bolshevik Party headed by Stalin, the Soviet Union and its heroic Red Army—despite the most frightful sacrifices—was able to make the chief contribution to the defeat of the Axis powers.

Today, the Soviet Union stands at the head of all those forces which are struggling to guarantee that the peoples of the world will accomplish the aims they fought to achieve in the war against the fascist powers. It stands at the head of all those forces struggling to establish a just, peoples' peace based on fulfillment of the Moscow, Teheran, Yalta and Potsdam agreements for the demilitarization and democratization of Germany and its former Axis partners and satellite states. It stands at the head of all those forces which are struggling to establish the conditions for an enduring peace.

That is why the 29th anniversary of the birth of the Soviet Union will be celebrated not by the Communists and advanced workers alone. Mil-

ions of peace-loving people will greet the anniversary of the country which plays so decisive a role in the fight for peace.

The celebration of this anniversary derives its special significance this year from the fact that it highlights the central importance of American-Soviet friendship and collaboration in order to build and maintain an enduring peace.

The anniversary of the Soviet Union must be an occasion on which labor and the people reaffirm their support of the Roosevelt policy of American-Soviet friendship as the cornerstone of an enduring peace.

This Roosevelt policy has been undermined by the giant Wall Street trusts and has been replaced by the "get tough with Russia" policy.

Under cover of this slogan, the trusts and monopolies are driving ahead to impose an unjust, imperialist peace in Europe and the Far East. They are doing this not only for reasons which motivate the imperialists of all countries—undying hatred of the Soviet Union, hatred of popular democratic forces and governments wherever they manifest themselves or come to power, restoration and expansion of profitable pre-war cartel connections, etc. These objectives are also pursued by the imperialists of Britain, France, Holland, Belgium, Canada, etc. Over and above this common motivation which stems from the inherently reactionary character of monopoly capital in all countries, the American imperial-

ists p
This
other
British
junior
of esta
nation
PAX
Hen
peace
pose of
cana,
world
perialis
its pol
Latin A
East, a
it is a
with a
mainta
peaceti
lishmer
icy. It
to mai
ica's m
was fo
The
Vander
Truma
this ai
comes i
interest
of all
ples eve
the gro
the dea
profour
Paris P
ation o
German

ists pursue their own special aim. This aim, which they share with no other imperialists, except insofar as British imperialism is tolerated as a junior partner, is the grandiose one of establishing their exclusive domination of the entire world.

PAX AMERICANA

Hence, it is no ordinary imperialist peace which Wall Street seeks to impose on the world. It is a *Pax Americana*, a peace which will insure world hegemony for American imperialism. This objective determines its policy in Europe, the Far East, Latin America, the Near and Middle East, and Africa. It is for this that it is attempting to ring the world with a network of military bases, to maintain an enormously swollen peacetime military and naval establishment as an arm of its foreign policy. It is for this that the Baruch plan to maintain and consolidate America's monopoly of the atom bomb was formulated.

The reactionary bipartisan Byrnes-Vanderberg foreign policy of the Truman Administration promotes this aim of U. S. imperialism. It comes into head-on collision with the interests of the American people and of all peace-loving democratic peoples everywhere. It is responsible for the growing civil war in China, for the deadlock on a whole series of profoundly vital questions at the Paris Peace Conference, for the violation of the Potsdam accords on Germany by British and American

imperialism, for the fascist-royalist terror in Greece, for the deadlock in the United Nations Atomic Energy Commission. It is this policy, summed up in the slogan "get tough with Russia," which is responsible for the deterioration of American-Soviet relations, for the abandonment by the Truman Administration of the Roosevelt policy of friendship and collaboration with the Soviet Union.

This policy has made it easier for the most extreme circles of reaction in the United States to carry on a widespread propaganda for war against the Soviet Union. These circles of pro-fascist reaction include the du Ponts, the Weirs, the Pews and Grundys, the Fords; the Hearst, Scripps-Howard, and Gannett press; the political spokesmen of these circles, such as Hoover, Taft, Bullitt, Farley, Vandenberg, Dulles, ex-Governor Earle, etc. These circles have attempted to inundate every avenue of propaganda with talk about the inevitability of war against the Soviet Union, with talk of the imminence of such a war, with predictions about the outbreak of hostilities within so many weeks or so many months.

This propaganda has induced a feeling of great concern among the American people. Even apart from this propaganda, the serious situation created on a world scale by the Byrnes-Vanderberg "get tough with Russia" policy was in itself sufficient to cause profound uneasiness among

the masses. When, added to this, the masses were subjected to an unprecedented barrage of warmongering talk, profound anxiety developed. An actual fear that World War III was around the corner gripped the people.

In the midst of this war atmosphere, Wallace delivered his well-known speech at Madison Square Garden. Coming, as it did, at a moment when Byrnes and Vandenberg were riding high, wide, and handsome at the Paris conference in pursuit of their "get tough with Russia" policy, Wallace's speech had the impact of a political explosion. Heretofore, it had been only the Communists and a few political figures formerly connected with the Roosevelt Administration (Pepper, Morgenthau, Jonathan Daniels, Elliot Roosevelt) who had publicly challenged the foreign policies of the Truman Administration in an effective way. The press had attempted to minimize this opposition in order to build up a synthetic "national unity" behind the Byrnes-Vandenberg "get tough with Russia" policies. Wallace's speech tore the fabric of this bipartisan effort to suppress the opposition of the people to the provocative anti-Soviet policy. It gave dramatic and effective voice to this growing opposition.

Wallace sharply challenged the "get tough with Russia" policy. He opposed the policy of the anti-Soviet Anglo-American bloc. He declared for a return to the Roosevelt policy of friendship and collaboration with

the Soviet Union and Big Three unity for peace. The terrific barrage unleashed against Wallace by the reactionaries, the demand for his removal from the Cabinet, and his actual dismissal by Truman testified to the political effectiveness of Wallace's intervention. The July 23 letter of Wallace to the President, released a few days following the Madison Square Garden speech, placed the central issues of struggle for a correct foreign policy even more forcefully and fundamentally than his Madison Square Garden speech.

In addition, this letter did not contain the negative features of his Garden speech—its concessions to the Red-baiters, his implication that American imperialism was following British imperialism rather than leading it, as well as the whole anti-Soviet pack. Furthermore, this letter was released under circumstances which made it clear that the Truman Administration repudiated Wallace's policy. Hence, there were not attached to it certain implications which had been injected by Wallace into his Garden speech that President Truman was "sympathetic" to Wallace's views, an implication that could serve only to disorient and demobilize the struggle against the Byrnes-Vandenberg policies.

Despite the negative features of Wallace's Garden speech, and despite his subsequent vacillations in connection with the Baruch controversy, his intervention helped rally and activate widespread mass opposition to

the
Tr
mak
time
a re
Am
labor
ing
for s
strug
velt
erabl
respo
supp
again
polic
comb
It
Stalin
to th
In th
stated
must
of wa
which
Th
ously
speci
count
been
mong
Squar
who,
an em
sia"
moun
in Br
Russia
streng
forces
Thi

the Byrnes-Vandenberg policy of the Truman Administration. It helped make articulate and forceful the sentiments of the American people for a return to the Roosevelt policies of American-Soviet friendship and collaboration as the basis for an enduring peace. It provides a platform for such wide masses to develop their struggle for a return to these Roosevelt policies. It stimulated a considerable, although far from sufficient, response by the labor movement in support of Big Three unity and against the repudiation of Roosevelt's policy by the Byrnes-Vandenberg combination.

It was in such a situation that Stalin released his now famous reply to the British correspondent, Werth. In the course of this reply, Stalin stated, among other things, that we must distinguish between loud talk of war and the actual danger of war which does not now exist.

This declaration was greeted joyously by the masses in all countries, especially the United States. It helped counter the war hysteria that had been manufactured by the rabid warmongers. It followed the Madison Square Garden speech of Wallace who, among other things, called for an end to the "get tough with Russia" policy. Likewise, it followed mounting expressions of opposition in Britain to the "get tough with Russia" policy of Bevin. Hence, it strengthened the hand of the peace forces in these two countries.

This declaration by Stalin deliv-

ered a powerful blow to the propaganda that "war was inevitable because Soviet expansionism was driving to war." This lie has been assiduously spread by the warmongers. They deliberately try to conceal from the masses the socialist, and hence anti-imperialist and inherently peace-striving character of the Soviet Union. Instead they dish up the Trotsky-concocted tripe of a "Red imperialism" with warlike designs on other lands.

SOVIET PEACE POLICY RESTATEd

Stalin's reply made it clear to millions who had been deceived by this propaganda that there was no danger of war from the Soviet Union. It was a clear reaffirmation of the unwavering desire for peace which has always been at the basis of Soviet foreign policy. At the same time, it was a restatement and further development of the principle upon which the Soviet Union has always based its relations with capitalist countries. This principle holds that, despite the fundamental differences in economic and social systems, in ideology, between the Soviet Union and the capitalist world, possibilities for peaceful cooperation do exist. Stalin indicated that, as the Soviet Union developed to Communism, these possibilities for peaceful cooperation, far from decreasing, may even grow.

But we would not grasp the full significance of Stalin's declaration if we stopped at this point. If this were

all, it could not be said that there is at present no actual danger of war. It is certainly clear that the Soviet Union does not want war. But this, by itself, is not sufficient to justify a declaration that there is no imminent danger of war. If the ruling circles of American or British imperialism planned an attack on the Soviet Union in the immediate future, there would be a real danger of a new war despite the Soviet desire for peace.

Hence, Stalin's reply to Werth is based on a realistic estimate of the present relation of all world forces. It takes into account not only the policies of the Soviet Union, but the present policies of the ruling circles of American imperialism as well. It takes fully into account the drive of American imperialism to dominate the world. But, equally, it takes into account the factors which, at present, restrain American imperialism from attempting to unleash a third world war in order to achieve that objective.

A CORRECT ESTIMATE IMPORTANT

It is extremely important to differentiate clearly between the talk of war and the actual danger of the imminent outbreak of a new world war, a danger which does not now exist. Communists must base their strategy and tactics on the real relation of forces (as well as the real direction of events and the tempo of that development) and not one which is not grounded in reality.

An estimate that the outbreak of war is imminent, under conditions in which this is not so, makes it more difficult to mobilize the masses for struggle around the real concrete issues which are involved in the present reactionary foreign policy of the Truman Administration. The fight for peace is not advanced one iota by shouting that war is right around the corner when in actual fact it is not.

The real concrete issues which are involved in the fight for peace under present conditions revolve around the question of whether the war against the fascist axis will be followed by the imposition of an unjust, imperialist peace, or by the establishment of a just, democratic, peoples' peace as the basis for an enduring peace. They involve such questions as the struggle against Wall Street imperialist intervention in China, the State Department support of the fascist royalist dictatorship in Greece, the support given to the Franco regime. They involve the struggle against the present drive to build up a colossal military and naval machine in preparation for future wars as well as for the current program of big stick military and naval demonstrations in the Mediterranean, round the world bomber flights, operations "Frigid" in Canada, etc. They involve such questions as fulfillment of the Potsdam agreements on Germany, democratization of Japan, etc. If these issues are not resolved by the struggle of the peo-

ple.
wh
cies
mine
ing
Th
now
mom
most
Sovie
war
deve
the i
the
Sovie
conce
ter o
now,
earth
woul
ignor
the S
talk.
dang
isolat
Ne
ent,
again
is ne
Brow
come
becau
conti
Sovie
denly
eratic
triali
tries
its g
acqui
the

ple, then the grave dangers with which the Byrnes-Vanderberg policies are fraught will surely undermine the possibilities for an enduring peace.

The relationship of forces which now exists is such that at the present moment it is only the circles of the most extreme pro-fascist and anti-Soviet reactionaries which incite to war against the Soviet Union, which develop a widespread propaganda of the inevitability, the imminence and the necessity for war against the Soviet Union. As far as they are concerned, it is not merely a matter of talk of war. They want war now, and are moving heaven and earth to try to unleash such a war. It would be the most fatal mistake to ignore their incitement to war against the Soviet Union "merely" as "war talk." These forces are powerful and dangerous. They must be identified, isolated and rebuffed.

Nevertheless, there is not, at present, an imminent danger of war against the Soviet Union. This is not because, as maintained by Browder, monopoly capital has become progressive and peace-loving; because it has reconciled itself to the continued existence of the Socialist Soviet Union; because it has suddenly become interested in the liberation of the colonies and the industrialization of the backward countries in order to provide a market for its goods; because it has suddenly acquired an objective class interest in the maintenance of peace. These

bourgeois-liberal views of Browder serve as a fig leaf to cover the reactionary character and role of U. S. imperialism.

The ruling circles of monopoly capital, no less than the most extreme pro-fascist warmongers, would like to destroy the Soviet Union. This always has been, and still remains, their main ambition.

But the great strength of the anti-imperialist peace forces restrains them from attempting to unleash an anti-Soviet war at present.

FACTORS FOR PEACE

They take into account the great moral, political, economic and military strength of the Soviet Union. They are not inclined to accept the pipe-dream illusion that the Soviet Union can be quickly destroyed by a shower of atomic bombs.

They take into account the strength of the new peoples' democracies in Eastern Europe which by their very existence cancel out the possibility of re-establishing an encirclement of the Soviet Union such as was attempted with the pre-war *cordon sanitaire*.

They take into account the great power and influence of the labor and democratic movements in the countries of western Europe, especially France and Italy in which the Communists play a decisive role.

They take into account the great upsurge in the national liberation movements of the colonial countries.

They take into account the new

role played by the labor movement on a world scale through the World Federation of Trade Unions.

They take into account the war weariness of the masses in the European countries which is not something passive but an active force helping to guarantee that American imperialism will not so easily find a partner in crime in any European government.

Finally, they are compelled to reckon with the power of the labor movement and the peace sentiments of the American people which, though not yet fully organized, are finding expression in the very election campaign from which the bipartisan coalition tried to exclude any question of foreign policy.

It is the strength of these peace forces and their struggle to maintain the peace which accounts for the fact that, at present, the ruling circles of American imperialism do not orient toward the achievement of world domination through military conquest. It is owing to the strength of these forces that there is in the present situation no actual danger of the imminent outbreak of a new world war.

However, the ruling circles of monopoly capital are not in the least reconciled to this situation.

On the contrary, their policy is to try to change the present relation of world forces which is so manifestly unfavorable to their reactionary ambitions. Their policy is to weaken and undermine the strength of the anti-

imperialist, peace forces in order to create a new relationship of forces. Among other things, this is the objective of the present drive by U. S. imperialism to impose an unjust, imperialist peace in Europe and the Far East.

Hence, even though there is no imminent danger of war, the fight for peace is the all-important and central task of the moment.

It is, in the first place, a fight against the most powerful reactionary circles of monopoly capital and their political spokesmen who are concentrated in the Republican Party, the main vehicle and political center of reaction and fascism in the country. For if these forces are not identified, isolated and defeated, if they are allowed to come to power in our country, then the present talk of war will soon be converted into an actual danger of war.

It is, secondly, a fight against the reactionary foreign policy of the Truman Administration as promoted by the bipartisan Byrnes-Vandenberg team. For if this policy of imposing an unjust imperialist peace in Europe and the Far East prevails; if this plan for establishing American imperialist domination of the world is not checked, then a new relation of world forces will be created which will bring into actual existence a real danger of a new world war.

For what would the Byrnes-Vandenberg policy result in if it is not combatted, checked and defeated?

It would bring the German monopolists and cartellists back into the seats of power to act as Wall Street's gendarme in Europe. It would subvert the new Eastern European democracies, restoring the Colonel Becks in Poland and the followers of Mikhailovich in Yugoslavia. It would convert Austria and Hungary into outposts of the American trusts in Central Europe. It would establish DeGaulle and the 200 families in power in France. It would elevate to power the neo-fascists in Italy. It would completely destroy the sovereignty of the Latin American countries, break up their democratic and labor movements, and reduce these countries to absolute vassals of Wall Street. It would crush the Communist and democratic forces of China, thus turning that country into the fully obedient tool of Wall Street's anti-Soviet aspirations.

Obviously, such a situation would at once convert talk of war into the very real and actual danger of outbreak of war.

This would be true quite independently of the fact that such a situation would also facilitate the victory of the most extreme reactionary forces in American political life. This is what Browder attempts to cover up with his bourgeois-liberal apologetics for the Truman Administration. According to Browder, it is only and exclusively a G.O.P. victory in 1948 which can create an actual danger of war. But the fact is that the foreign policy of the Truman Ad-

ministration helps the warmongers not only because it facilitates the possibility of their victory in 1948, but also because it is a policy which, if successful, will result in a new world situation in which the danger of war will become imminent. Furthermore, it is a policy which is today, in the main, dictated by the Republicans.

It is this which Mrs. Roosevelt chose to ignore when she attempted to gloss over the differences between the policies advocated by Wallace and those pursued by Byrnes. Mrs. Roosevelt declared that the differences between the two were only over "methods," since the "objectives" of both were the same. Such an analysis rests upon the following over-simplified conception: in contrast with the extreme warmongering elements, neither Wallace nor Byrnes call for the launching of war against the Soviet Union. Hence, apparently, we are to conclude that the objectives of both are the same and that Byrnes, as well as Wallace, is following a peace policy. But this is ridiculous. The policies of Byrnes undermine the peace and, should they not be checked, would create an entirely new international situation in which the danger of a new world war would become acute and imminent. Wallace, on the other hand, with all his weaknesses and vacillations, advocates a policy which will help secure and maintain the peace because it is essentially a demand for the restoration of the Roosevelt policies of Big Three unity based on friend-

ship and collaboration with the Soviet Union.

Hence, in the fight for peace, a number of things must be borne in mind:

(1) It is not enough to denounce imperialism in general. It is necessary to identify, isolate, and direct sharp fire against the most extreme and vicious anti-Sovieters and warmongers, the ultra-reactionary and pro-fascist circles who are inciting to war, in order to rebuff and defeat their warmongering and to prevent them from coming to power.

(2) It is necessary to intensify the struggle against the Byrnes-Vandenberg bipartisan foreign policy of the Truman Administration, a policy of "get tough with Russia," a policy of an Anglo-American imperialist bloc, a policy directed toward the establishment of U. S. imperialist world domination. It is necessary to strengthen the fight against all those forces inside and outside the Truman Administration who capitulate to or appease the open warmongers.

(3) It is necessary to build the widest front of all the varied peace forces. The labor movement must take the leading role in building and guiding such a broad peace front without at any time subordinating itself to the forces with which it is in alliance.

(4) Taking into account and utilizing the real differences that exist in the capitalist class, it is necessary to involve in such a struggle for peace such spokesmen for sections of the

capitalist class as Wallace, Pepper, Morgenthau, Ickes, in order to fight for the restoration of Roosevelt's policy of Big Three unity and friendship with the Soviet Union.

Stalin's reply to Werth, in which he differentiates between talk of war and the actual danger of war which does not exist in the present situation, does not contain a new estimate of the world situation in relation to the danger of war. As far back as March 22, Stalin gave the same estimate in his reply to the questions of the A. P. correspondent, Eddy Gilmore:

Question: What in your opinion is responsible for the present fear of war felt by many peoples in many lands?

Answer: I am convinced that neither the nations nor their armies are aiming at a new war. They desire peace and are endeavoring to secure peace. This means that the "present fear of war" is not being caused by this side. I think that the "present fear of war" is being brought about by the actions of certain political groups engaged in the propaganda of a new war and by these means sowing seed of discord and uncertainty.

As can be seen, as far back as March, Stalin differentiated between talk of war and the actual danger of war, which does not exist in the present situation.

What is new in this respect is his incisive and penetrating explanation of the objectives of such war talk. Stalin pointed out:

I do not believe there is a real danger

of a
"ne
milit
few
They
noise
a.
certa
their
gove
sions
b.
of th
tries.
c.
there
emph
Or
twec
whic
real
not c
A P
In
calcu
mest
objec
is th
gers
Unio
dona
tabli
and
peop
rope
of bl
to in
cessi
will
Yugo
can p

of a "new war." There is clamor of a "new war" made at present mainly by military-political adventurers and their few supporters among civilian officials. They find it necessary to make this noise only to:

a. Frighten with the specter of war certain naive politicians from among their opponents, and thereby help their governments to extract more concessions from these opponents.

b. Prevent for some time the cutting of the military budgets of their countries.

c. Check demobilization of troops and thereby prevent the rapid growth of unemployment in their countries.

One must differentiate strictly between the uproar about a "new war" which is being spread today, and the real danger of a "new war," which does not exist at the present time.

A POLICY OF BLACKMAIL

In other words, the war talk is a calculated policy of foreign and domestic blackmail. Obviously, the first object of such a policy of blackmail is the Soviet Union. The warmongers hope to intimidate the Soviet Union by threats of war into abandoning its firm struggle for the establishment of a just peace in Europe and the Far East. Likewise, the new peoples' democracies in Eastern Europe are the objects of such a policy of blackmail. The warmongers hope to intimidate them into making concessions by the threat that refusal will lead to war. The violations of Yugoslavia's sovereignty by American planes as well as the demonstra-

tions of military strength by American armed forces in connection with the Trieste question are cases in point.

But this policy of blackmail through talk of the inevitability and imminence of a new world war also operates in other directions. Let us take the various countries, other than those in which there are occupation forces in which American imperialism maintains armed forces, garrisons, bases or other military establishments. Is it conceivable that they would, in ordinary circumstances, permit the maintenance of foreign military forces on their soil or grant permission for the establishment of such military bases? Obviously not. Such normal opposition to American military bases, for example in Latin America, does not make itself felt because these countries have been blackmailed by talk of a new war against the Soviet Union—for which these bases are supposedly necessary.

This policy of blackmail even operates as between British and American imperialism, to the benefit, so far, of American imperialism. Among other things, Churchill's warmongering Fulton speech was designed to wrest concessions from American imperialism in connection with the loan to Britain. Obviously, if British imperialism were soon to be joined with American imperialism in a war against the Soviet Union, it would be to the interests of American imperialism to ask for less than a pound of flesh in return for the loan in or-

der not to weaken the British empire in such a joint war.

Likewise, talk of the inevitability or imminence of war against the Soviet Union—a war in which obviously American imperialism would have to shoulder the main burden—is extremely useful in blackmailing British imperialism. It facilitates the entry of American imperialism into areas from which, in normal circumstances, British imperialism would exert every effort to exclude American penetration. Such areas are the Mediterranean, Central Europe, and sections of the Far East. It is undoubtedly the consequences for the British Empire of this game of blackmail which helps account for the denunciations at the Tory Party convention of America's "harassment" of the British Empire. The fact that Stalin exposed this game of blackmail in a reply to a British correspondent rather than to an American correspondent, will surely not be without some effect in this connection among British capitalist circles.

This use of war talk as a means of blackmail also operates on the domestic scene. It was with the use of exactly such talk of the inevitability and imminence of war against the Soviet Union that an effort was made to silence all opposition to the reactionary Byrnes-Vandenberg foreign policy. The argument went as follows: We are moving steadily to an inevitable war against the Soviet Union. In time of war, opposition to the policy of the government is

treason. Hence, opposition to the foreign policy of the government at this stage borders on treason. Therefore, just as during the war we had a wartime national unity, so now we need a "pre-war national unity." No one must oppose or fight against the foreign policy being operated by Byrnes and Vandenberg!

Equally sinister is the utilization of such war talk to develop a wholesale attack against the labor and progressive movement. The main weapon of such an attack is a Red-baiting witchhunt. It is under cover of a deliberately manufactured war psychology that J. Edgar Hoover, at the American Legion Convention, launched his fascist declaration of war against all progressives, against labor, against all who fight for the restoration of the foreign and domestic policies of President Roosevelt. By trotting out the old slander about Communists being "the agents of a foreign power"—the further implication being that the U. S. will soon be at war with the foreign power—Hoover called for the suppression of the Communist Party. He called for a struggle against all alleged "fellow travellers," *i.e.*, all those who oppose the present reactionary course of the Truman Administration. The reactionaries count upon the development of a war atmosphere to aid them in this diabolical scheme. A further utilization of such war talk for purposes of blackmailing the American people is the drive to militarize the country, to

brit
inc
life
try
F
just
den
stan
war
it is
war
mai
is co
of r
B
mor
help
of t
figh
cow

bring the reactionary military caste increasingly into all phases of civilian life under guise of readying the country for imminent war.

Finally, the talk of war is used to justify an enormous and unprecedented peace-time war budget and standing armed force. Wall Street wants both because, in the first place, it is even now preparing for future wars, and because, secondly, the maintenance of a large armed force is counted upon to offset the growth of mass unemployment.

By exposing this game of the warmongers, Stalin's reply to Werth helps open the eyes of wider sections of the population to the necessity for fighting against, instead of being cowed by, the loud talk of the in-

evitability of war.

The national interests of our country—which are the interests of the great mass of people and not the interests of the trusts—demand the maintenance of world peace. Only a policy of American-Soviet friendship and collaboration can guarantee an enduring peace. Hence the fight to scrap the Byrnes-Vandenberg "get tough with Russia" policy and to restore the Roosevelt policy of American-Soviet friendship is a fight for a truly American foreign policy.

The observance of the 29th anniversary of the birth of the Soviet Union by great masses of the American people will help advance this fight for such an American foreign policy.

TASKS AND PROBLEMS BEFORE LABOR

By JOHN WILLIAMSON

THERE ARE A number of major questions facing the trade union movement which urgently require decisive answers if the offensive of reaction is to be defeated. Some of these questions, to be discussed below, revolve about the problems raised by the wiping out of wage increases due to the smashing of price control, the increasing division in the ranks of labor, the need of organizing the unorganized, and the menace presented by the new wave of Red-baiting.

The importance of these questions can be properly assessed if they are viewed in the light of the current tactics of monopoly capital aimed at lessening the effectiveness of the trade unions through a planned attack that has many aspects. Some of these are:

a. The creation of confusion through an ideological offensive aimed to "prove" that increases in wages must inevitably result in price increases; that it is price control and the O.P.A., and not the conspiracy of the trusts, that have led to shortages, black markets, and a meat crisis; that the labor leaders who have fought for price control are responsible for unemployment and therefore should be replaced, etc.

b. The creation of confusion among the workers in the organized shops and industries in order to stimulate the workers' wrath against the trade unions or to prolong the settlement of economic disputes or strike struggles so as to weaken the power of unions. This can be seen in the deliberate provocation of strikes, as in the automobile industry; in the refusal to settle strikes, as in the maritime industry and the Pittsburgh utility strike; in the constant and deliberate turnover of labor, as, for example, in Flint, where it is accompanied by continuous publication of full-page advertisements for "Help Wanted by General Motors."

c. The pressing for the passage of anti-labor legislation.

d. The effort to pit the A. F. of L. against the C.I.O., and to have employers enter into agreements with top A. F. of L. leaders, of such a nature that they will lead to jurisdictional disputes.

e. The determination, through these political and economic activities, to influence workers politically in the 1946 elections, with the aim of strengthening the Republican Party in preparation for 1948.

As against these tactics of monopoly capital, labor must work out more clearly its policies for advancing the interests of the great majority of the nation's producers. It must plan how to use its mighty power most effectively against the giant power of the trusts and their growing influence in government.

THE PERSPECTIVE ON WAGES AND ECONOMIC DEMANDS

After V-J Day the workers and the C.I.O. unions correctly demanded wage increases and, when necessary, struck for them. Such action had become essential because of the growing gap between frozen wage scales (Little Steel Formula) and the creeping increase in the cost of living even under war-supervised price control. The total wage increase in all industry from January, 1941, until the wage demands were presented last year, had been about 37 per cent, whereas the increase in the cost of living, even prior to the ending of price control, had been 55 per cent. Add to this the 5 per cent increase in labor productivity each year during the war, plus the abolition of overtime, the adoption of the short week, etc., after V-J Day, and the reasons for labor's demands and struggles are crystal clear.

Since the wresting of these wage increases from the employers (the average increase was considerably less than 18½¢ per hour), the trusts, through their stranglehold on industry and their influence and power in government, have wiped them out twice over through the skyrocketing inflationary increase in prices.

Today, the A. F. of L. Executive Council cynically joins with the National Association of Manufacturers in holding the workers, specifically the C.I.O., responsible for the price increases and related economic diffi-

culties. The *New York Times* of October 7, said:

The fifteen-man Executive Council, in its report covering the A. F. of L.'s activities since the last convention two years ago, unsparingly condemned the strikes conducted last fall and winter by affiliates of the Congress of Industrial Organizations in the oil, automobile, electrical equipment, meat packing and other industries. Because of these strikes, together with the President's settlement of the steel strike by increasing steel prices, prices in general have had to be raised with a disastrous effect on the entire economy, the report asserted.

The Executive Council Report itself says:

Those unions which broke price ceilings to get 18½¢ followed a short-sighted policy. Had they been really willing to accept smaller increases and adjust their demands by genuine collective bargaining to industry's ability to pay, they would be better off today and so would all American workers.

Small wonder that the N. Y. *World-Telegram* on October 5, flatly declared that it is "especially good news" when the A. F. of L. does "such sound economic thinking"; or that David Lawrence, high priest of Big Business, said, "If their labor leaders are wise, they will be content to let the wage scales rest awhile. . . ."

This reasoning is fallacious and in the case of the A. F. of L. Executive Council is in line with its traditional

policy of associating itself with the interests of capitalism rather than with those of the workers whom it is supposed to represent.

Why is this reasoning wrong?

1. It is wrong because prices are not determined by wage rates.

2. It is wrong because money wages can increase while prices decrease. Thus, between 1923 and 1939, for instance, the wholesale prices of manufactured goods decreased about 25 per cent, while average factory wages per hour increased by about 15 per cent. Even the A. F. of L., in its *Monthly Survey* for September, has to recognize this fact. The wiping out of wage increases through the rise in prices was brought about by the monopolies, and by the Truman Administration's betrayal of its own pledge that on the basis of the workers accepting the 18½¢ increase, "the price line be held."

3. It is wrong because, as Marx demonstrated, wages can be increased without increasing prices if profits are cut. The facts are, for example, that while the workers did receive an increase in money wages during the war, the employers' profits skyrocketed from 26 billion dollars in the six peacetime years of 1934-39, to 117 billions in the six war years of 1940-45.

4. It is further wrong because Big Business not only stole the 18½¢ wage increase twice over from the workers through price increases, but increased its profits still further by its conspiracy to withhold goods from

the market for higher prices, by its participation in the black market, etc.

Labor, and in the first place the C.I.O., was correct in proposing and fighting for wage increases during the past year. Without such wage raises the conditions of labor would be so much the worse, since the price increases were completely independent of wage increases. The monopolies used the wage increases as a club to get government approval for still higher prices. *The facts are that industry could have paid the 30 per cent wage increase originally demanded without regard to any increase in productivity last winter and spring, and still would have reaped profits twice those of the pre-war level.*

All this serves to show how wholly hypocritical is this "weeping" of the N.A.M. and the A. F. of L. Executive Council. Today, the problem before labor and the trade unions is not that of being satisfied with things as they are, as is implied by the A. F. of L. Executive Council. *The real problem is how to wrest new wage increases, without further price rises, so as to balance the losses already incurred by the workers.*

The fact is that among large sections of workers there is a rising tide of resentment about the present situation. However, it is also a fact that there is unclarity as to why this situation developed. The ideological bombardment of the N.A.M. and the newspapers—now joined by the A. F.

of L. such the v wages work on th throu new v appea emplo reserv Fur leader ment A. F. holds sponsi gram

Cont improv weapo negotiate ceiling: ployers with y duction know t

This by ma he ra many creases

In th rship ng res his sit ed a rol an August

The

of L. Executive Council—has been such as to create confusion among the workers on the relationship of wages and prices. In addition, many workers, who suffered long months on the picket lines, hesitate to go through that ordeal once more if new wage increases are again to disappear overnight. Others are not employed a full work-week and their reserves have been wiped out.

Furthermore, they are given little leadership by the trade union movement as a whole. In the case of the A. F. of L. Executive Council, which holds the C.I.O. and the workers responsible for price increases, its program is:

Continue to increase production and improve efficiency. . . . Use the strike weapon only as a last resort. . . . Negotiate wage increases within price ceilings. . . . We say to American employers: we have offered to cooperate with you as partners in improving production. Show us the facts so we can know the results of our efforts.

This approach is rejected in life by many A. F. of L. locals and by the rank-and-file, as evidenced in many current strikes for wage increases.

In the recent period the C.I.O. leadership has struck out boldly in placing responsibility upon the trusts for this situation. It has called for and led a vigorous fight for price control and the roll-back of prices. On August 15, it even declared:

The future of wage stabilization will

be decided in the next 30 days. If prices continue to rise, the pressure of rising prices will sweep away the entire wage stabilization program. We cannot accept a situation in which wages are frozen while the cost of living soars.

However, there is considerable hesitation on the part of the C.I.O. leadership to chart a course of action. This probably reflects the uncertainty among the workers and also indicates that an effective course of action has not yet been decided upon. Furthermore, it is hoped that everything can be allowed to "mark time" until the spring when the steel workers union can set the pace.

The danger of continuing with such a "wait and see" policy is that large sections of workers will begin to feel helpless about fighting back against the inflationary conspiracy and other attacks of the monopolies. This can lead to a certain demoralization and lack of confidence in the unions.

It is urgently necessary that any such tendencies be immediately overcome by outlining a firm course of action for labor. True, individual unions cannot hope to challenge the combined might of the trusts. It is preferable and necessary that the entire labor movement, or at least the entire C.I.O., with real united action of the Big Three—the steel, auto and electrical workers unions—move together.

However, until such united action takes place, and in preparation for

it, it is urgently important that the fighting spirit of the workers be maintained on a high level by the following steps:

a. Clarity must be created on the responsibility of the trusts and the capitulation of the Administration in the matter of the wiping out of the wage increases.

b. The broadest people's movements must be developed under the leadership of labor against the trusts on the meat crisis, price increases, the housing shortage, for a reduction of taxes through a drastic reduction in armaments, etc.

c. Wherever contract expirations take place, wage increases must be immediately demanded.

d. All unions, both C.I.O. and A. F. of L., without violating contractual relations, should demand essential wage adjustments to maintain the wage standards agreed to when they signed their contracts, and thus make up the losses since incurred by the workers.

e. Above all, the broadest activity must be developed, expressed in all forms of struggle, short of national strike action, to combat the attacks of the employers and to wrest concessions from them.

This requires an improvement in all types of shop and department work by the unions, including improved functioning of the steward system and the involving of the workers in department and shop meetings and activities.

A combination of such types of ac-

tivity will overcome the tendencies of the workers to feel "stymied" and hence to be driven into passivity, into moods which play directly into the hands of the employers and other reactionaries. Through such steps the army of labor can be alerted and be in a fighting mood when the C.I.O. leadership decides that the time is ripe for common action on a national scale.

In preparation for the next big round of struggles to improve the conditions of American labor, thought should be given by labor to a revised and extended program of economic demands. Some of the major new demands that merit discussion and consideration might well be:

1. An immediate increase in wages to offset the increase in prices.
2. A guaranteed annual wage.
3. The 30-hour work-week (6 hours—5 days) for 40 hours' pay.
4. A Health and Hospitalization Program under the supervision of the individual union, but paid for by the employers.
5. National wage agreements in all major industries, with common expiration dates if there is more than one union in the industry.
6. A standard work-week starting Monday, for industries with continuous production.

All of these activities and struggles around the burning economic issues of labor and the people must be closely tied up with a broader program of domestic and foreign policy

that i
and
The
worse
masse
phase
ican
shod
fight
people
nopol
fore r
this st
embra
ism's
nation
The
sues, t
over-a
for th
pro-pe
interv
velop
assura
which
most
up a r
1. T
crusad
emph
drive
in the
in thi
canno
tion a
2. T
fighti
incen
3. T
Trum
the W

that is in the interests of the people and not of the trusts.

The drive of monopoly capital to worsen the living conditions of the masses at home is but the domestic phase of the entire program of American imperialism for riding roughshod toward world domination. The fight of the working class and the people as a whole against the monopolies on domestic issues can therefore not be effectively waged unless this struggle becomes part of the all-embracing struggle against imperialism's designs nationally and internationally.

These struggles on economic issues, therefore, must be related to the over-all perspectives that open up for the U.S. as a result of Wallace's pro-peace stand and the recent Stalin interview. These two outstanding developments not only give heart and assurance to the peace forces, of which the labor movement is the most powerful factor, but also point up a number of important lessons:

1. The need of organizing a great crusading peace movement that will emphasize that U.S. imperialism's drive to dominate the world is not in the interests of the Common Man in this country, and that, hence, it cannot be in the interest of the nation as a whole.

2. The need of identifying and fighting the specific groups of war incendiaries in the United States.

3. The need not to over-simplify Truman's vacillations at the time of the Wallace speech, but rather to see

in them an uncertainty reflecting a fear of the masses. If the peace forces—who are the vast majority—had really seized the initiative and developed a tremendous movement instead of losing this initiative to the reactionaries, it might have been possible to effect a change in Truman's attitude.

4. The need of recognizing that to have placed emphasis in the past so exclusively on the imminence of war, actually weakened the fight against the efforts of American imperialism to impose an imperialist peace upon the world, and consequently resulted in tendencies towards underestimation of the need for maximum mobilization to defeat reaction in the 1946 elections.

The struggle on the wage front received powerful reinforcement politically as a result of the great step forward taken by the convening of the Chicago Conference of Progressives, which adopted a minimum program on foreign and domestic policy. This program, despite some serious shortcomings, is a guide for the entire trade union movement and can serve to unite labor with the other progressive sections of the population. Outstanding in the decisions of this conference was its program of action for the 1946 elections and thereafter, which says in part:

Our program comes out of the people's needs and will succeed to whatever degree the people work for it through basic organization, through grass roots activity. Through the build-

ing of ward and precinct clubs and councils and action committees, we will carry the issues to where the voter lives and works. . . .

The perspectives of the progressive movement extend beyond Nov. 5. . . .

Toward this end, we instruct the sponsors of this Conference to constitute a Continuations Committee. . . .

Among its prime tasks will be the planning of a second Conference of Progressives to be held in mid-January in Washington to express the feelings of America's progressives toward the legislative problems confronting the 80th Congress and to develop ways and means for effective political action during the life of this Congress and thereafter. . . .

ORGANIZING THE UNORGANIZED

The second major question that must again be placed high on labor's agenda is the task of completing the organization of the unorganized.

While labor's 14 million trade union members—especially the six million in the C.I.O.—represent a great cornerstone of American democracy, a broadening and strengthening of this base is nevertheless essential to guarantee success in the work that lies ahead.

While the Southern organizing campaigns of both the C.I.O. and the A. F. of L. are of key importance in this regard, it should not be forgotten that even in the major industries that are organized and under contract, the work of organization still has to be completed. In General Motors it is said that 30 per cent of

the workers still do not belong to the U.A.W. In various steel mills, from 10 per cent to 25 per cent of the workers are not enrolled in the U.S.A.-C.I.O., not to speak of the unorganized Weirton Steel Co. In the jurisdiction of the U.E.R.M.W.A., the big Western Electric Co., and several G.E. and Westinghouse plants, plus numerous small shops are all still unorganized. Crying for organization in the shipbuilding industry is the big Newport News Co.; and in the shoe industry over one-third of the workers are not yet organized. Also unorganized are the millions of white-collar and agricultural workers, including the sharecroppers of the South.

This task is not one that can wait. It should be tackled with the same energy, forces, and methods of organization that were so fruitful in 1936-38. There is need for major attention to involving the rank-and-file in the organizing work, and for the use of a more experienced and diligent staff of organizers.

Especially important is the need for systematic organizational activity among the Negro workers. The fact is that the great majority of Negro workers are either being eliminated from industry altogether or are being returned to the dirtiest and most unskilled work. Very few unions have really put up a struggle against this and hence the danger exists of a growing estrangement between labor and the Negro people, with all of its political consequences. This need

not
feat
deve
war
bor
ness
tion
unio
unio
come
THE
UN
TH
hand
aries
move
even
A. F.
Wol
with
tryin
has b
for
dema
To
again
unite
need
prog
To
of an
comr
been
high
To
foll
other
whic
by th
amor

not happen because one of the new features of the democratic unity that developed in our country during the war was precisely the alliance of labor and the Negro people. An alertness to this problem, greater attention to promotion of Negro trade unionists to leadership, and a real unionization drive can quickly overcome the existing strains.

THE URGENT NEED FOR LABOR UNITY AND JOINT ACTION

The single greatest weapon in the hands of the trusts and the reactionaries in Congress is a divided labor movement. This weapon becomes even more dangerous when such A. F. of L. leaders as Lewis, Green, Woll, Ryan, and Hutcheson join with the employers in attacking and trying to weaken the C.I.O. which has been in the forefront of the fight for labor's economic and political demands.

To beat back the new offensive against wages and living standards, united or at least common action is needed in working out a common program of demands.

To prevent and defeat a new wave of anti-labor legislation in Congress, common action is needed; as has been proved in the past, it will be highly successful if carried through.

To avoid what appears as strikes following on the heels of one another in the maritime industry, which will be taken advantage of by the employers to create confusion among workers and antagonism to-

ward labor on the part of other sections of the population, there should at least be common expiration dates of all agreements as a first step toward the formation of a united maritime trade union federation based on a progressive program.

To avoid jurisdictional disputes between unions, with useless expenditure of money and energy instead of maximum organization work among the millions of unorganized, it is necessary to set up machinery to achieve a degree of order in the relations between the unions.

These are a few of the elementary but possible steps in the direction of a united labor movement. While the A. F. of L. top command rejects every attempt at united labor action, the A. F. of L. rank-and-file have shown, particularly in the maritime industry, a high degree of solidarity and desire for united action. The main responsibility for this drive for united or at least common action between the A. F. of L. and the C.I.O. must rest with the A. F. of L. rank-and-file whose every effort in that direction must receive the warmest and most fraternal support from the entire C.I.O.

DEFEAT RED-BAITING

In accordance with their plans to advance reaction at home and abroad, the trusts and their "brain-trusters" have let loose a new wave of Red-baiting in order to divert attention from the true character of

their offensive against the labor movement, the workers' conditions and everything democratic in our country. A particular phase of this is a real conspiracy to drive the C.I.O. and its leadership from the course that it has sailed since its inception—a course predicated on a democratic, progressive program and a militant and united membership and leadership.

This reactionary conspiracy uses the technique of shouting "Communist Menace" and "Purge the Communists" and threatening the President of the C.I.O. that if he does not succumb to the demands of Big Business, and begin a witch-hunt that can only lead to weakening and dividing the C.I.O., he himself will be suspect. The *Pittsburgh Press* expressed this bluntly, when it declared:

It is high time President Philip Murray of the C.I.O. stopped giving aid and comfort to the Communists in that organization. . . . And worst, he has helped keep them in power by opposing efforts of the anti-Communists to oust them.

Against whom does the *Pittsburgh Press* want action? Those in the unions who are "always at work . . . busy day and night." What does the *Pittsburgh Press* propose? Without any pretense, it declares for "open and determined rebellions" in the C.I.O. unions and attacks President Murray because of his "soft-pedaling, appeasing, avoid-any-trouble attitude

that has helped discourage such revolts."

This vicious and slanderous campaign must be understood as a new anti-C.I.O. drive, initiated and conducted by all the enemies of the entire trade union movement. These are the same people and papers who have always opposed union organization, who oppose every advance of labor, who want to amend the Wagner Act and chop the unions to pieces. Their present purpose is to weaken and divide the C.I.O. by what the *Pittsburgh Press* calls "open and determined rebellions." Who will benefit by this weapon of Red-baiting? The trusts, the Republican Party and the poll-tax Democrats, and John L. Lewis—all determined to give battle to the C.I.O.

This is not new. Each time in the past that Red-baiting has been attempted, the vast majority of the membership and leadership of the C.I.O. and its affiliates have rejected it. It is common sense—aside from a more fundamental understanding of the motives of this Red-baiting—for the C.I.O. membership and leadership once again decisively to repudiate Red-baiting.

As the labor and progressive movement sails into stormy political weather—with attacks on the C.I.O. as the central aim of all the reactionaries, whether they be in Congress, the N.A.M., or the A. F. of L. Executive Council—the burning need of the hour is unity in the C.I.O. under the able leadership of Philip Murray.

Red-baiting does not arise from within the labor movement. *It is injected into the labor movement by outside forces.* And who are these outside forces? The industrialists, the daily newspapers, the hierarchy of the Catholic Church, the professional Red-baiters and pro-fascist forces, and such people as Attorney General Tom Clark and J. Edgar Hoover.

True, some workers and even a few trade union leaders fall victim to the propaganda of Red-baiting in the same way that they fall victim to other propaganda from outside the ranks of labor that is also detrimental to the trade union movement.

The average active trade unionist views this question in a very practical, although limited, way. He uses as his yardstick in judging a fellow trade unionist: his contributions to building the union and keeping it progressive, strong, and active; his alertness to the maneuvers of the employers and his suggestions for preserving and advancing the interests of the worker; his struggle for the unity of the union and its leadership.

In the same way, the average trade unionist reasons that if the employers and all the forces and spokesmen of reaction are the promoters of Red-baiting, then it is something of which to be suspicious. When he sees that this will lead to witch-hunts and division in his union—and to attempts to purge some of the most active members—he readily rejects it. It is this healthy instinct of the worker

that has so often prevailed, except where special pressures have been applied or other confusing issues have been injected, especially by reactionaries within the trade union movement.

Why is the Communist Party singled out today as the target of this Red-baiting conspiracy? Because it has consistently struggled and fought against atom-bomb diplomacy and for a democratic foreign policy based upon Big Three unity, for treating the Soviet Union as an equal, for strict fulfillment of the agreements we entered into at Yalta, Potsdam, and Moscow, with particular attention to the breaking up of the Nazi cartels and to the defascization of Germany and Japan—all policies on which alone a durable peace can be based. Similarly on the domestic field, the Party has consistently exposed all those who have departed from F.D.R.'s Second Bill of Rights program; who organize conspiracies, such as meat shortages, in order to stampede the people to vote Republican; who oppose Negro rights and aim to undermine the very existence of trade unions, etc.

As the Party of the working class, the Communist Party has no interests separate and apart from the working class or its trade unions. Individual Communists are obligated by the Communist Party Constitution, wherever they belong to unions or other mass organizations, to "work to promote and strengthen the given organization and protect the

interests of its members" and furthermore are "required to belong to the respective trade unions to which they are eligible." Within a trade union, a Communist functions like any other member, in accord with the democratic rules and regulations of their respective union. A Communist in a trade union yields to no one in his loyalty, devotion, and adherence to his union and its members.

It is precisely these facts—facts known through their own experiences to the union men and women in thousands of shops, organizing campaigns and strikes—that lend confidence to the belief that the C.I.O. will give this renewed Red-baiting conspiracy a well-deserved setback.

Precisely because of their knowledge of how Communists function in the labor movement it becomes increasingly clear to the workers that such charges as "Communist menace," "capturing unions," "importing alien ideas," "loyalty to a country other than the U.S.A.," or "distorting trade unionism into Communism," are mere bugaboos, with as much validity as those used to scare children.

Communists know better than anyone else the difference between a trade union and the Communist Party. The trade unions unite all workers irrespective of national origin, religion, color, sex, or political affiliation, primarily in defense of their immediate economic interests. While it is true that the unions more

and more consider political questions and actively participate in forms of political action—and it is right that they should do so—it can readily be seen that the unions, by their composition and function, are limited in the tasks which they undertake and in their ability to provide effective and all-round leadership on all questions and issues before the nation.

The Communist, as a worker and trade unionist, joins his fellow worker in all their struggles. His membership in the Communist Party is not competitive with his membership in the trade unions. Actually, it helps him to be a good trade unionist. However, his primary purpose in belonging to the Communist Party is for reasons that go beyond the immediate aims of the trade unions. This is fully explained in the Preamble of the Communist Party Constitution, which states:

The Communist Party recognizes that the final abolition of exploitation and oppression, of economic crises and unemployment, of reaction and war, will be achieved only by the socialist reorganization of society—by the common ownership and operation of the national economy under a government of the people led by the working class.

The Communist Party, therefore, educates the working class, in the course of its day-to-day struggles, for its historic mission, the establishment of Socialism. Socialism, the highest form of democracy, will guarantee the full realization of the right to "life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness," and will turn the achievements of labor,

science and culture to the use and enjoyment of all men and women.

Within the trade unions, the individual Communist should be judged as a trade unionist and on no other basis. This can easily be achieved by judging the activity of the Communists, whether it be in helping to organize the unorganized; in the day-to-day struggles of the trade unions; in the varied struggles for the rights of the Negro people and all other civil rights; in the field of political action; in their activities during the war, including support of the no-strike pledge; in various forms of anti-fascist activity, including the armed struggle against fascism. The

Communists in the trade unions ask for no special privileges, but neither will they agree to be second-class citizens, denied the rights and privileges granted and due to all others.

* * *

The important problems discussed above require to be grasped clearly by the labor movement as a basis for positive work and achievement. To the extent that this clarity prevails, the backbone of the nation, labor, will be strengthened, thus enabling the people to move forward toward the future with greater confidence in their own strength and in their victory over the forces of reaction.

AMERICAN IMPERIALIST POLICY IN THE FAR EAST

By FREDERICK V. FIELD

SINCE THE DEATH of President Roosevelt and the increased influence in the White House of the most reactionary sections of American finance-capital, the wartime policy of seeking to adjust differences within the framework of Big Three cooperation has given way to a policy of forming a reactionary bloc against the Soviet Union and against every manifestation of people's democracy. This policy has led to the formation of the Anglo-American imperialist bloc, the alliance of the two most powerful capitalist nations. It has led also to cooperation with, and support of, reactionary, precapitalist forces wherever they can be found, conspicuous among which are the Vatican and the remnants of feudalism.

The dependence of American imperialism upon feudalists, collaborationists, pro-fascists, and other backward reactionary elements and institutions is world-wide. It is not restricted to the Far East. We observe the same American policy working in regard to Poland, Greece,

Yugoslavia, and Iran. But it is in the Far East that we find the policy carried to its furthest extremes. The special significance of this area in terms of American foreign policy derives from the relative strength and opportunity of American imperialism there in contrast to its lesser strength and opportunity in Europe. One of the most important changes that took place during and immediately after World War II in the relationships among capitalist countries was the emergence of the United States to a position virtually unchallenged by its imperialist rivals in Eastern Asia.

SOME RESULTS OF WORLD WAR II

While America's traditional imperialist rivals in the Far East—Britain, France and Holland—have been severely weakened by World War II, and while Japanese and German imperialism have been soundly defeated as a result of the war, the peoples' democratic movements throughout the Far East have been immensely strengthened, and the Soviet Union has emerged more clearly than ever as the most powerful world force for peace and security. American imperialists do not have a clear path in their attempt to conquer Eastern Asia and bring it within their orbit. Every thrust is being met by a counter-blow. In China, in the Philippines, in Indonesia and Indo-China, the people, denied the opportunity to win their freedom and independence in com-

mon struggle against Japanese fascism, have taken to arms to defend themselves against their new would-be conquerors, American and European imperialists allied, as in the case of China and the Philippines, with local reactionaries.

Furthermore, it must be recognized that while the United States has emerged from the war in a very much stronger position than before in relation to its imperialist competitors, it must cope with the contradictions inherent in capitalism in the Far Eastern scene. Within the imperialist coalition that has operated against all forms of democracy in the Far East since V-J Day lie all the classic rivalries of imperialist competition. Nor have these contradictions been altogether latent during the postwar months. While accepting, and indeed depending upon, American support in their attempt to re-establish their colonial hegemonies in the Far East, the British, French, and Dutch have struggled to prevent the Americans from striking too hard a bargain for their aid. Britain has been engaged in a vigorous trade promotion program centered upon Hongkong, which has again brought an important part of South China within its imperialist orbit. Australia has hurled frequent challenges to the American imperialists. In Japan, even the British have shown discomfort over the unilateral policies of MacArthur. These examples show that imperialist contradictions are

again coming to the fore in the Far East; they foretell increasing obstacles for the Americans.

The present influence of reaction in the Far East is no accident. It is an historical consequence of conscious policies of imperialist circles in Britain and the United States that manifested themselves in the course of the war. Churchill's famous assertion in 1942 that he did not consider it any part of his duty to preside over the liquidation of the British Empire was not an isolated or exceptional point of view during the war period. On the contrary, it was a symptom of preparations carefully made by both British and American elements during the war, and partially carried out during the war period, for the sabotage of Big Three unity and of democracy, which reached its full expression shortly after V-J Day. A contrasting factor between the European and Far Eastern war sectors was that in the former it was possible to challenge and to defeat, though sometimes only partially, the plans of the imperialists to a far greater extent than in the Far East. Churchill's long delay of the Second Front in Europe lengthened the war and was tragically costly in terms of lives and material destruction. His attempt to avoid the Second Front altogether by insisting upon an Anglo-American thrust through the Balkans is reflected in the dangerous situation in Greece. Both of these policies, however, were opposed and in large

part defeated by the greater strength of the democratic forces among the Big Three. In the Far East, the attempt to sabotage the war effort and the war objectives had more success. The policies symbolized by Lord Louis Mountbatten, Chiang Kai-shek, General MacArthur and Major-General Patrick J. Hurley were unsuccessfully challenged during the war and have contributed to the present critical situation.

Five sets of circumstances give a particularly dangerous coloration to the Far Eastern picture. Two of these had to do with the war itself: the way it was fought and the way it was brought to an end. The other three, connected with the first two, are postwar phenomena: the occupation or attempted occupation of allied as well as enemy nations by imperialists, the importance of the Far East in the struggle for national independence, and the proximity of the East Asiatic continent to the Soviet Union. Each of these factors bears examination.

COALITION WAR THWARTED

The development of a genuine and consolidated coalition among the nations and peoples fighting against Japan was deliberately prevented. The war against Hitler, in contrast, did develop into a coalition. This was true not only in the political sphere, as exemplified by the Moscow, Teheran and Yalta conferences, but in military operations as well. The Second Front, when it

was finally opened, and the attack from east and west upon Hitler's armies within Germany, were genuinely coordinated military undertakings. Nothing in either the political or military aspects of warfare in the Far East paralleled these European developments.

The Soviet Union, which bore the main burden in the task of destroying Hitler's armies, was not able to enter the Far Eastern theater of war until after the surrender of the Nazis. As soon as possible thereafter, and in fulfillment of its coalition obligations, the Soviet Union did declare war upon Japan and launched an immediate large-scale attack upon the Mikado's armies in Manchuria. But, as will be noted below, the full significance of this momentous event, as far as leading to a coalition war effort in the Far East was concerned was largely thwarted by the policies of the American and British imperialists and by Chiang Kai-shek's sabotage of a unified war effort within China. One other opportunity to establish coalition warfare, in both political and military fields, emerged from the policy adopted by President Roosevelt and implemented by General Stilwell toward China during the first nine months of 1944. President Roosevelt had come to the conclusion that he could not rely upon Chiang Kai-shek to lead a united Chinese people in war against the Japanese enemy. The Chiang Kai-shek regime had more in common

with Japanese military-fascism than it did with the democratic aspirations of the Chinese people. President Roosevelt concluded that the United States would have to establish direct relations with all Chinese groups willing and capable of fighting. Through General Stilwell, he therefore opened up direct contact with Yenan, the capital of Communist China, and a policy looking to supplying the Communist and guerilla forces began to be developed.

This policy received a severe blow with the withdrawal of Stilwell, at the request of Chiang Kai-shek, and the appointment of Major-General Hurley to replace him in the early fall of 1944. It was not until after President Roosevelt's death that the policy was openly turned into its opposite, but even while the great war leader was alive, Hurley, as the American Ambassador, did all he could to sabotage it.

As far as the war against Japan was concerned, there was a wider significance to Stilwell's removal. Stilwell had been a chief advocate of a great land offensive to destroy the Japanese army. He had been opposed by the British who, regardless of cost, wanted to avoid a strategy that would bring the Asiatic masses actively into the war. Stilwell had also been opposed by MacArthur, who advocated the stepping-stone strategy which was eventually employed and which left the Japanese mainland armies practically intact—with the notable exception of the

Kwantung army which was decimated by the Soviet forces in Manchuria. Chiang Kai-shek also opposed a major land offensive, because the inevitable consequence of such strategy was to support the Communists, guerillas, and other democratic forces, whom he regarded as his real enemies.

The upshot of the removal of General Stilwell was the abandonment of the land offensive, loss of the opportunity to turn the war against Japan into a coalition struggle, and exclusive reliance upon the MacArthur stepping-stone strategy. A further consequence was the concentration of political and military power in the war against Japan in the person of MacArthur.

Despite the Stilwell period in China and the entrance of the Soviet Union into the conflict, the general nature of the war against Japan at no time became a war of coalition. The three great fighting forces which contributed to the victory, the Chinese Communists and guerillas, the United States forces operating from Pacific Islands, and the Soviet Red Army, fought separately in separate sectors, without mutual coordination, and pursuing a strategy which, in the case of the Chinese Communists and the Soviet Union, was opposed by the MacArthur school.

Those who had been concerned over the refusal of the imperialist powers to arm their colonial dependents to resist Japan's invasions

in the first weeks and months after Pearl Harbor, and who later became even more incensed at their refusal to permit the colonial peoples to become participants in liberating their lands, were not surprised by this deliberate policy of preventing a coalition from forming in the latter stages of the war. The notorious Southeast Asia Command under Lord Mountbatten, direct representative of British imperialism, sat the war out at its bases in India and Ceylon and went into action only after V-J Day when it was assigned and gladly accepted the "heroic task" of invading Indonesia on behalf of the Dutch empire.

This was the picture in the military field. The lack of coalition in the political field corresponded to it. No effort was made to apply the Atlantic Charter and its promise of self-determination to the peoples of the Far East. Nor was there any development in the Pacific which corresponded to the great meetings and declarations of Moscow, Tehran, and Yalta with respect to the war against Hitlerism.

HOW THE WAR WAS ENDED

The second factor leading to the present dangerous situation in the Far East, and which distinguishes it from the situation in Europe, follows directly from the failure to establish a coalition during the war. It is the manner in which the war ended.

During the spring and summer of 1945 the United States government,

through the facilities of the Office of War Information, sent a series of extraordinary messages to the Japanese. The messages were broadcast in Japanese by Captain E. M. Zacharias of the U. S. Navy. He had formerly been Naval Attache in Tokyo and a close personal friend of several of Japan's war leaders. He was now, according to Arthur Krock of the *New York Times*, a consultant to President Truman. His May 8 broadcast contained the following friendly greetings to America's enemies:

"Admiral Yonai will recall our many conversations. . . . Admiral Nomura will remember my frank discussions, both in Japan when Admiral Nagano often attended, and on his way to Washington to his last official assignment. Mr. Kurusu will know my regret in the loss of his son, whom as a young boy I often patted on the head. Generals Matsumoto, Teramoto, and Hirota will remember my frequent advice. Likewise Mr. Debuchi, Mr. Wakatsugi, Mr. Horinouchi and the staff of the late Ambassador Saito. Your Premier, Admiral Baron Suzuki, may remember our meetings when he was chief of the naval general staff. My impression of him was fully confirmed by his recent sympathetic statement regarding our loss in the death of Franklin Delano Roosevelt. . . ."

This broadcast ended by telling the Japanese they could "choose a peace with honor."

Captain Zacharias, again unquestionably speaking for the U. S. government, went much further in his July 21 broadcast. Again emphasizing "peace with honor," he virtually promised Japan a soft peace if she would hurriedly surrender to the United States alone and he especially warned against a delay which might bring the Soviet Union into the picture. He said: "China, Great Britain, Australia and the Netherlands among them—may require a stronger voice if the war drags on and they put more into it, in determining the kind of peace Japan will get." "If Japan should initiate the cessation of hostilities without further delay, it may be assumed that it will be the United States which will enforce the formula and insure the peace." Prophetic words indeed, and heartening to the Japanese fascists then as now! Then, in a passage obviously referring to the possible entry of the Soviet Union into the Far Eastern war, Zacharias said: "Are the leaders of Japan really so shortsighted that they cannot see the possible complications which they may have to face if they fail to act, and act promptly?"

No clearer appeal to the military-fascist government of the enemy could have been voiced.

The historical record is not yet sufficiently complete to say whether or not the dropping of the atom bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki was timed to bring the fighting to a rapid close in order to prevent the

Soviet forces from effectively entering the Far Eastern theater of war. In any case, the war was brought to an abrupt and unexpected close, with the Japanese armies in China south of Manchuria virtually intact, the home islands uninvasion, and the emperor and his entire government ruling Japan and dealing directly with General MacArthur.

In a few days of fighting, the Soviet Union had been able to smash the crack Kwantung Army in Manchuria and effectively occupy and accept the Japanese surrender in that whole area. Time, however, did not permit the further advance of Soviet troops to points where they could engage in joint operations with the Chinese in Jehol, Chahar, or other North China points. Neither time nor the political propensities of MacArthur permitted the occupation of Japan to be undertaken by a joint Allied force.

Regarding this whole episode of the Soviet entry into the war against Japan, it is highly interesting to note a comment by William J. Donovan, former chief of the O.S.S., in the September 30 issue of *Life*. Donovan, in arguing for a new intelligence service, says: "It is terribly easy to go wrong, to make a mistake in high policy because of an intelligence slip-up. The appearance of the U.S.S.R. as a partner in Manchuria [this is the "mistake"—F.V.F.] was largely brought about by an American policy decision [by President Roosevelt at Yalta—

F.V.F.] growing out of a fatal gap in intelligence." That "fatal gap," according to Donovan, was the failure of the U.S. intelligence services to inform the President that we could beat the Japanese by ourselves!

There would be no suspicion cast upon the sudden ending of the war had the aftermath of the surrender indicated the resolution of the American victory to banish forever the leaders and the institutions which had brought on the war. The record proves otherwise. The record proves that the Zacharias broadcasts quoted above expressed the policy of the U.S. government. The way in which the war was brought to a close cannot therefore be separated from the policy of appeasement of Japanese reaction and the deliberate building of an anti-Soviet bastion in the enemy nation which has characterized MacArthur's postwar occupation of Japan and Southern Korea.

The actual Japanese surrender was governed by the Potsdam declaration of July 26, 1945, issued jointly by the United States, Great Britain, and China, the Soviet Union subscribing formally on August 8 when it declared war upon Japan. There can be no doubt that the Soviet Union was fully aware of the terms of the declaration when it was first made and unquestionably influenced them. To those in control of American policy, however, the formal unconditional surrender was turned into its opposite. The ground for this had been well prepared dur-

ing the war; the opportunity for carrying it out was seized upon by America's unilateral occupation after the war.

Before turning to the occupation period itself, when the United States set about establishing its imperialist "peace" throughout the Far East, it is well to remind ourselves of two events which occurred almost simultaneously with the surrender.

In China, Chiang Kai-shek—being in daily conference with Lt. Gen. Albert C. Wedemeyer, chief of the U.S. forces in China, and with Ambassador Hurley—commanded the Japanese and puppets to retain their arms (that is, not to surrender to the Communist-led troops who were on the spot) and to keep order until the arrival of his own troops. Even before Japan's surrender the American officials were arranging to fly Chiang's troops to the battle fronts to rob the Chinese people of the peace for which they had fought for eight years. Thus was laid the groundwork for China's Civil War.

The basis for the war against the Indonesian Republic was similarly laid. Dr. Soekarno, President of the Republic, proclaimed the independence of his people on August 17, 1945. Shortly thereafter the Combined Chiefs of Staff, an Anglo-American outfit, ordered Lord Mountbatten to invade the Indonesian islands for the alleged purpose of accepting the surrender of the Japanese. As in China, the imperialists actually used these Japanese

in their armed conflict against the local democratic elements.

A POLICY OF DOMINATION

The way the war against Japan was fought and the way it was ended paved the way for policies which the postwar occupation has been designed to consolidate. These policies are, first, to impose on Eastern Asia and the Southwestern Pacific an imperialist peace rather than a people's peace, and, secondly, for American finance capital to dominate that imperialist peace. Thus, the third factor which we wish to take up in indicating the particularly dangerous character of the Far Eastern situation, namely, the occupation of friendly as well as enemy nations, follows directly upon what has just been discussed.

A detailed analysis of the American occupation policy will not be attempted here, since our readers are familiar with its main outlines, particularly as they pertain to the key area of China. However, there are two points which should be stressed in connection with our thesis regarding the special significance of America's imperialist policy in the Far East. These are the new position of the United States among the imperialist powers, and the consistent pattern of U.S. policy since V-J Day throughout the Far Eastern area.

In an article entitled "The record of American Imperialism in China" in the January, 1946, issue of *Political Affairs*, the changing position of the

United States among the imperialist powers in the Far East was indicated by this writer. The well known liberal writer, Owen Lattimore, has characterized the role of America in the Far East a century ago as that of a "hitchhiking imperialist." That is an apt description of the days when the British were the dominant imperialist power and American traders were taking whatever rides they could thumb on the British empire's bandwagon. The roles have changed radically since the days of the Opium War. The power of the United States grew rapidly during the latter third of the nineteenth century. This period was climaxed by the war with Spain at the turn of the century when the "Manifest Destiny" of the new American finance capital expressed itself in the seizure of the Philippine Islands from the Filipinos who had just wrested their independence from Spain. But the first important change in the relations among imperialists in the Far East did not take place until World War I. In the decade and a half that elapsed between the Spanish-American War and the First World War, British, American, Tsarist Russian and Japanese imperialism, with German and French contestants, had been jousting for the dominant position in the Far East. The result had been a sort of standoff, expressed in the International Banking Consortium through which loans and credits to China were pooled. World War I

temporarily wrote off the power of German imperialism in the Far East, as elsewhere, and seriously weakened the British and French. The October Socialist Revolution, by ending Russian imperialism, permanently eliminated it as a factor in the situation.

For the United States it was World War II that was to prove decisive in establishing it as the dominant imperialist power in the Far East. If in the 1840's the United States was a hitchhiker, in the 1940's she became the bus driver. British, Dutch, French finance capital no longer could travel the Far Eastern road without American assistance.

The expression of American imperialism's dominant position in relation to the other capitalist powers in the Far East has not been confined to China. There, it is true, it has had its most blatant manifestation. Following the MacArthur-Chiang Kai-shek orders for taking the surrender of Japanese arms, the United States embarked upon undisguised military intervention in China on behalf of feudal-fascist reaction and against the majority of the Chinese people who aspired to unity, democracy, and national independence. If the American people allow this policy to continue, not only will China be doomed to years and years of bloody civil war, but the American people as well will face a future of insecurity, and finally world war, which its own government will have instigated.

This same type of intervention goes on in Japan and Korea also, though under the disguise of occupying former enemy territory. Japan has changed in only one major respect as a result of its defeat. It no longer challenges American imperialism. It is being shaped to serve it. Its feudal-fascist institutions have not been eliminated; they are being made subservient tools of the American master. The political, social, and economic pattern of Japan today is not something different from the Japan of 1941; it is simply an alteration of that pattern. And it will take more than the ousting of MacArthur or of any other personality in the occupation setup to wipe out the structure of Japanese reaction; it will take a defeat of the American imperialist policy for the whole Far Eastern area.

Events in Southern Korea, as disgraceful as anything that can be found in American history, have for the most part been lost in the confusion of postwar events which have crowded the American mind. It is too seldom remembered, for instance, that a united front of Korean anti-fascists had taken over from the Japanese and the quislings and formed a popular government before the Americans landed in the southern half of the country early in September. The American military command refused to deal with them, and, instead, imposed its own imperialist government. The leaders of the popular Korean movement

were suppressed, harassed, and in many cases imprisoned. Their organizations, their newspapers, and their meetings were forcibly broken up. Reactionary Koreans were imported from the United States and Chungking to replace those who had led the people in sabotage of the Japanese fascists. Collaborators, landlords, and former quislings were systematically promoted to power by the United States occupation authorities. A simple criterion of desirability was established. All those who supported the Moscow decisions, to which the United States was a party, regarding joint trusteeship and early independence for Korea, were branded as dangerous radicals; those who publicly denounced the Moscow accord were given positions of responsibility in the new government. Korea, like Japan and China, was being ideologically, economically, and militarily prepared for the American-inspired struggle against democracy in the Far East.

One of the most extravagant frauds of history has been perpetrated by the United States over the question of Philippine independence. There was a period before and during the war when the Dutch, British, and French imperialists were concerned at the break in the colonial system allegedly represented by the American intention to free its Pacific colony. The precedent thus to be set, they felt, would have disturbing implications for their tens of millions of "charges." But as matters turned

out, the farce which the Truman Administration's "bi-partisan" policy made of Philippine "independence" has set a pattern which the British, Dutch, and French might well copy with a minimum of loss to their imperialist interests.

Veterans of the Philippine campaign put it this way: "After we landed we fought the Japanese hand in hand with the Filipino guerillas and we moved forward toward Manila largely on the basis of intelligence supplied by the Filipinos. In each town we captured we'd take the Japanese that were left and put the Filipino collaborators in jail. Afterwards things changed. We'd go back to visit these towns and we'd find that the Filipino guerillas had been jailed or driven to the hills. The quislings would not only have been released but would be holding down the job of mayor, or judge or whatever other position was at the disposal of the American authorities."

That is the story in a nutshell. This was American policy. It was carried out, and of course in part initiated, by General MacArthur whose former business associates in the Philippines and present military and political colleagues were the leaders of Franco's Falange in the Islands and Filipino quislings. To execute the policy the United States has retained in the Philippines a force of no less than one hundred thousand troops. It has trained and equipped an army and a militia of

Filipinos which are under the command of former quislings. It has turned over to the Quisling government surplus property worth nearly three quarters of a billion dollars. It has employed its own troops and its Filipino puppet troops to intervene in the presidential elections and to try to slaughter the anti-landlord peasant movement of Central Luzon. There has thus been created an internal situation momentarily in favor of American imperialism. Formal independence has brought no change in the imperialist relationship, a change only in the tactics of imperialism.

On the strictly economic side of the picture the Philippines Trade Act, passed by Congress and signed by Truman in April, 1946, not only perpetuates the dominance of U.S. vested interests in the Philippines for another 28 years but grants to Americans even greater economic privileges in the Islands than they enjoyed before "independence."*

THE IMPORTANCE OF THE FAR EAST

The Far East is the greatest colonial area in the world. The immediate political future of its 600 million colonial people, together with the immediate political future of China's 450 million semi-colonial people, holds the answer, not only to war or peace, poverty or security in that vast region, but is decisive for

the rest of the world as well. In the Far East, imperialism, especially American imperialism, has its greatest opportunity for exploitation and for launching its planned counter-offensive against world progress. The importance of the Far East as a colonial and semi-colonial area is the fourth reason why the strength of American imperialism in that area is particularly dangerous.

"Whereas after the war we shall find Asia economically still largely in a state of primitive agriculture, politically we shall find it divided in two parts: Free Asia and Subject Asia. While Lincoln's phrase cannot be applied literally, yet in a larger sense it is true that neither country nor region can indefinitely continue to exist half slave and half free."

These words were written by Henry A. Wallace in the Spring of 1945 and appear in a pamphlet, *Our Job in the Pacific*, published by the American Council, Institute of Pacific Relations. They express the position of President Roosevelt in his struggle against the colonialism of the old world empires. Mr. Wallace did not then anticipate American military intervention in China; he included China in the category of Free Asia. Elsewhere in this pamphlet he recognizes the key relation of China to the struggle for freedom in the Far East. "Today," he writes, "the peoples of the East are on the march. We can date the beginning of that march from 1911 when the revolutionary movement

* See, James S. Allen, "Enlightened American Imperialism in the Philippines," *Political Affairs*, June, 1946.

among the Chinese people, inspired by the teaching of Sun Yat-sen, overthrew the Manchu dynasty. . . ."

American imperialism also recognizes the key role of China in the march toward Far Eastern democracy. Why else does it stake everything, including the lives of American marines, upon imposing Chiang Kai-shek's pro-fascist dictatorship upon the Chinese people!

The policy of American imperialism toward the Philippines and toward the colonial policies of its imperialist rivals are operations complementary to the main attack upon China. Referring again to the division between a free and a subject Asia, Mr. Wallace says: "It is to our advantage not to perpetuate this division but to see an orderly process of transition so that the area of free Asia will grow and the area of subject Asia continually diminish." In sharp contrast to this sound advice, the "bipartisan" Byrnes-Vandenberg policy uses and encourages military violence in subjecting even further the area of "Subject Asia" and in attempting to enslave China, the main fortress of Henry Wallace's concept of "Free Asia."

A THREAT TO WORLD PEACE

The way in which the Far Eastern war was fought and brought to an end has given American imperialism a special postwar character in that area which it does not enjoy in Europe. For all the reasons mentioned

a Far Eastern vista has been opened to American imperialists which ends on a horizon of world domination. Not only is Eastern Asia, with its resources, its economic backwardness, and its hundreds of millions of inhabitants, a first-rate imperialist prize in itself; it offers far more. It offers a vast land base of great potential power and strategic significance *on the borders of the Soviet Union*. This is the fifth reason that U.S. imperialist policy in the Far East is peculiarly dangerous to world peace.

Control of this land base has not been achieved by the imperialists. But neither can it be said that the present situation excludes the possibility that the imperialists will stake even more than they already have in order to achieve that goal, nor that in doing so they will not lead the world toward another war. Today they have instigated civil war in China for the purpose of controlling that great land base and they are risking extension of that war to the actual Soviet borders. Today it is an imperialist maneuver for position. Tomorrow—?

American imperialism during and after the war made its greatest advances in the Far East. It is there that it has its greatest opportunities to expand, to enslave, to hold back the march of freedom and democracy, and to achieve the preconditions for launching World War III.

THE COUNTERACTING FORCES

American imperialism in the Far

East must be weakened and destroyed on the picket lines at home, as well as by the fight of the heroic Chinese people. It must be challenged on the American cost-of-living front, as well as by the seventy million Indonesians who stand firm in their demand for independence. It must be turned back in the Congressional elections just as firmly as it is fought by the Filipino tenant farmers. Together with the demand for Big Power unity and particularly for a return to American-Soviet cooperation, the American people must find ways of giving direct aid to the Far Eastern peoples who are today fighting our common fight against imperialism on the battle front.

American policy in the Far East is, of course, not having its own way. It is being challenged by the most powerful democratic movements that have ever existed in the Far East. American marines, airplanes, naval transports, military advisers, billions of dollars of Lend-Lease and surplus property, the tricky political maneuvers of General Marshall—all these have not brought victory to American imperialism in China or to its puppet, the Kuomintang. In Korea, in the Philippines, in Indonesia, Indo-China, Burma, Malaya, India, and throughout Eastern Asia, imperialism is being fought by aroused peoples under capable and often brilliant democratic leadership. This struggle will never cease until imperialism is thrown out of the Far

East. The great danger today is that through the failure of the democratic forces in the United States, particularly, to act with sufficient speed and strength civil warfare will continue and spread, fighting will continue for many years, insecurity and poverty will continue to characterize the Far East, and always there will lurk the danger of a new world war.

The hope for peace and security lies in three main directions: in the steadfast efforts of the Soviet Union to restore Big Power Unity and to rid the world of all vestiges of fascist reaction; in the heroic efforts of the Chinese, Filipinos, Indonesians, Koreans, and other Far Eastern peoples who are fighting against imperialism and their own oppressors; and in the working class and other progressive ant-imperialist elements within the capitalist countries, especially the United States. In the fifteen months since the end of the war the Far Eastern peoples have borne the brunt of battle against imperialism. They have received powerful though indirect aid from the Soviet Union's consistent struggles against Anglo-American imperialism and on behalf of a peoples' peace. It has been within the imperialist countries that the anti-imperialist fight has been weakest. And it is there—particularly in the United States—that the decision must be made, for democracy or imperialist world conquest, for a people's prosperity or world-wide poverty and crisis, for peace or war.

EC
AN

WH
The
disc
wou
thin
econ
thin
sent
and
tion
Tru
It
situ
that
cont
labor
the
and
Nor
Tru
sour
certa
litica
lies a
and
"mar
that
uatic
the
neith
is rec
evid

ECONOMIC TRENDS AND PERSPECTIVES

By ALEXANDER BITTELMAN

WHAT IS THE economic outlook?

The fact that this question is being discussed so widely and intensely would in itself indicate that something is the matter with the present economic situation. Indeed, something is, only not exactly as represented by the spokesmen of the trusts and by the Republican Party reactionaries or by the spokesmen of the Truman Administration.

It is not true that the economic situation is "basically sound" and that the trouble lies in government controls, high wages, strikes, and labor inefficiency, as is claimed by the monopolies, by their economists, and by their political representatives. Nor is it true, as is claimed by the Truman Administration, that the sources of present-day economic uncertainties lie exclusively in the political machinations of the monopolies and their Republican spokesmen and in the "inability" of labor and "management" to get together, but that fundamentally the economic situation is good. For the truth is that the economic situation is basically neither sound nor good. When this is recognized, it becomes even more evident that the political machina-

tions of monopoly reaction, and the "get tough with labor" policies of "management," are playing an *exceptionally important role* at this moment in aggravating and deepening economic difficulties and uncertainties.

THE MEANING OF THE STOCK EXCHANGE BREAK

The meaning of the severe break on the Stock Exchange in September would present less of a mystery to bourgeois economists if it were recognized:

(a) that the trends on the Stock Exchange reflect on the whole the cyclical trends in the national economy, even though, at times, in a somewhat distorted form;

(b) that the large stockholders, investment firms, and corporations are able, despite existing regulations and controls, to exploit current Stock Exchange trends for their own selfish economic and political purposes by hastening or retarding, within certain limits, the development of tendencies *inherent* in the objective economic situation; and

(c) that, in their turn, developments on the Stock Exchange can and do materially affect current trends in the economic situation, even though the large corporations and monopolies are in ever greater measure meeting their needs for new capital out of their own liquid reserves and accumulation rather than by the sale of stocks.

Seen from this standpoint, it be-

comes clear that the sharp break on the Stock Exchange, which wiped out nearly nine billion dollars of stock values between September 3 and 10, is an indicator of serious economic difficulties and constitutes a storm signal of the maturing economic crisis. This we shall demonstrate by an analysis of current economic trends. For the moment, we must take note of some of the features of the September break on the Stock Exchange. These can be listed as follows:

1. The break was a culminating development of a downward trend during the entire summer, a downward trend which became more pronounced by the middle of July and especially since the middle of August. For example, between the middle of August and the middle of September stocks declined nearly sixteen points according to the *New York Times* index of combined averages. The nearest comparison for one month is May, 1940, when there was a decline of 22 points. On September 15, the Dow Jones index of averages stood at 45 points below its high point of 212 in May when the upward development on the Stock Exchange which began in 1942 came to an end.

2. There is a good deal of evidence that the selling was initiated and led by large investors and investment firms and not by some panicky small investors. These latter were soon precipitated into selling naturally enough and, as usual, were the worst

sufferers. The Securities and Exchange Commission, if it goes through with its promised investigation, will undoubtedly throw interesting light on this particular angle.

3. While serious losses were suffered in the break by all stocks without exception, the outstanding losers were basic industry shares and those of munitions and war equipment producers. For example, du Pont dropped 17 points on September 3 and more than 4 points on September 10. U. S. Steel lost 6 points on September 3 and nearly 3 points on September 10.

4. The decline on the Stock Exchange continues. Reporting developments, the *New York Times*, on October 9, said: "Financial circles had warned last week that there were indications that the September liquidation had not run its course and Tuesday's drop [Oct. 8] was held to set the stage for a new assault." We are thus dealing here with a consistent and strong declining trend of several months' duration, affecting all stocks and particularly the "strongest." It plainly marks a reversal of the upward course which began in 1942, reflects serious economic difficulties, and presages the coming of an economic crisis, *whose arrival is no doubt hastened by the reactionary imperialist offensive of the American monopolies at home and abroad.*

5. The foregoing explains in the main the cause of the sharp break on the Stock Exchange on September 3 and 10 and for the continuing

decline. But this is not all. The *political machinations* of the monopolies have a good deal to do with it. It can be safely assumed that the monopolies, or certain sections of them, by their deliberate actions precipitated the break in order to promote further the current reactionary campaign of incitement against labor and the trade unions, in which strikes are blamed for the existing economic uncertainties, and the cry is raised of the alleged incapacity of American business to compete effectively abroad because of high American wages. This may also have been a maneuver, as charged by Representative Sabath and others, to intensify economic fears on the eve of the elections in order to secure reactionary victories for the Republican Party. It is certainly a means of pressure upon the government to force the abolition of the remaining wartime controls and regulations and, above all, *to force the adoption of a much larger scale of war production and militarization* for economic reasons and to intensify the war scare. This may also represent an attempt to exploit declining trends on the Stock Exchange in order to achieve a so-called "more flexible and adequate" reserve of unemployed by precipitating economic disturbances.

6. The break on the Stock Exchange, reflecting in the main the maturing of an economic crisis, itself tends to hasten the maturing of this crisis. It has also produced new

economic uncertainties in other capitalist countries, especially in England, where the capitalists are now looking for extra measures of protection "from American instability." This, in turn, is bound further to sharpen imperialist rivalries and all the contradictions of the world system of capitalist economy.

LIMITATIONS OF THE HOME AND FOREIGN MARKETS

It was stated above that the declining trends and sharp breaks on the Stock Exchange must be viewed as storm signals of the maturing economic crisis. What then are the cyclical trends?

1. There is continued high production and employment. The Federal Reserve Board index of industrial production stands at about 175 of the 1935-39 average, while total employment is about 58 million. The National Industrial Conference Board, a reactionary Big Business outfit, claims that industrial employment in July was 39.3 per cent higher than in August, 1939. The thing to remember, however, is that since 1939 the population has increased by 6 million and the available labor force has increased by 7 million.

2. However, production in many lines is below capacity. Steel ingot production for the first 8 months of 1946 was 28 per cent below the corresponding period of 1945. Below capacity production is a factor in many industries producing basic raw ma-

terials, producers' durable goods, and consumers' durable goods. Strike struggles provoked by the capitalists have played their part in the situation, but the main reason lies in the tremendous "excess capacity" of industrial plant (excess, that is, as compared with what the monopolies feel they can exploit for *monopoly* profits). Another reason lies in the general economic and political uncertainties created by the reactionary imperialist offensive.

3. Unemployment is officially stated to be between 2 and 3 million, and may be closer to 5 million, if we include all those looking for jobs but unwilling to work for wages below standard. Here the real reasons should be noted as to why previous forecasts by our Party of mass unemployment in the summer of 1946 (government economists had named figures of between 8 to 10 million) were only partially realized. First, labor won the first round of struggle against drastic reductions in the workers' take-home pay, and for a measure of favorable legislation, during the wage movements of the end of 1945 and the early part of 1946. These achievements tended to preserve a wide base of mass purchasing power feeding high industrial and agrarian production and employment. Secondly, technical re-conversion was completed in the main sooner than expected, thus reducing substantially the size of "re-conversion" unemployment. Thirdly, production for the armed forces, and

the size of the armed forces themselves, have not been cut as drastically as anticipated.

It is true, of course, that the mounting high cost of living—part of the general reactionary offensive—has already cancelled out labor's economic gains. But, in doing so, this growing high cost of living has created additional elements of the maturing economic crisis.

4. The national income continues relatively high, running at an annual rate of about 160 billion dollars. But high income rates are confined to no more than about one-third of the population and to a small minority of workers. Between April, 1945, and April, 1946, labor's real earnings have dropped 18 per cent. Since mid-summer labor as a whole has been experiencing a *steadily falling standard of living*. In general, we must always remember that what counts is not just the workers' income in dollars but the purchasing power of these dollars, that is, the real earnings. Thus, when we are told that the national income is now running at an annual rate of 160 billion dollars, we must note that this is in 1939 prices, and that it would be from 25 to 45 per cent smaller if measured in present prices.

5. The limitations of the home market are becoming more evident. Facts have come to light recently showing the following:

(a) Liquid wartime savings are held mostly by the upper income groups, with 10 per cent of all fami-

lies
ing
(
sum
pate
(
now
abo
than
cons
ann
doll
(
grow
whic
reco
plan
18 b
(e
term
for g
due
priv
tage
who
ing
(f)
capa
"surp
estim
vates
lem
fore
settli
omy
tation
kets;
(g)
* Or
C.I.O.
of Con
000,00

lies holding 60 per cent of the savings;

(b) The deferred demand for consumer goods is smaller than anticipated;

(c) New capital investments are now running at an annual rate of about 10 billion dollars, which is less than one-half of what business itself considers necessary to maintain an annual national income of 160 billion dollars;

(d) The disturbing scale of the growth of inventories must be noted, which reached, at the end of July, the record figure of 30 billion dollars,* plant inventories alone amounting to 18 billion dollars;

(e) The housing programs—short term for the veterans and long term for general use—are breaking down, due mainly to monopoly sabotage of private financing and to the sabotage by the reactionaries in Congress who have obstructed public financing of the housing programs;

(f) The great unused production capacities held by the government as "surplus plants," amounting to an estimated 18 billion dollars, aggravates tremendously the general problem of "excess" capacity, and therefore has a most disturbing and unsettling effect upon the whole economy in the face of the growing limitations of the home and foreign markets;

(g) Growing acute rivalries and

contradictions manifest themselves between so-called old and new industries as well as between new and old industrial regions. We refer here to the rivalries between steel, aluminum, various plastics, and chemically treated woods; between natural and artificial rubber; between various natural and so-called synthetic textile raw materials. There are, furthermore, the rivalries and acute contradictions in the field of transportation between rail, water, and air, with the immense excess shipping capacities; the rivalries in the field of communications due to new electronic devices and to new capital flowing into the field. Above all, the potentialities of atomic energy for peaceful production, the realization of which is now in the hands of a few monopolies (Westinghouse, du Pont, General Electric), are in themselves a most potent source of elements of crisis under capitalism, setting in motion numerous contradictions and rivalries between old and new industries. This fact has already had an upsetting and unstabilizing effect upon economic trends. Lastly, we must note the increasing contradictions between the old industrial regions of the Northeast and Middle West, on the one hand, and the Far West and South, on the other.

6. The limitations of the foreign markets are beginning to have definite effects. Exports are now running at about 800 million dollars a month, including U.N.R.R.A. shipments and some lend-lease settle-

* On October 14 Philip Murray stated that the C.I.O. had "obtained figures from the Department of Commerce that there is a backlog of \$37,000,000,000 worth of durable and light products."

ments. Despite its substantial size as compared with the pre-war exports, this scale of exports is proving disappointing to American business in view of the existing "excess" capacities of production. Big Business is trying to shift the blame for this lag in foreign trade to labor's high wages. This, however, is nonsense. The competitive difficulties now arising for American business on the world market stem from the following:

(a) The refusal and inability of the monopolies to introduce further technical improvements in production and to achieve a higher utilization of existing production capacities, which is in accord with basic monopoly policies of restricted production at high prices and of attaining higher labor productivity mainly by speed-up.

(b) Monopoly policies, followed by the government, of high and prohibitive tariffs on foreign goods.

(c) Reactionary and imperialist foreign policies: the drive for world domination by Wall Street, for monopoly positions in the export of capital whose tremendous unused accumulations are seriously interfering with the so-called normal development of the present economic cycle; the drive for monopoly control of sources of raw materials, and the blackmailing atom-bomb diplomacy of intimidation—these are the main factors keeping world capitalist economy unstable and militating against a wider growth of American foreign

trade. Furthermore, American support for the feudal reactionaries in China, and in the Far East generally (the Philippines), obstructs agrarian reform and industrialization, stimulates the Kuomintang civil war of offensive, and thus prevents the development of the Chinese home market for American goods. The hostility of American official policy to the new democracies in Europe is militating against the growth of peaceful American commerce with these countries. These are the countries of Eastern and Central Europe which are in the process of achieving postwar economic stability, free from monopoly and imperialist domination and sabotage, with the support and assistance of the Soviet Union which is following a democratic foreign policy in the economic as well as in the political field. Reactionary intervention by the American government in Western Europe hampers the economic stabilization of the countries in that area, obstructs their economic revival, and thus further curtails American opportunities for foreign trade. Most glaring is the failure of the United States to offer adequate long-term credits to the Soviet Union, which admittedly represents exceptional opportunities for foreign trade. In short, these foreign economic policies, dictated by the imperialist drive of the monopolies for dominating positions in the export of capital, control of raw materials, bases, etc., play a major role in the slow growth of American ex-

port
(C
from
Am
spea
pire
(e
riali
whic
the l
restr
for
T
creat
Am
this
of p
men
7-
cies
ernm
upon
cycle
T
gove
in th
ernn
the
tight
oppo
ing
the
the l
In th
to pr
men
preci
valu
tect
the r
share

ports and foreign trade in general.

(d) Strong economic competition from British imperialism in Latin America and parts of Europe, not to speak of the Middle East or the Empire itself.

(e) Reactionary American imperialist policies in Latin America which obstruct the development of the home markets of those countries, restricting American opportunities for foreign trade.

The foregoing are the main factors creating limitations for the growth of American foreign trade. Naturally, this sets up limitations to the growth of production and creates new elements of the maturing economic crisis.

7. Contradictions in the fiscal policies of the monopolies and of the government are having negative effects upon the course of the economic cycle.

The monopolies are pressing the government for a deflationary course in the matter of credit policy, government spending, and taxation for the lower income groups, that is, tighter and more restricted credit opportunities, less government spending and continued high taxation of the workers, working farmers, and the lower middle classes in the cities. In this way the monopolies also seek to protect the large corporate investments in government bonds from depreciation due to the fall in the value of the dollar, that is, to protect the share of the monopolies in the national debt, which is the lion's share. A major phase of this defla-

tionary course is the drive to reduce the real earnings of labor.

On the other hand, the monopolies are forcing an inflationary rise in prices, are pressing the government for more tax exemptions and refunds, accumulating extraordinarily large liquid reserves which exert a powerful inflationary influence, since they are not reinvested rapidly enough in production. This tends to depreciate the holdings of the large corporations in government bonds.

To solve this contradiction, spokesmen for the monopolies advocate economic and fiscal policies that are oriented toward a sort of combined inflation-deflation course whose main aim is to counteract the tendencies toward a declining rate of profit, to raise rates of profit, and to protect the big corporation's holdings in the national debt while depreciating the holdings of the smaller investors. In the immediate situation, these policies of the monopolies, which materially affect government policies, are having an unbalancing effect upon economic trends. These policies tend to decrease the income of the masses, to deepen economic fears, and to inject doubts among smaller holders as to the complete solvency of the national debt.

THE OUTLOOK AND THE TASKS BEFORE US

From the foregoing we are justified in arriving at the following conclusions regarding the further course of the economic cycle.

The tempo of upward rise of industrial production, the *rate* of increase, will begin to decline more rapidly and steeply in the coming months. This will be accompanied by a continuing high demand for consumer goods, especially durable goods; rising prices; labor's falling standards of living; a levelling out of employment; and increasing unemployment. Foreign trade will continue to grow, but with no significant advances commensurate with production capacities and capital accumulation.

We should note that elements are becoming evident of the maturing of an agrarian crisis. This is seen in the tremendous overvaluation of land, great excess capacity of production, highly inflationary agricultural prices, and steadily decreasing home consumption due to the falling real income of labor.

We must expect a more rapid tempo in the maturing of the economic crisis. Without projecting any definite *time* forecasts, but merely by way of orientation, it is possible to say that we shall continue to have a rising curve for the next six months to one year, followed by a similar period of levelling out, followed immediately by the outbreak of the crisis. The question is: Will it be a crisis of the type of 1921 or 1929, or some other type, in scale, depth, and severity?

In answer to this question, the following has to be said: there are two factors of opposite nature which may

seriously affect the scope and rapidity of the maturing economic crisis. These are:

(a) Faster war preparations, larger war orders, may affect present economic trends by slowing down the tempo with which the crisis is now maturing. However, this would at the same time prepare the ground for a more catastrophic economic crash later on.

(b) The struggle of the masses against the imperialist offensive of the monopolies, for the economic and political aims of the labor-democratic coalition, may materially affect the course of present economic trends. Without removing any of the elements of basic importance that are responsible for the maturing of the economic crisis, let alone "abolishing" the causes of crises, as projected by some bourgeois economists (Keynes) and in part by Browder revisionism, the struggle of the masses against the reactionary offensive and for the maintenance of living standards *may slow down the tempo of the maturing of the economic crisis, may equip the masses economically to withstand with less suffering the impact of the crisis and may also narrow the scope of the crisis.* This latter possibility is more limited, since the scope of an economic crisis is determined in large measure by the international situation and the specific conditions prevailing in the world system of capitalist economy.

In this connection, it is worth ob-

ser
the
191
wo
is r
van
Un
dor
ital
mec
cies
is s
fect
mer
thes
siti
in
eco
brea
Uni
mor
othe
the
Wa
wou
cris
now
cour
Eur
nati
with
F
now
and
cam
Am
the
and
ards
strik
ning

servicing certain differences between the present situation and that of 1919-21. The general crisis of the world system of capitalist economy is now much deeper and farther advanced. As to the economy of the United States itself, it is now more dominant in the world system of capitalist economy. Hence, it is less immediately dependent upon the policies of other capitalist countries, but is subject just the same to the effects of all the weaknesses and elements of crisis in the economies of these countries. The dominant position of American capitalist economy in the world system of capitalist economy also means that the outbreak of an economic crisis in the United States would have much more disastrous consequences for the other capitalist countries than was the case before the Second World War. However, the area which would be affected by an economic crisis in the United States would now be smaller since a number of countries in Eastern and Central Europe are free of monopoly domination and collaborate economically with the Soviet Union.

Furthermore, American labor is now much stronger than in 1919-21, and so is the entire anti-monopoly camp. In the present postwar period, American labor was victorious in the first big battles for wage increases and the maintenance of labor standards—in the wage movements and strikes at the end of 1945 and beginning of 1946. But in 1919-21, labor

was grievously defeated in its postwar struggles, which contributed in no small measure towards hastening the outbreak of the 1921 crisis. Now labor faces a second round of economic struggles which, if their outcome is favorable to labor, would mark another difference from 1919-21, and materially affect the course of economic trends in the interests of the people.

The conclusions to be reached from the foregoing analysis and forecast is that the American people, headed by the working class, are now confronted with the following task: *to break the economic sabotage of the monopolies—the sabotage inherent in the very nature of monopoly and closely connected with the present reactionary imperialist offensive of the monopolies.* It is this sabotage which restricts and obstructs full production, drives down the living standards of the masses, and hastens the outbreak of an economic crisis. To combat and defeat the economic sabotage of the monopolies, the masses must wage a struggle along the following lines:

1. For wage adjustments, wage increases, against high prices, against monopoly prices, for effective and democratic price controls.

2. Against monopoly sabotage and restriction of production and distribution, for the projection of various legislative measures for curbing monopoly domination in the national economy.

3. For extension and enlargement

of the Social Security system and of unemployment insurance payments.

4. For extension and enlargement of benefits to the veterans.

5. For putting into effect the housing program for the veterans and the longer range housing program for general use.

6. For preparation of extensive public works projects; for more effective and democratic controls of the Stock Exchange to protect the small investors and to counteract the financial and political manipulations of the monopolies.

7. For a democratic and anti-monopoly foreign economic policy; for loans to the new democracies of Europe and to the Soviet Union.

8. For a true peace policy, against the imperialist Vandenberg-Byrnes policy of the Truman Administration, for the Roosevelt policy of friendship and collaboration with the Soviet Union.

It is urgently necessary to make special preparations for presenting and popularizing the Party's economic program in connection with

the projected public hearings of the Council of Economic Advisers which was set up under the Full Employment Act.

It is equally necessary for the Party organizations to organize a series of educational activities, for the membership and for the non-Party masses, on the laws of economic development of capitalism which produces cyclical crises and Socialism as the solution. This is especially dictated by the need of combatting the fallacies and dangers of non-Marxist theories of crises, including the theory that by merely raising the purchasing power of the masses crises can be eliminated altogether, or almost so (Keynes, Browder, etc.). These activities must include education in the Party's program of struggle against the economic sabotage of the monopolies, for full employment, for the maintenance and improvement of the living standards of the masses, for affecting the course of present economic trends in favor of the people and against the monopolies.

S
 TH
 Jul
 der
 con
 and
 Ma
 the
 dee
 ism
 aga
 tari
 T
 nist
 of
 and
 fac
 of
 step
 for
 T
 we
 ton
 F.
 of
 con
 Ma
 lea

Statement by the National Board of the Communist Party on the Recent Expulsions of Vern Smith, Ruth McKenney, Bruce Minton and William F. Dunne*

THE EMERGENCY CONVENTION of July, 1945, repudiated and condemned Browder revisionism, reconstituted the Communist Party and restored it to the path of Marxism-Leninism. It called upon the entire Party to continue and deepen the struggle against revisionism and at the same time warned against the danger of "left"-sectarianism.

The expulsions from the Communist Party at the beginning of 1946 of Earl Browder, William Browder and A. Heller for their revisionist, factional struggle against the line of the Party, marked an important step forward in the continuing fight for a correct Marxist-Leninist policy.

The expulsion during the past weeks of Vern Smith, Bruce Minton, Ruth McKenney and William F. Dunne is a further development of the struggle on two fronts to consolidate the Party on the basis of Marxist-Leninist policies around the leadership of our National Commit-

tee headed by Comrades Foster and Dennis.

Smith, Minton, McKenney and Dunne, and their few scattered followers, have in one form or another carried on opposition to the line of the Party ever since the Emergency Convention. These anti-Party elements have adopted a common line of struggle against the Party, a line which can be characterized as semi-Trotskyism and unprincipled Leftist adventurism. In their disruptive activities, they have tried to utilize the Party's rejection of Browder revisionism by posing as the only true opponents of Browderism and by slandering our Party and its leadership with the false charge that the Party is "still revisionist" in its policy and practice.

* * *

This motley crew of anti-Party oppositionists has pursued factional methods within the Party, some having ties with the open renegade cliques grouped around Sam Darcy, Lyle Dowling and Charles Keith,

* Issued on September 29, 1946.

who propagate anti-Marxian views and have crystallized an active anti-Party group.

The decisions of the July, 1946, meeting of the National Committee, which declared war on Right opportunism and "Left"-sectarianism, have cut the ground from under the feet of these anti-Party elements in our midst and have brought into the light of day their disruptive factional activities. They were able to carry on this anti-Party activity within the Party for so long only because, despite repeated warnings against the danger of Right opportunism and "Left"-sectarianism by the Emergency Party Convention and subsequent meetings of the National Committee, sections of our Party underestimated the danger of "Left"-sectarianism and were slow in developing the struggle against this danger simultaneously with the fight against Browderism. They were able to carry on their sinister activity for so long because among a section of our membership there existed an erroneous view that "Left"-sectarianism was not as serious a danger as Browderism. Therefore, "Left"-sectarianism was not sufficiently and consistently combated.

Such toleration of "Left"-sectarianism by a section of our membership is due primarily to a lack of understanding of the Party's policies, of Marxism-Leninism and of the history of our Party and the world Communist movement. The

overwhelming majority of such comrades are devoted working-class comrades, loyal to the Party policy and leadership. To the extent that they are still confused by and suffer from remnants of "Left"-sectarianism, they must be won fully to an understanding and support of Party policies through patient explanation and increased mass activity, and must not be lumped with the anti-Party opposition.

* * *

The anti-Party elements also took advantage of unclarity of sections of our membership concerning Communist principles of organization and democratic centralism. Distorting the right and duty of every Party member to healthy, constructive discussion and criticism, as provided for by our Party constitution which is based on the principle of democratic centralism, they advanced the petty-bourgeois, anarchistic slogan of "freedom of criticism" to facilitate their propagation of views hostile to the Party.

The July meeting of the National Committee further registered the decisive defeat of Browderism and called for the continued fight against Browderism and any conciliation with it, whether open or concealed. It also registered the fact that in the year since the Emergency Convention the Party has united and consolidated its ranks, engaged in mass activities, and has won thousands of

new members, especially from the basic industries and the Negro people. These successes, while not blinding us to many serious weaknesses and obstacles that still hinder our growth and activity, have shattered the hopes of the anti-Party cliques to utilize our difficulties and shortcomings for their nefarious purposes.

It is not accidental that these isolated and discredited factionalists have raised the flag of opposition to the Party at this time. It coincides with the intensified attacks against our Party and its leadership by the ruling class and its apologists ranging from open fascists and reactionaries to anti-Communist, anti-Soviet Social-Democrats, Trotskyites and frightened liberals.

These attacks have been growing in fury with the development of monopoly capitalism's drive toward world domination and "putting labor in its place." They include open threats against our Party by official spokesmen of the Truman Administration, Congress, the GOP, the Legion and V.F.W. the Catholic hierarchy, etc. They aim to behead the labor and people's movement by seeking to weaken and destroy the most consistent and courageous fighter for labor and the people—the Communist Party. They aim to disrupt and split the C.I.O., to prevent trade union unity, and eventually to destroy the trade union movement. They aim to prevent the further development of a broad

peace movement and a people's anti-monopoly, anti-fascist coalition.

It would be odd if reaction did not seek to combine its attacks against our Party from without, with attempts at organized disruption from within. In view of the decisive defeat suffered by Browder revisionism in the Party, it is not surprising that certain anti-Party disrupters should attempt to drape themselves in a "Left" cloak. This is the true light in which the anti-Party opposition of Dunne, Smith, McKenney, and Minton stands exposed.

* * *

To carry out the decisions of the Emergency Convention and the July meeting of the National Committee, to meet our responsibilities to the labor and people's movement—in the struggles around the vital domestic and world issues, and for the realization of Socialism—the Party must conduct a relentless and persistent struggle against both Right opportunism and "Left"-sectarianism; it must conduct the struggle simultaneously on two fronts to safeguard the purity of its Marxist-Leninist principles. This implies the necessity of directing our main fire against the specific danger which may constitute the main danger in a given situation. But we must never lose sight of the fact that *both dangers* must be fought, since both hamper the fulfillment of the Party's vanguard role.

Both Browder revisionism and

"Left"-sectarianism challenge the basic strategy and tactical line which our Party worked out at the Emergency Convention and which, as further elaborated at successive Plenums, was embodied in the July 23 statement of the National Board, summarizing the main decision of the July Plenum:

To defeat the drive of reaction, there must be launched a resolute political struggle to create a new and broad anti-monopoly, anti-fascist coalition led by the working-class movement, for the resurrection of President Roosevelt's social domestic program and his foreign policy of friendly collaboration with the Soviet Union.

Though marked by definite social limitations, of course, the Roosevelt policy of liberal social and labor legislation and for fulfilling the Yalta-Potsdam agreements with the U.S.S.R. has elements on which a successful anti-fascist, anti-war coalition can be established in the United States.

This is the general goal for which the working class and its Communist vanguard must struggle in order to halt the march to fascist-like reaction and atomic war.

In order to carry forward this policy, the statement calls attention to the necessity for developing a tremendous increase in the independent political and economic activities of the working class and organized labor movement and "the most skillful, determined and flexible application of the united front and the democratic front in cooperation with every group ready to de-

fend democratic liberties, the nation's living standards and a program of peace."

* * *

The National Board statement, in emphasizing the necessity of the fight on two fronts, essential to carry out this program, says further:

All Leftist moods and tactics, which can only help the reactionary aim of splitting this alliance, as a preliminary to smashing the entire labor-progressive movement, and ending democratic rights in the U.S., must be forcefully combated and overcome.

All Right-opportunist tendencies and practices, all slowness in mobilizing the people for struggle, all Browderite remnants of reliance on this or that capitalist group for leadership, all Browderite pro-capitalist propaganda concerning the "progressive" intentions of Wall Street imperialism, must be vigilantly rooted out of the Party's ranks.

Browder revisionism would lead to victory for reaction by advocating reliance on the non-existent "progressive" role of American monopoly capital. It would doom the Party to passivity and liquidate its leading role and its very existence—a liquidation which Browder temporarily brought about. "Left"-sectarianism would accomplish the same objective by isolating the Party from the working class and the working class from all its allies.

While Browderism openly surrenders our socialist objective, the "Left"-sectarians would make the

vict
the
guid
ples,
lianc
fasci
this
class
reali
task:

T
man
ideo
bers
since
cour
the
of t
ideo
tem
on
ing
the

as a
T
stud
agai
Lov
agai
on t
the
ence
ent,
the
of t

victory of Socialism impossible in the name of "Socialism." Our Party, guided by Marxist-Leninist principles, works for labor's unity and alliance with all anti-monopoly, anti-fascist forces, while in the course of this struggle educating the working class to socialist consciousness for the realization of its historic socialist tasks.

* * *

This struggle on two fronts demands that our Party raise the ideological level of the entire membership along the lines undertaken since the Party convention, in the course of the speedy execution of the decisions of the July meeting of the National Committee. This ideological struggle involves the systematic training of the Party cadres on all levels, the theoretical training of the entire membership for the mastery of Marxism-Leninism as a guide to action.

The Party can learn much by a study of its own history, the struggle against the Rightist revisionism of Lovestone, on the one hand, and against the Cannon-Trotskyite gang, on the other. We must also bring to the Party membership the experiences of the struggles, past and present, of our brother Parties, above all, the history of the Bolshevik Party of the U.S.S.R. In this struggle for

the unity of the Party, its independent role, against all deviations from Marxist-Leninist policies, the Party must give greater attention to bringing a full understanding to the membership of the Party's organizational principles. Every member of the Party must truly grasp the essence of democratic centralism in order to be guided by this fundamental principle of Communist Party organization and activity.

The expulsion of these anti-Party elements parading in "Left" clothing—a step taken by the lower organizations of the Party—will have the full support of our membership which, having routed Browderism, will be relentless in the struggle against attackers of our Party from the other direction. It is a step which will make the Party more alert, not only against "Left" deviations, but also against Right opportunism and all remnants of Browder revisionism. It is a victory because it cleanses the Party of alien elements who would disrupt its unity and weaken its authority among the workers and in the camp of progress as a whole. Their elimination from our ranks is a victory for the Party, for the working class, for the building of the anti-fascist and anti-imperialist coalition, for the forces of Socialism in our land.

MANIFESTO OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF SPAIN

The Communist Party proposes to Republican and working-class organizations and parties a meeting to prepare a joint statement and program of struggle for the restoration of the Spanish Republic.

SPANIARDS!

Nearly a year ago the Republican Parties-in-exile, correctly interpreting the aspirations of the people of Spain, reaffirmed their loyalty to the Republic and created the Government at present presided over by Dr. Giral.

The Republican Government was created to give united political leadership to the anti-Franco movement, to reinforce the faith and confidence of millions of Spaniards in the coming defeat of Francoism, and to aid the development of the anti-Franco struggle inside the nation.

The activities carried out by the Republican Government, which was also sustained by the great work accomplished by the leadership of the Communist Party of Spain and especially by Comrade Pasionaria, in the mobilization of the world democratic movement in behalf of the Spanish people, have achieved considerable results, and have succeeded in winning recognition for the Republican Government-in-Exile by eight nations

and the establishment of government offices in others.

These activities have had powerful repercussions inside Spain, where the people follow the work of the Government-in-Exile with great interest and enthusiasm. An increase in the struggles of the people can be seen in the important strikes conducted by the workers of Cataluna, Euzkadi, Andalucia, Madrid, and Levante; in the demonstrations of women in Valencia and other places; in the heroic deeds of the guerrillas; and in the increased protests against terror in many places.

These activities have pushed toward the anti-Franco opposition those groups who, because of their conservatism and their fear of the consequences of a political upheaval, were supporting the present regime.

The isolation of Falangist elements has reached such an extent that sectors within the Catholic Church, the army, landowners and financiers, among whom Franco had his main support, have become alarmed and seek for a fascist way out without Franco.

They are attempting to cover with the mantle of the Bourbon monarchy, which committed so many crimes against our people, the political and economic chaos of fascism.

IN SUPPORT OF THE REPUBLICAN GOVERNMENT AND ITS INSTITUTIONS AGAINST CAPITULATION

The crisis of the Franco regime is clearly evident in the violent reaction of its propaganda organs against the Republican Government and its President, against the anti-Franco mobilization of the democratic peoples throughout the world, and against those who, within the country itself, are abandoning the sinking ship of Francoism.

It is also manifested in the vicious offensive launched by the Franco forces of repression against the heroic guerrillas, and their efforts to eliminate them at all cost. It is seen in the increased terror of which our Party has been a victim, our Party whose members such as Cristino Garcia and Ramon Via, because of their strength and valor, are living examples of Republican patriotism and loyalty to the people's cause.

Franco and the Falange are making desperate attempts to hold back their coming doom. They want to thwart, at the reconvening of the U.N. in September,* the reappearance of the Republican Government with its claim of justice for the Spanish people, a claim which daily it becomes more difficult to hold back. They want the U.N. to find itself faced with an impotent and disunited Republican Government instead of a

monolithic front capable of inspiring confidence and faith. This would permit the defenders of Franco at the U.N. to justify their policy of "non-intervention" on the Spanish problem, which in practice means nothing less than effective support of the fascist regime.

Agents of British imperialism, in a coordinated manner, use capitulators and cowards within the Republican camp and pressure in and out of Spain among the Republican and working-class forces, so as to provoke division and achieve the elimination of the Republican institutions and the self-dissolution of the Giral Government.

Those who wish to save fascism and reaction have invented the dastardly lie that the Republican Government is an obstacle to the democratic solution of the Spanish problem and speak in favor of other plans which in practice only reduces the solution to a simple change of façade.

The supporters of these plans reiterate that Franco will never cede power to the Republican Government, and therefore the Government should disappear, to make room for one (a transitional government) which will organize a plebiscite.

What kind of transitional government are they planning? The Spanish people have already seen that formula applied to other countries. It would be a government that would sneer at the aspirations of the people, a government that would perpetuate reactionary and fascist domina-

* Since the issuance of this manifesto, the time for reconvening the U.N. General Assembly was postponed to October.—The Editors.

tion in Spain. The clearest example of this is Greece. In Greece, the British imperialists divided the resistance movement, and spawned a transitional government which, following a Hitlerite policy, permitted the existence of fascist terrorist organizations, while viciously persecuting the progressive forces; a government which, through illegal elections and threats, voted a reactionary and fascist majority to Parliament; a government which keeps alive the flames of civil war throughout the entire country, and which now prepares a plebiscite similar to that which the proponents of a transitional government want to impose upon the people of Spain so as to facilitate the restoration of the monarchy.

Any party or organization, regardless of its political beliefs; any individual in the Republican camp who supports this treacherous policy against the interests of Spain and the Republic, and particularly against those of the working class, even though he try to cover his capitulation with pompous "patriotic" or Republican phrases, incurs a tremendous historic responsibility for which he will some day have to answer to the people.

In answer to these maneuvers for a capitulation, the Government of the Republic made clear its position when it stated:

. . . the Spanish problem should be solved with the disappearance of the Franco regime, the annulment of the Falange and the immediate restoration

of the Republic. . . . Transitory situations or intermediate solutions will never be accepted or put forth by us.

The Communist Party, in agreement with this statement, is of the opinion that the declaration of the Government is not sufficient. There is great need for the Republican and working-class parties and organizations unequivocally to manifest themselves on the side of the Republican Government, for unity, for the Republic, and against any plan for capitulation or compromise with Francoism, regardless of what name may be given it.

The Communist Party proposes to the Republican and working-class parties and organizations the beginning of discussions for the preparation of a joint declaration solemnly pledging the Spanish people and international opinion to defend the Republican institutions, reinforce anti-Franco unity, and give strength to the resistance activities inside the country, as well as to the world campaign against the Franco regime, a declaration in which we will promise to struggle unitedly, without separation, until the Republic has been restored in Spain.

ANTI-COMMUNISM AND THE SPIRIT OF CAPITULATION GO HAND IN HAND

The Communist Party deems it necessary to have a solemn pledge from the parties and organization because, unfortunately, not all have up to now taken a firm position in

favo
misc
W
mac
cam
ner,
the
tack
Fran
lic a
mur
alwa
in h
tion,
trigu
W
indi
wou
mor
out
all I
The
tion
publ
self-
T
publ
sequ
polic
Repu
whic
of S
wou
react
O
lican
Gov
actio
tiona
plebi
mass

favor of unity and against compromise with fascism.

Well known are the statements made by men in the Republican camp, in which, in a most open manner, they defend the plebiscite and the transitional Government, and attack, with a fury never used against Franco, the vanguard of the Republic and Spanish democracy, the Communist Party. On this occasion, as always, anti-Communism goes hand in hand with the spirit of capitulation, with the maneuvers and intrigues against the people.

We are of the opinion that if the individuals who favor capitulation would look less toward London and more toward Spain, they would without exception fight for the unity of all Republicans and anti-Francoites. They would fight for the continuation of the Government and the Republican institutions, not for their self-elimination.

The Communist Party once again publicly denounces the serious consequences of the anti-Communist policy and of abandonment of the Republican institutions, a policy which seriously threatens the future of Spain, and which, if continued, would signify the prolongation of reaction and civil war.

On the other hand, if we Republicans continue united behind the Government, any Francoite and reactionary move to set up a transitional Government or to institute a plebiscite since it would be without mass support, would be condemned

to defeat and would mean the beginning of the end for the Franco regime.

This is a moment when men and parties will have to prove their Republican strength and faith in our triumph. All must understand that, if the attacks and maneuvers to weaken the aspirations of the Republicans increase, it is not because our victory is unobtainable and far off, but, on the contrary, because the situation of the Franco regime is such that only the division of the Republicans and their negligence in carrying out their obligations toward Spain can hold back the defeat of the fascist dictatorship.

FOR WORKING CLASS UNITY, FOR A BROAD ANTI-FRANCO COALITION

The Communist Party extends its hand again in fraternity to our comrades in the Socialist Party and in the C.N.T. (Confederacion Nacional del Trabajo) irrespective of the party to which they belong, and calls upon them to reinforce solidly the ties existing between the parties and the working-class organizations.

The working class of our country has always been the base of democracy and the Republic. Today, the unity of the working class is an imperative necessity because without it the unity of all Republican and democratic forces is inconceivable.

The task of the moment is *unity, unity, unity*. On the other hand, we must unite around the Government

of the Republic *all the anti-Franco forces regardless of their political beliefs, from the Left to the Right, as long as they agree on the need to establish liberty and democracy in our country, and to form a real anti-Franco national coalition.*

We must daily strengthen the Government of the Republic, encompassing it with an active and fighting support, *facilitating the inclusion in it of representatives of all those forces which, placing themselves sincerely in the camp of anti-Franco struggle, accept the Republic as the legal framework through which to conduct an election in which the people will freely choose the type of Government they wish to give themselves.*

The broadest possible unity is needed at this moment! *Unity and desire to resist, without capitulation, and by remaining united in battle until the establishment of the democratic Republic!*

The working class, and all Republicans and anti-Francoites, should not permit themselves to be influenced by the discouragements of the capitulators.

Of course, those who speak of capitulation do so under the pretext of stopping the suffering of the people. But all capitulations have been made under the same pretext and have provoked much more suffering and bloodshed than the continuation of the struggle. Under the pretext of stopping bloodshed, Austria and Czechoslovakia were handed

over to Hitler. France capitulated, betrayed by the leaders of that time. Under the pretext of stopping the shedding of blood, Casado consummated his betrayal, which has cost our people so many lives, so much blood and suffering.

The Spanish people will pay dearly for a new capitulation. In order to avert it, the Communist Party calls upon all parties and men in the political field, upon all Spaniards, to unite behind the Republican Government and to resist and struggle, because the sacrifices which would have to be made until victory over Francoism is achieved are nothing compared to those which we would have to make if, at the supreme moment, we lack the courage to continue.

FOR THE CREATION OF A NATIONAL RESISTANCE COUNCIL INSIDE SPAIN

In order to induce our people to withhold their support from the Government and its Republican institutions, the agents of reaction attempt to strangle the Resistance Movement inside Spain with false promises of solutions.

It would be most advantageous for them to be able to state that it is *the Resistance Movement* which demands the so-called transitional plan, and that the Republican Government should yield to this "demand" of our people.

We are perfectly aware of the difficulties faced by the Democratic Al-

liance. The Communist Party knows full well the sacrifices needed to bring into being an effective Resistance Movement. We have been the ones who, from the beginning of the temporary defeat of the Republic, have organized the active struggle against Franco and the Falange, and have always maintained that there is great need for an active Resistance Movement, even while other groups remained passive.

But the interests of the people and the Republic demand of the Democratic Alliance a stronger organization for the development of the united struggle against Franco.

We must develop a broad Resistance Movement, full of fighting spirit and audacity, capable of dealing powerful and decisive blows against the fascist regime.

To achieve this it is imperative to create *one supreme political leadership of struggle*, as has been done in all those countries which have undergone similar struggles. That supreme leadership must be the *Government of the Republic*.

This means that the Government must pay greater attention than in the past to the problems of the development of the Resistance Movement, and give it sustained and ever-increasing aid on all fronts.

It is necessary to ensure that the Democratic Alliance, together with the resistance organizations, such as the A.F.A.R.E.,* the Guerrilla Units,

the Union of Free Intellectuals, the youth organizations and the anti-Franco Basque, Catalonian and Galician organizations, be the basis for the creation of a *National Resistance Council* which will undertake the task of organizing and promoting the anti-Franco struggle without hesitations or vacillations, and that this National Resistance Council be under the *supervision of, and in close contact with*, the Republican Government.

The anti-Franco parties and organizations must create the organizations for resistance and unity in every corner of the country. We must bring into them thousands upon thousands of men and women, so that the struggle becomes general and results in victory.

The Communist Party believes that only with a resolute policy of struggle shall we be able to succeed in building on a real basis the Resistance Movement which, although still weak, it is to the interest of all anti-fascists to extend and develop.

It is true that the Spanish Resistance Movement does not as yet count on obtaining all the help which has been given similar movements in other countries in the way of parachutes containing arms and money, but in spite of this it is possible to struggle.

It is also evident that in this field the Republican Government must do much more than it has been doing. This requires that all the Resistance forces orientate themselves toward

* *Asociacion de Fuerzas Armadas de la Republica Espanola* (Association of Armed Forces of the Spanish Republic).

the road of struggle, sweeping away all feelings of passivity.

LET US CONTINUE ON THE ROAD OF STRUGGLE

We anti-fascist Spaniards would commit a grave error if we were to believe that international action alone is sufficient to achieve victory. We must coordinate the most energetic resistance inside the nation with the international movement. The situation today would be much different if behind the Government there will appear visible to all the world a solid and fighting Resistance Movement inside our country. We cannot forget that justice, in order to succeed, must be cemented and supported by force, and that the force which already exists must be rapidly organized.

We Communists are of the opinion, and experience has proved it, that a National Resistance Council would today be in condition, if it were strongly proposed, to unleash in the country a tremendous protest movement, a wave of strikes, of struggles and demonstrations against hunger and misery, against terror, for the freedom of the imprisoned, for democratic rights.

The strikes which recently took place in Cataluna, Euzkadi, Asturias, Galicia, Andalucia and Madrid, like the demonstrations in Valencia and Sevilla, are clear indications that these actions are realizable.

A National Resistance Council could organize and develop struggles

in the countryside against the Falangist robbers, against the oppression of which the peasants and agricultural workers are victims under the present regime.

It could also carry out a tremendous task in publishing illegal anti-Franco propaganda and exposing before the people the crimes committed by the Franco regime, so as better to orientate and organize the people.

Such a combination of *possible* actions would create an insupportable situation for the regime and would determine, together with action abroad, its rapid fall.

This is the road which we anti-Francoites must travel—the road of struggle for the establishment of the Republic, for the defeat of Francoism, and against the currents of capitulation.

WE WANT A SPANISH REPUBLICAN DEMOCRATIC POLICY

The Communist Party struggles so as to find a solution for the problem of Spain in accordance with the democratic and Republican aspirations of our people.

We understand that the Republic, once established, should maintain the closest, friendly relationships and collaborate politically and economically with the United States, Great Britain, France, and the Soviet Union, as well as with the other democratic nations.

But we are resolutely against any attempt to make our country a satellite of any imperialism, a stra-

tegic and economic base for any power. We are against those who, arguing *geographic fatalism*, manifest themselves ready to serve docilely the dictates of a foreign power.

We want a Spanish Republican Democratic Policy.

In order to achieve this in a Spain free of Franco and the Falange, we support the unity of all Spanish anti-Francoites in one broad national coalition. All we ask of the democratic nations is that they help us by placing economic and political sanctions upon the Franco regime, path-follower of Nazism and fascism, by according recognition to the Spanish Republican Government, and aiding the acceleration of the struggle inside the country.

The Communist Party reiterates its absolute faith and confidence in the liberation of Spain, in the democratic and Republican future of our country. We are sure that, regardless of what obstacles we may meet, no one or anyone can rob the Spanish people of their right to live a free and independent life.

No will to fight, no honest collaboration should be refused in this task. No idea, no belief, no legitimate interest should be hurt. Only Franco and the Falange must fear the democratic and popular desires, because our fight is directed solely against them.

The Communist Party calls upon all Spanish democrats and anti-Francoites to repel the anti-Communist machinations which have

brought, and can bring only catastrophe to Spain. The Communist Party is the vanguard of the Republic and democracy. If the fascist's hatred is especially directed against us, it is because the Communists are the most resolute and audacious defenders of the Republican cause, the most decided partisans of anti-Franco unity. Our anti-Francoism is active and combative; it stimulates the most noble sentiments of heroism and love of the liberty of the people and repels all cowardice and capitulation.

THE COMMUNIST PARTY, VANGUARD OF THE REPUBLIC AND DEMOCRACY

These characteristics of militancy and strength that mark the Communists are put at the service of democracy and the Republic. If Franco fears us, as he should, then the Republicans and anti-Francoites should sincerely congratulate themselves, on the other hand, that the Republican cause can count upon a vanguard party, inspired by Marxist-Leninist-Stalinist theory, supported by the working class and the most militant forces among the people, tempered in the fire of struggle, and capable of the greatest efforts and sacrifices, a party which goes forward and acts as a wedge to open the way for the assault against the Francoite dictatorship.

Well known is our desire, many times reiterated, to collaborate with all Republicans, with all anti-Francoites, in the common task of con-

structing a democratic Spain where there will be bread, liberty, and culture for all.

We call to the struggle the valiant Spanish working class, the peasantry, the women, the youth, the people in general, to tell them that we must continue to follow the examples of Manresa and El Ferrol, the heroic examples of the Guerrilla Units, and the glorious road traveled with so much sacrifice by our national heroes, Cristino Garcia and Ramon Via.

We call upon the patriot in the armed forces to unite their efforts with those of the people and to refuse to continue to help Francoism which has made of Spain a Hitlerite slave and which has thwarted our nation from playing internationally

the role which, because of Spain's importance and history, belongs to it.

Let us double the strikes and every type of action against Francoism!

Let us all unite against all types of surrender, and for the Republic and democracy!

Let us revive the sacred fires of anti-Franco resistance!

Let us find within our people the force to carry out the decisive battles!

Let us support with all our energy the Republican Government and its institutions.

Down with the terrorist regime of Franco and the Falange!

Long live the Republic!

Central Committee, Communist Party of Spain, August 15, 1946.

COMMUNIST WORK AMONG THE AMERICAN JEWISH MASSES

RESOLUTION OF THE NATIONAL GROUPS COMMISSION OF THE C.P.U.S.A., OCTOBER, 1946.

COMMUNIST WORK among the Jewish masses, as in all other fields, must be based upon the program, policies, and general line of the Party. At the present time, the main approach to our Jewish work is the general line of the Party for the struggle against the offensive of American imperialist reaction, and its drive for world domination, for peace and democracy, against the unfolding attacks upon the economic standards and political rights of labor and its allies. The special policy problems in our Jewish work have to be approached and solved from the general Party position for the building of an anti-imperialist, anti-fascist labor-democratic coalition, headed by labor, to combat and defeat the warmongering, reactionary pro-fascist offensive of the monopolies in the United States.

I. THE GENERAL SITUATION AND IMMEDIATE TASKS

An analysis of the present situation among the American Jewish masses discloses the following characteristics:

1. A growing awareness of the new anti-Semitic and pro-fascist dangers, accompanying the warmongering,

imperialist offensive of the American monopolies, and of the special threats to the Jewish people inherent in these dangers.

The struggle against anti-Semitism and for equal rights for the Jewish people is a basic part of the general struggle against the imperialist offensive. It is therefore the duty and responsibility of all progressive forces of the American people, especially of labor, the trade unions, and the Communist Party, to fight militantly for the outlawing of anti-Semitism and against all forms of discrimination and segregation.

Since it is fundamentally a product of social systems of class and national oppression, anti-Semitism in this country will be completely and permanently uprooted, and eventually disappear altogether, only with the abolition of capitalism and the establishment of Socialism in the United States. But the fight to combat anti-Semitism, to outlaw it, and to protect the equal rights of the Jewish masses against all forms of discrimination, is a fight of a general democratic character to win equal rights for all. It is a major part of the struggle against imperial-

ist reaction which is using anti-Semitism as one of its chief weapons to divide and demoralize the progressive movements of the people and to strengthen monopoly rule. The fight against anti-Semitism is a central task in the struggle to uproot fascism. Anti-Semitism is one of the main pillars of fascism, *i.e.*, of the open and terroristic dictatorship of the most reactionary sections of finance capital. It is a means for the physical annihilation of the Jewish people. The fight against anti-Semitism and for equal rights for the Jewish people is a fight against all reactionary, imperialist, and pro-fascist ideologies of race superiority and supremacy, against Jim Crowism and all forms of national oppression of the Negro people, against the theory of Anglo-Saxon or white race "superiority." It is a fight for the brotherhood of nations and peoples and for the democratic unity and solidarity of the American people and its working class.

It is labor and its progressive organizations that must assume the main responsibility for combatting anti-Semitism and its penetration among the working people, in order to protect the unity and integrity of the labor movement which the monopolies are trying to undermine.

A major phase of the struggle against anti-Semitism must be a systematic and persistent fight against all forms of anti-Jewish discrimination. These discriminations in employment, in education, in political

rights, and social relations, are now on the increase due to the offensive of imperialist reaction in the United States. All nationality groups in the United States are victims of such types of discriminations. In the case of the Negro people, they have assumed, in a growing number of cases, the dastardly form of fascist-like murderous attacks and persecutions; and these are also beginning to be practiced against Jews. Hence, the fight against all forms of national, racial, and religious discrimination has become a central task of the American people, especially the labor movement, as an inseparable part of the fight for peace, democracy, equal rights and economic security.

2. There is a relatively high degree of understanding among Jewish workers, and growing middle class circles as well, that the fight against the new anti-Semitic dangers can be waged effectively only in alliance with labor, with the Negro people whose political weight in progressive American life is continually growing, with other nationally discriminated and persecuted groups, and with all the progressive movements of the American people. At the same time, there is a distinct increase in the activities of the reactionaries among the Jewish masses, *i.e.*, of reactionary bourgeois-nationalists, bourgeois-assimilationists and Social-Democrats.

3. There is a growing mistrust among the Jewish masses in the Tru-

man
from
the
exter
peria
ticular
fecte
ing t
Sovic
by it
F.E.I
anti-
impe
by i
Roos
4-
the J
ness
tion.
of re
victor
action
gress.
the J
the c
alition
forces
altho
ties to
an im
5-
amon
prog
ment
L. Th
the n
dent
streng
Deme
Amer
has it

man Administration. This results from the general political course of the Administration in internal and external affairs, a course which is imperialist and reactionary. Most particularly, the Jewish masses are affected by the Administration's yielding to the warmongering and anti-Soviet incitements of the monopolies, by its betrayal of the fight for the F.E.P.C., by its failure to combat anti-Semitism, by its hypocritical and imperialist course in Palestine, and by its continual departure from Roosevelt's progressive policies.

4. Republican party circles among the Jewish people demonstrate awareness of new opportunities for reaction. This adds to the serious danger of reactionary Republican electoral victories and of a strengthened reactionary bipartisan coalition in Congress. But more pronounced among the Jewish masses is the trend toward the developing labor-democratic coalition and toward the progressive forces of the third-party movements, although old loyalties and traditional ties to the Democratic party still play an important part.

5. There are growing trends among Jewish workers toward the progressive forces in the labor movement, in the C. I. O. and the A. F. of L. This is especially noticeable among the native-born, but is also very evident among the naturalized. Yet the strength of the reactionary Social-Democrats is still considerable in American Jewish life. This strength has its source not only in the strate-

gic positions of the Jewish *Daily Forward* group in certain trade unions and fraternal organizations (I. L. G. W. U., Workmen's Circle) as well as in some political movements (Liberal Party), but also in special Jewish organizations and in the special field of interests of the Jewish nationality group. The reactionary Social-Democrats exploit this field largely through their domination of the Jewish Labor Committee. In the cultural field, the reactionary Social-Democrats operate particularly by exploiting the Jewish Scientific Institute (Y. W. O.) for reactionary political purposes.

6. Communist influence among the Jewish masses is growing. This results, first of all, from the increasing realization that the Communist Party is not only the best defender of the economic and political aims of labor, but that it has also proven the most consistent fighter against anti-Semitism, reaction, and fascism.

While gravely hampered by still existing remnants of Browder revisionism, Communist work among the Jewish masses has contributed materially toward strengthening the influence of the Party among the Jewish workers and also among sections of the middle classes.

Finally, a potent factor in the building up of anti-fascist influence among the American Jewish masses in this period has been the contact and collaboration between the American Jews and the Soviet Jews in common demonstrations against anti-Semitism and fascism and for Jewish

rights, and in cultural collaboration. This collaboration was established during the war with the aim of helping to win the war, and is now developing as a force for friendship between the American and Soviet peoples and for promoting the culture and well-being of the Jewish people.

The collaboration between the American and Soviet Jews has helped in combatting the reactionary influences coming from the ideological and programmatic positions of Zionism, from bourgeois assimilationism (Council for Judaism, the American Jewish Committee, sections of the leadership of the Joint Distribution Committee), and from Social-Democratism (the leadership of the Jewish Labor Committee, the *Forward*, Dubinsky, etc.).

7. Problems of relief and rehabilitation of the Jewish masses in the liberated countries occupy a major place in the life of the American Jewish masses and in the activities of their organizations. In this field, the major activities of the Jewish workers and sections of the middle classes during the war were devoted to Russian war relief, in considerable measure through the Jewish Council of Russian War Relief. The end of the war and the resulting new situation have produced a number of changes in these activities, mainly in the direction of work of cultural relations and certain forms of work of rehabilitation.

Since the liberation of Poland by the Red Army, the work of Jewish

relief and rehabilitation in Poland, and the struggle in support of the new Polish state, has become a central task in the general work of Jewish relief and rehabilitation. It has also become a field of activity in which sharp clashes are taking place between the anti-fascist unity forces among the Jews and the reactionary nationalists, assimilationists, and Social-Democrats. The democratic forces support a people's program which calls for the building of the new Jewish community in Poland, while facilitating the emigration from Poland of those Jews who so desire. The reactionaries, although not united are working against the building of the Jewish community in Poland. At times the reactionaries precipitate panic flights from Poland by various Jewish groups. They exploit the tragic and truly difficult situation which results from the terroristic attacks of Polish fascists upon Jews as well as upon labor and other democratic elements. In all this, they have the expectation of bringing most of these emigrants into Palestine.

The major issues in this clash are the following: The democratic unity forces among the Jews propose to fight for the safety, equal rights, and well-being of the Jewish people in Poland by joining with the progressive forces and government of Poland to uproot the remnants of fascism and reaction in Poland, to help consolidate the new Polish state, and to support the struggle for Big Three collaboration in the United Nations

for peace. They aim thereby to eliminate anti-Semitism and all anti-Jewish attacks. On the other hand, reactionary Zionists, assimilationists, and Social-Democrats propose in effect that the Jews abandon this fight and quit Poland completely. On this basis, the Zionists are carrying on a campaign for mass migration from Poland and the whole of Europe as the bourgeois-nationalist answer to anti-Semitism. The reactionary assimilationists and Social-Democrats are agitating against the new Polish state and its government as being "impotent" to protect the Jews. They pretend to favor "in principle" the building of the Jewish community in Poland if a government were to come into power capable of protecting the Jews. By this is meant a government hostile to the Soviet Union and friendly to the reactionary forces of the old Polish regime, the same forces which are now stimulating the terroristic attacks upon the Jews in Poland and upon Poland's democratic forces generally. This is, in substance, the position of the *Forward-Dubinsky* leadership of the Jewish Labor Committee, a position masked by intensive maneuvering and false pretensions which we must expose by the energetic development of the anti-fascist unity policy among the supporters and affiliates of the Jewish Labor Committee.

The fight against this position of the Jewish reactionaries is part of the general fight against the warmongers and reactionaries. Hence, the work

of relief and rehabilitation in Poland, and in the other Jewish communities in the liberated countries is of crucial importance.

Finally, and of a different nature, is the work of growing numbers of American Jews and other progressive forces for the building of Birobidjan. A broad movement is growing around this work which is contributing much toward strengthening the ties of collaboration between the American and Soviet Jews. This support to Birobidjan draws inspiration from the outlawing of anti-Semitism in the Soviet Union, the complete equality and fraternal collaboration of all nationalities in that land, and the development of Birobidjan as a Jewish Autonomous Region. This progressive movement in the life of the American Jews must be actively supported.

8. The struggles in Palestine are having many repercussions in American Jewish life. They are taking place in the midst of developing liberation currents in the Arabian Middle East, a growing trade union movement among the Arab workers, progressive developments in the Jewish trade unions, growing solidarity between the Arab and Jewish workers and growing opposition among the democratic Jewish forces in Palestine to the official Zionist Biltmore program for a Jewish Commonwealth in Palestine. Furthermore, the struggles in Palestine are taking place at a time when British imperialism is building an anti-Soviet bloc in that

region, as well as major military bases, and when American imperialism is aggressively expanding its penetration in the Middle East, while the prestige of the Soviet Union and its anti-imperialist and peace policies are rising. As a result of these developments, the Palestine struggles are having the following main effects upon the American Jewish masses:

a) In the Zionist movement of the United States, the main leadership has passed into the hands of the extreme elements, headed by Rabbi Silver. These are also, in many cases, part of the conservative and reactionary forces in general American political life, the forces represented by Taft, Hoover, Hearst, etc. At the same time, the growing realization in Zionist circles that the Zionist program—the Biltmore program of turning Palestine into a Jewish state or Commonwealth—is in deep crisis, is stimulating the development in the American Zionist movement of progressive and democratic tendencies desirous of working for Arab-Jewish collaboration and for support to the peace and anti-fascist policies of the Soviet Union.

b) Among the wider masses of American Jews, Zionist-influenced as well as non-Zionist, the crisis in the Biltmore Commonwealth program gives rise to tendencies, which must be helped to find adequate expression, toward a united democratic and anti-imperialist position of the Jewish people for the support of the Palestine Yishuv, based on Jewish-Arab

collaboration for a free and independent Palestine. This is accompanied by growing disillusionment in the so-called friendship of British imperialism. The illusions which still persist in the so-called friendship of American imperialism must be systematically exposed and dissipated.

9. The reactionary Social-Democrats—the *Forward*-Dubinsky leadership of the Jewish Labor Committee—are developing very intense activities. They are spearheading among the Jewish masses the imperialist war incitements against the Soviet Union and are allied with the camp of "get-tough-with-Russia" reactionaries, with Denikin, Bor and Churchill. They are also working for the restoration of the Second International; and at the same time they continue without letup to struggle against labor unity in America and against the World Federation of Trade Unions. Through numerous agents and emissaries, the dominant leadership of the Jewish Labor Committee is carrying on these reactionary activities, not only in the United States, but in many European countries (e.g., France), as well as in Latin America. On the question of Poland, the *Forward* leadership of the Jewish Labor Committee is maneuvering, due to pressure from below and some internal divisions, pretending to accept the new regime in Poland, while orienting its main political work on a struggle against the new Poland. It will therefore be necessary to unfold a broad campaign for united

action of all Jewish workers, trade unionists, and other democratic forces, with special concentration among the supporters and affiliates of the Jewish Labor Committee, in support of the new Poland, for the building of the new Jewish community in Poland, for combatting the reactionary forces in the United States which stimulate fascist reaction in Poland, and for a policy of friendship by the American government toward the new Poland and its democratic government.

On the question of Palestine, the reactionary Social-Democratic leaders (*Forward-Dubinsky-Rogoff*) are maneuvering to hide from the masses the fact that the line of this group constitutes treachery to the Jewish people and to the Palestine Yishuv. The *Forward* completely supports the imperialist and warmaking policies of Bevin and Churchill, the policies that are responsible for the British imperialist terror and oppression in Palestine and the hateful schemes of partition rejected by most Arabs and Jews in Palestine. However, it is trying to obscure this fact by mildly remonstrating with Bevin for the "mistakes" of his tactics in regard to the Jewish community in Palestine. The *Forward* group particularly supports the policies of American imperialism and its orientation upon an Anglo-American bloc against the Soviet Union, the colonial peoples (including the Jewish and Arab communities in Palestine), and the new democracies in

Europe. This duplicity and treachery of the *Forward-Dubinsky* group is alienating from it growing numbers of its present supporters and creating strains and divisions within the group. Thus new and more favorable conditions are arising for united anti-imperialist, anti-fascist actions with workers and groups under Social-Democratic leadership, in the struggle for labor unity and for people's anti-fascist unity.

The reactionary Social-Democratic leaders are also very active in the Jewish field, with the main aim of disrupting the unity of the democratic forces among the Jewish masses. It especially strives to end the collaboration of the American Jewish Labor Council and the Jewish People's Fraternal Order of the I. W. O. with the other democratic forces of the American Jewish Congress and the American Jewish Conference. These disruptive activities of the *Forward-Dubinsky* group receive the support of the assimilationist big bourgeoisie, on the one hand, and the reactionary bourgeois nationalists, on the other. This accounts for the periodic get-together of these elements for common action (Jewish Labor Committee, American Jewish Committee, and certain forces from the Zionist movement) as against the unity movements of the democratic elements in Jewish life. However, on this issue of Jewish democratic unity the Party has made substantial advances against the reactionary Social-Democratic leaders driving them

into positions of partial isolation from the Jewish masses on many practical questions.

In this field, in addition to remnants of Browderism, our main difficulty has been our weakness in helping to overcome the continued inadequate participation of progressive Jewish trade unionists in the fight for the Jewish people's interests and Jewish democratic unity. This weakness is being slowly overcome by a policy of developing the American Jewish Labor Council as an active and leading body of the American Jewish masses. This will help greatly to advance the positions of the progressive forces in the trade union movement.

The internal political orientation of the reactionary Social-Democrats is upon the emergence of an anti-Soviet combination, if need be through a reactionary third party, capable of decisively influencing the policies of the Truman Administration or of facilitating the coming into power of a government that will be so influenced. Some of the political objectives of this Social-Democratic group are being fulfilled in part by the reactionary bipartisan coalition in Congress, but the openly anti-labor character of this coalition makes it impossible for the reactionary Social-Democrats openly to collaborate with it. Hence, their aim is to bring about a somewhat different combination in which the reactionary trade union bureaucracy and Social-Democrats will play a decisive part. Hence, it is

necessary to expose the reactionary, divisive, and imperialist character of the so-called "third party" maneuvers of the reactionary Social-Democratic leaders, popularizing among the masses, and winning their support for the developing labor-democratic coalition of all progressive, anti-fascist, anti-imperialist forces, and for the eventual organization of a people's anti-monopoly party.

The struggle to isolate and defeat the reactionary Jewish Social-Democrats is the major task in the struggle for the unity of the Jewish workers and the anti-fascist unity of the Jewish people. In this struggle we must aim to win the Social-Democratic workers and the masses under the domination of reactionary Social-Democratic leaders to united actions on a broad anti-fascist program of working-class unity, seeking joint action with all Socialist elements and groups who favor working-class, anti-fascist, anti-imperialist, and anti-war unity.

10. In the struggle for the anti-fascist unity of the democratic forces of the American Jewish masses, the following are the immediate practical tasks of Jewish labor and of its vanguard, the Jewish Communists:

a) The labor, democratic, and progressive forces in the American Jewish Congress (the American Jewish Labor Council, the Jewish People's Fraternal Order of the I. W. O., certain forces in the Zionist movement, in the Landsmanshaften, etc) must be supported in their struggle for

progressive policies of anti-fascist Jewish unity in the American Jewish Congress. Support must be given to their struggle for active participation in the fight of the American Jewish masses against the warmongers and for peace, against anti-Semitism and discrimination, for full equality of the Jewish people, and in alliance with the Negro people, in alliance and in accord with the main progressive policies of the developing labor-democratic coalition of the American people, with Jewish labor effectively represented in the leadership of the American Jewish Congress.

b) The democratic forces in the American Jewish Congress must be supported in their struggle for democratic and anti-fascist policies in the World Jewish Congress, in which the democratic forces in Jewish life, especially labor, should be adequately and effectively represented. The democratic forces in the World Jewish Congress must work consistently for the building of Jewish life in the liberated countries of Europe in accord with the unity programs of the Jewish communities themselves. They must support the national rights of the Jewish Yishuv in Palestine on the basis of Jewish-Arab collaboration for an independent Palestine, and resist all tendencies to subordinate the World Jewish Congress to the party policies and interests of the Zionist movement. Collaboration between the World Jewish Congress and the Soviet Jews for the democratic and anti-fascist objectives of the Jewish

people is an indispensable condition for success.

c) A similar policy must be supported in the American Jewish Conference of active struggle for the rights and interests of the Jewish people in the U. S. as well as of those in other countries. To justify its existence, the Conference must begin to function as a progressive factor in American Jewish life, in "the American scene." At the same time, we must support the orientation that the progressive forces in the American Jewish Congress have greater capacities and opportunities than in the Conference to help develop the activities of the American Jewish masses on a democratic anti-fascist unity program.

d) We must continue to work for the elimination of all Browder revisionist tendencies to subordinate the workers to the bourgeoisie. Hence, we must promote actively the struggle for the labor-democratic coalition, headed by the working class, to check and defeat the reactionary imperialist offensive of the monopolies, and systematically build the vanguard role of the Communist Party.

e) We must actively support the upbuilding of the American Jewish Labor Council both as a force capable of effectively challenging the reactionary *Forward-Dubinsky* group which dominates the Jewish Labor Committee, and as a leading factor in the American Jewish Congress. We must actively support the independent activities and influence of

the Jewish People's Fraternal Order of the I.W.O. and help to develop its leading position in the American Jewish Congress. A basic phase of this work is the development of the democratic unity program among the Jewish people organized in the Landsmanshaften.

Full and active support must be given to the work of the Jewish Council (formerly of Russian Relief) in its new forms of activity of cultural relations and rehabilitation, to the Committee for Birobidjan, to the Committee of Jewish Writers and Artists, to the Jewish Cultural Alliance (Icuf), to the Musical Farband, and to the Progressive Committee of the Workmen's Circle.

f) A broad ideological and political campaign must be carried on against all reactionary forces in Jewish life, concentrating upon the reactionary Social-Democrats and the reactionary forces in the Zionist and bourgeois-assimilationist movements. In this way we must promote the anti-fascist unity of labor and all other democratic forces among the Jewish people, and at the same time popularize the Marxist teachings in all fields, particularly on the question of national and colonial liberation.

g) We must particularly support the policy of collaboration and alliance of the American Jewish masses with the Negro people, as well as with labor, the progressive forces of all nationality groups, and the progressive camp in general of the

American people. The Negro people are especially qualified for the role of vanguard fighter and most dependable ally in the struggle against all forms of national, religious and racial oppression and discrimination, and for equal rights. This is so because the Negro people are faced with the task of national liberation in the South, as well as the task of securing elementary and fundamental equal rights in the country as a whole. Hence, we must systematically build the alliance between the Jewish masses and the Negro people, as an organic part of the labor-democratic coalition of the American people, and we must expose and combat all forms and expressions of white chauvinism among Jews.

11. The winning of the Jewish war veterans for the democratic and anti-fascist struggles and for membership in the Communist Party is now a major task. We must note among the war veterans a heightened sensitivity to the dangers of anti-Semitism and an intense determination to fight as American Jews together with all war veterans for full equality. We must also take note of bourgeois-assimilationist tendencies among certain groups of progressive Jewish war veterans which threatens to isolate them from the main democratic forces of the American Jews and which must therefore be counteracted by drawing these war veterans into active struggle against discrimination and anti-Semitism and for Jewish rights. We must draw all

the practical conclusions from the fact that the returning war veterans are becoming an important factor in the progressive movements of the American Jews.

12. In the struggle for our policies among the American Jewish people, we must systematically combat the influence of Jewish bourgeois nationalism and Jewish bourgeois assimilationism. The fact that these influences have not been adequately combated, especially during the period of Browder revisionism, is now making it necessary to struggle against the danger of deviations toward the ideology of bourgeois nationalism as expressed in Zionism and Bundism. Both of these, while differing sharply on the question of a Jewish state in Palestine, are based upon the reactionary-utopian conception of a Jewish world-nation, with the consequent tendencies toward national chauvinism and separatism. Similarly, we must combat the danger of deviations toward bourgeois assimilationism (Council for Judaism and American Jewish Committee) which reflects the pressures of the Anglo-Saxon race supremacy theories of American imperialism. The fight against the danger of these deviations is also a fight against revisionism and Social-Democratism, which have a close affinity to both bourgeois nationalism and assimilationism. Only in this ideological struggle will we build the Party and its influence among the American Jewish masses.

13. Party Commissions on Jewish

work shall be established in all States with large Jewish populations, and a National Commission on Jewish work shall also be established. These Commissions shall guide the work of the Communists in the Jewish field, under the supervision and control of the general leading organs of the Party. These Commissions shall regularly formulate plans of activity for integrating the systematic building of the Party among the Jewish masses (recruiting, press, education, etc.) into every phase of our mass activities and political campaigns, and for the development of mass activities in the Jewish field in the name of the Party.

14. Communists shall render active support to the *Morning Freiheit*, the Jewish anti-fascist and labor daily paper. We will support the *Morning Freiheit* Association, in accord with its program, as a non-Party anti-fascist Jewish organization, carrying on its work among both the Yiddish and English-speaking Jewish masses, for the development of the *Morning Freiheit* as a unifying political center of the more consistent Jewish anti-fascist movements, with a broad, mass, sustaining, individual membership and a committee form of organization.

II. PALESTINE, ZIONISM, THE JEWISH YISHUV, AND OUR SPECIAL TASKS

1. Communist participation in the struggle for anti-fascist Jewish unity,

against anti-Semitism, for the democratic rights of the Jewish people, for relief and the building of Jewish life in the liberated countries, in support of the national rights of the Jewish community in Palestine, and for the building of Birobidjan, has been and continues to be of major importance for the defense of the vital interests of the Jewish masses and for the promotion of the anti-fascist struggles of the whole of the American people. The achievements in these fields have greatly advanced our positions and influence. However, in the course of these struggles a number of serious errors have been committed which militated against the firmer consolidation of the ideological positions of the working class and of the Communist movement.

2. These errors came to particular expression on the following points. While correctly supporting the equal rights of the Jewish community in Palestine to a free national development, we failed to base this support, especially in our practical mass work, upon the joint Jewish-Arab anti-imperialist struggle for an independent and democratic Palestine which would secure and protect the equal national rights of both the Jewish people and the Arab people. We failed to draw all the necessary conclusions from the fact that the first and basic problem of Palestine is the liberation of that country from British imperialist domination, for this is the primary condition for the realization of the national rights of the

Arabs and Jews and the free national development of the two peoples of Palestine. Consequently, our fight in support of the national rights of the Jewish community in Palestine became one-sided and distorted, as is particularly evident in the wrong way in which we fought for the abrogation of the "White Paper" and for Jewish immigration into Palestine.

3. It was correct and necessary to support the demand for the abrogation of the "White Paper" and for the right of Jews to immigrate to and settle in Palestine, but it was incorrect to separate these demands, in practice, from the basic and fundamental demand for the independence of Palestine. It was incorrect to place the right of Jewish immigration into Palestine on any other basis than as part of the task of general collaboration and agreement of Arabs and Jews for common struggle against imperialism and for the independence of Palestine.

4. A similar one-sidedness and distortion characterized our use of the slogan calling for "A Jewish National Homeland in Palestine." This old, widespread, and popular slogan among the Jewish people has been appropriated by the Zionist movement for the promotion of its political aim of turning Palestine into a Jewish state—or Commonwealth, as formulated by the so-called Biltmore program—and for the spread of its bourgeois-nationalist ideology based upon the proposition that a Jewish state in Palestine would be the na-

tional homeland of the Jews of all countries. We must reject totally and combat systematically this Zionist use of the slogan of "A Jewish National Homeland in Palestine." The Marxist position on the national question, which is the most consistently democratic position, insists upon the equality of nations. It rejects all solutions which subordinate the interests and rights of one nation to those of another, such as the Biltmore program for Jewish State of Commonwealth, which would subordinate the national rights and interests of the Arab people in Palestine to those of the Jewish people. Equally, the Marxist position rejects the solutions proposed by the reactionary Arab nationalists, who would subordinate to themselves and sacrifice for their own benefit the national rights and interests of the Jewish people.

The Marxist position on the question of a Jewish National Homeland in Palestine is:

a) That only an independent Palestine will create the conditions for the free, national development of the Jewish Yishuv, which will thus realize its equal national rights side by side with the Arab people whose free national development in a united Palestine will be assured by the guarantee of the equality of its national rights;

b) That this calls for Arab-Jewish struggle against all schemes for the partitioning of Palestine, since partition would make impossible any free national development of the Jews and

Arabs in Palestine, for it would transform the split-up portions of the country into mere military reservations of British, American, or Anglo-American imperialism;

c) That this also calls for a united Jewish-Arab struggle against all reactionary and imperialist schemes of fake independence as perpetrated, for example, by British imperialism in Trans-Jordan;

d) That the realization of the national rights of the Jewish Yishuv will create a national homeland for the Jews in Palestine. It will not be the national homeland for the Jewish people of other countries, whose rights, well-being, and forms of national existence will be realized and developed in each of these countries in accord with the concrete conditions prevailing in each and on the basis of the common struggles of their peoples for the uprooting of fascism and anti-Semitism, for democracy, for peace, for equal rights, and for general social progress;

e) That the final complete and permanent solution of the Jewish question will be attained only under Socialism on the basis of the principles formulated by Lenin and Stalin and as developed in the Soviet Union's solution of the national question. In our own use of the slogan of "A Jewish National Homeland in Palestine," though we correctly coupled it with the demand for a free and democratic Palestine, we did not, with sufficient clarity and consistency, differentiate our conception of the

slogan from that of the Zionist movement, thus weakening our entire position.

5. In the struggle for the rights of Jews to immigrate to and settle in Palestine, we have insufficiently resisted the harmful activities of certain Zionist groups and of certain leading elements of the Joint Distribution Committee. These people aim to make Palestine the only place of immigration for Jewish refugees. This plays into the hands of the British imperialists in their game of promoting antagonisms between the Jews and Arabs and of preventing their collaboration in Palestine.

The report of the Anglo-American Commission is basically an effort to establish an understanding for Anglo-American imperialist collaboration in Palestine at the expense of both Arabs and Jews, excluding the United Nations from that part of the world, and aiming to strengthen imperialist oppression in Palestine and in the whole of the Middle East. It has aggravated the question of Jewish immigration into Palestine instead of helping to solve it. The recommendation for the admission of 100,000 Jewish refugees into Palestine is being used by both the British and the American governments to intensify Arab-Jewish antagonisms and to try to strengthen their respective rival positions there—Britain with the Arab League and America with the Zionist movement—each imperialist power seeking at the same time

the support and collaboration of both Jewish and Arab reactionaries.

The fate of the Jewish refugees in the camps in Germany and elsewhere is of deep concern to the Jewish people and to the democratic forces of all peoples. It is therefore necessary to intensify the fight for the demand that the United Nations assume responsibility at once for these refugees, that it seek to secure the widest opportunities for the immigration of these refugees into the countries of the United Nations, and that it provide all the means necessary for this. We must especially demand broader opportunities for the Jewish refugees to enter and settle in the United States. We favor the right of Jews to immigrate to and settle in Palestine, on the basis of Arab-Jewish agreement for the realization of this right under joint Arab-Jewish control. We must make it clear, at the same time, that the salvation of the European Jews does not lie in their so-called "Exodus" from Europe, as advocated by Zionists, but on the road of the democratic struggle of the people headed by labor, for the uprooting of fascism, anti-Semitism, and reaction, for the development and consolidation of the new democracies of Europe.

6. These errors result primarily from insufficient alertness to the pressure of Zionist and other bourgeois-nationalist currents and from insufficient resistance to these pressures. It is, therefore, necessary to correct our policies and especially their execu-

tion. We must win the Jewish toiling masses, first of all the workers, to the Marxist position on the Jewish question as on all others, and to do so in the very process of struggle for labor unity and for the democratic unity of the people against fascism, reaction, and anti-Semitism.

7. Summing up our position on Palestine we must say:

a) The basic task there is joint Jewish-Arab struggle to end British or Anglo-American imperialist rule and military occupation and to establish an independent and democratic Palestine state of Jews and Arabs, guaranteeing alike the interests and rights of both nationalities;

b) Only in an independent and democratic Palestine will the Jewish Yishuv, the same as the Arab people, be able to realize its right to a national existence, and to develop as a Jewish national homeland for the Jewish people of Palestine on the basis of self-government;

c) A major task in the struggle for the independence of Palestine is the joint Arab-Jewish fight, supported by all progressive and anti-imperialist forces, against the British and Anglo-American imperialist schemes for the partition of Palestine or for some fraudulent "independence" maneuver similar to the one in Trans-Jordan, based upon the collaboration with imperialism of the Jewish and Arab reactionary forces;

d) The right of Jews to immigrate and settle in Palestine will be real-

ized only in agreement between Jews and Arabs for the common struggle for an independent and free Palestine of Arabs and Jews; and

e) All progressive and labor forces in Jewish life must unite for joint struggle for the above people's program for Palestine—a program of action for non-Zionists, as well as for the democratic elements in the Zionist movement, as is demonstrated in the Jewish Yishuv itself.

8. To meet the immediate practical problems of the Palestine situation we urge support for the program of action submitted by the *Morning Freiheit* Association to the American Jewish Conference, containing the following propositions:

1. That the American Jewish Conference shall appeal at once to President Truman and to the Secretary General of the United Nations, asking them to recommend to the Security Council of the United Nations (a) that the United Nations assume immediately full responsibility for the fate and maintenance of the 100,000 Jewish refugees in German camps, and to intervene with the countries of the United Nations that they open their doors to the immigration and settlement of the Jewish refugees and to provide for that the necessary means; (b) that Britain shall transfer Palestine at once to the trusteeship of the Big Three in the United Nations for the purpose of setting up Palestine as an independent and democratic State of Arabs and Jews that will guarantee the equal national rights of both peoples; and (c) that the United Nations shall

recommend to Great Britain the immediate withdrawal of all British armed forces from Palestine.

2. That the American Jewish Conference shall organize and send a delegation to President Truman for the purpose of achieving the widest opportunities for the entrance and settlement of Jewish refugees in the United States.

3. That the American Jewish Conference shall issue an appeal to the Jewish Agency in Palestine asking that the Agency open at once negotiations with the spokesmen of labor and other democratic forces of the Arab people in Palestine. These negotiations should seek an agreement for joint Arab-Jewish struggle for the independence of Palestine and for the purpose of reaching an agreement in favor of Jewish immigration into Palestine under joint Arab-Jewish control.

4. That the American Jewish Conference shall undertake to rally the widest united actions of the American Jews, in collaboration with all progressive forces of the whole American people, especially with labor and the Negro people, in support of the foregoing proposals.

9. Bourgeois-nationalist pressures have colored and distorted other phases of our work in the democratic unity movements of the American Jews—in the American Jewish Congress, in the American Jewish Conference, etc. Here, too, we deal primarily with insufficient resistance to Zionist influences, with many instances of failures to present our independent position, and insufficient struggle for the Marxist positions

and ideology, especially for the leading role of the Jewish workers in the Jewish people's movements.

10. Furthermore, we have not combatted effectively the pressures of bourgeois assimilationism, which are a reflection of the Anglo-Saxon race supremacy "theories" of American imperialism. These assimilationist pressures continually hamper the Party's Jewish work. They feed nationalist tendencies as an extreme and false reaction to assimilationism, and are responsible in large measure for the fact that basic sections of progressive Jewish trade unionists either do not participate at all in the struggle of the progressive Jewish people's movements or, when they do, participate under the leadership of bourgeois nationalists. In either case, this tends to leave the field to the reactionary Social-Democrats of the *Forward*-Dubinsky group which dominates the Jewish Labor Committee.

11. Browder revisionism, including the false theory that anti-Semitism in the United States is merely and exclusively an importation from countries under fascist rule, tended naturally to facilitate the growth of both tendencies. Paving the way for the ideological subjection of the masses to American imperialism, revisionism opened the road to all bourgeois ideological influences, to bourgeois nationalism and bourgeois assimilationism. Hence, a determined fight must be made to free our work of all remnants of Browder revision-

ism
tend
III.
W
N
I.
Com
mass
in a
to be
but
first,
Jewi
large
const
and
litica
secon
speal
large
ing
of th
2.
nist
grou
speci
of th
move
grou
a Ma
the s
the r
must
geois
tablis
Jewis
great
Com
whol
ties v

ism and to overcome both bourgeois tendencies.

III. THE CHARACTER OF OUR WORK IN THE JEWISH NATIONALITY GROUP

1. The Party does not consider Communist work among the Jewish masses of America "language work" in a narrow sense, since our work has to be carried on not only in Yiddish but also in English. The facts are, first, that important parts of the Jewish nationality group, particularly large sections of Jewish workers, consider Yiddish their mother tongue and give it a primary position in political and cultural intercourse; and, second, the native-born, English-speaking Jews play an increasingly larger role—in some places the leading role—in the life and struggles of the Jewish nationality group.

2. Hence, the Party views Communist work in the Jewish nationality group as the Marxist answer to the special needs, problems, and interests of the toiling masses and progressive movements of the Jewish nationality group. The Party states that there is a Marxist, a Communist, answer to the special needs and problems of the nationality group, and that we must combat the efforts of the bourgeoisie and Social-Democrats to establish a monopoly in the life of the Jewish nationality group. This places great responsibility upon Jewish Communists and the Party as a whole to strengthen our work and ties with the Jewish masses. Commu-

nists and their progressive allies can and must become the recognized leaders of the masses—workers, farmers, professionals, small businessmen—in the nationality group.

3. It has become evident that the Jewish nationality group, as is true of other American nationality groups, possess a relative stability and inner vitality which requires that the Communist Party supply Marxist leadership to its needs and problems as a nationality group. This is in no contradiction to the Leninist principle of the organizational and political unity of the working class. This principle is directly embodied in the vanguard Party of the working class—the Communist Party—and also to a degree in other progressive political organizations of labor and in the trade unions. Hence, we cannot have separate national group Communist organizations or trade unions. But auxiliary mass organizations of a fraternal, cultural, or relief character, organizations called into existence to meet special needs and problems of a nationality group, can function most effectively and properly when organized as nationality groups in character, composition, and leadership, joined in many instances with other similarly organized nationality groups. In such organizations the political and organizational unity of the American working class can be achieved and is being achieved by the work of its vanguard, the Communists.

4. Experience has demonstrated

that Communist leadership in the life of the masses of the Jewish nationality group makes possible the development of Marxist answers to the problems of achieving complete integration with general American life, as against the answers supplied to these problems by bourgeois nationalists, bourgeois assimilationists, and Social-Democrats. The Marxist answer to the problems of integration is based on the objective fact that the Jewish nationality group, like other nationality groups in the United States, is a progressive factor in the democratic development of the American nation. The growth along progressive lines of the nationality group is proving to be a necessary stage toward the voluntary and complete integration of all the component elements of the American nation. Many factors have combined to develop the nationality group in America as a progressive stage in the growth of the American nation. These factors are: the history of our country; its economic and political structure; the origin of our people from many nations and cultural strains; the historical process of resistance to the rigid attitudes of the Anglo-Saxon ruling classes to keep the masses of other national origins in a position of general inferiority—economic, political, social—and to hold them in ideological and cultural subjection by manifold pressures of forced assimilation falsely called Americanization; and increasing political and cultural intercourse

between the American masses and the democratic forces of the countries and nations of their origin. It will be necessary for Marxists to carry through a thorough study of the concrete process of growth of the nationality groups and the perspectives of their further development.

5. Jewish bourgeoisie nationalism seeks to perpetuate a national Jewish identity around Zionism and a Jewish state in Palestine, while accepting forced and mechanical assimilation of American Jews in all respects except religion. As against this, Communists must lead the American Jewish masses to the building of a progressive Jewish nationality group life—cultural, social, and in relations with Jews of other countries, especially with the Jews of Birobidjan and with the Soviet Jews in general. In doing so, we must combat all tendencies to separatism and isolation, fighting for the full equality of the Jewish masses to become freely and completely integrated in all phases of general American life and to participate actively in the building of the American nation, thus bringing the Jewish masses ever closer to the labor movement and to the Communist Party. This demands that Party organizations carry on systematic work in their own name among the Jewish masses.

6. Jewish bourgeois assimilationism, which has also had its influence within the ranks of the Party, seeks to impose upon the Jewish masses the imperialist ideology of Anglo-

Saxon
not of
of a
gether
ish na
comm
Comm
and ef
ity gro
for th
into g
Comm
tionary
forced
fight f
groups
tionali
cratic r
tegrati
We m
combat
Democ
Americ
movem
lies of
tionists
not onl
ests of
Americ
as the
ple.
7. Th
anti-fas
is one
struggle
ism and
can Jew
establish
tural re
can and
the lead

Saxon race "superiority." It opposes not only Zionism, but the building of a progressive Jewish life altogether, and seeks to reduce the Jewish nationality group to a religious community. As against this, the Communists must fight for complete and effective equality of all nationality groups as the first prerequisite for their free and full integration into general American life. The Communists must expose the reactionary and imperialist character of forced bourgeois assimilationism and fight for the right of the nationality groups to develop a progressive nationality group life as the only democratic road to the historic goal of integration into general American life. We must consistently expose and combat the reactionary Jewish Social-Democrats, not only as agents of American imperialism in the labor movement, but also as the direct allies of the Jewish bourgeois assimilationists and reactionary nationalists; not only as the betrayers of the interests of the working class and of the American people as a whole, but also as the betrayers of the Jewish people.

7. The struggle for a progressive, anti-fascist, and people's mass culture is one of the basic elements of the struggle against bourgeois nationalism and assimilationism in the American Jewish nationality group. By establishing and developing close cultural relations between the American and Soviet Jews, the latter being the leaders in the field of Jewish cul-

ture, it will be possible to enrich American Jewish cultural life with a progressive and consistently anti-fascist content. This will stimulate the growth in the United States of a progressive American Jewish culture, reflecting the aspirations of the working class and its historic, leading role in the liberation movements of the people. We must carry on the struggle for such a culture in order to combat the efforts of bourgeois nationalism to confine Jewish cultural life in America to the enjoyment of the products of Palestinian Hebrew culture by the wealthy and educated groups, as well as to combat the efforts of bourgeois assimilationism to cut the American Jews off altogether from a progressive mass Jewish cultural life and to attach to the so-called superior Anglo-Saxon culture the more educated and wealthy groups among the American Jews. Both bourgeois positions—nationalist and assimilationist—would reserve culture to select groups of upper class circles. Communists must fight for the cultural activity of the masses, for a people's culture, for a progressive Jewish mass culture in the American Jewish nationality group, just as we fight for a progressive mass culture of the American people as a whole. The democratic forces of the American Jewish nationality group have the historic task of promoting and building the progressive culture of the Jewish people and to help build the progressive culture of the American nation. In this connection, we espe-

cially emphasize the need in New York City of supporting the strengthening of the bilingual School for Jewish Studies.

8. The question of language in the Jewish nationality group, as in the others, has to be settled on this basis. American Jews use either English or Yiddish. Considerable numbers are bilingual. Hence, our work has to be carried on in these two languages, and Communist actives and leaders in the Jewish national group must aim to be able to use both languages. In the coming period, we must especially concentrate on overcoming the long standing neglect of Jewish work in the English language. We must raise it to the level of crucial importance, without in any way weakening our work in Yiddish, and develop the closest and organic collaboration between the activities conducted in both languages in the one field of Jewish work. We strongly urge the most active support to the new anti-fascist monthly magazine, *Jewish Life*, published in English by the *Morning Freiheit* Association. At the same time, we must energetically combat the tendency to underestimate the work in English, as well as the tendency to belittle the work in Yiddish, since both tendencies are harmful to the Party's work among the Jewish masses.

9. In considering the relative position of Yiddish and English in the Jewish nationality group, the following must be taken into account: (a) both bourgeois nationalism and as-

similationism oppose the development and cultivation of the Yiddish language; (b) the growth of close cultural relations of the American Jews with the Soviet Jews, especially with the growth of Birobidjan as the Socialist home land of a developing Jewish nationality in a system of Soviet Republics, as well as the cultural relations with the Jewish communities in the new democracies of Europe, greatly strengthen the position of Yiddish in the American Jewish nationality group; (c) while important sections of American Jews maintain Yiddish as their primary language in social and cultural life, the objective processes of integration continue to undermine the position of Yiddish, tending to make the English language dominant in general economic and political life, with bilingualism becoming an outstanding feature in the Jewish nationality group.

The conclusion must therefore be that the Yiddish language, historically the common language and basic means in modern times of cultural intercourse between the majority of Jews in various countries, will continue to play a big and, for a time, decisive role in the struggle for a progressive mass Jewish culture in America. But, at the same time, a continually growing section of American Jews will find progressive Jewish cultural expression in English, with an increasingly larger number finding it in both languages. Hence, the spread of Yiddish and its cultiva-

tion an
Jews i
struggl
mass c
along
the pr
English
al valu
availab
Jews th
culture
guage.
10. I
to find
swer t
the Je
cordin
is a pe
charac
tional
single
ing as
tries a
period,
unity v
uproot
for equ
sive n
rehabil
Jewish
for hel
ment c
dent I
Jews, a
of the
Birobid

tion among the masses of American Jews is an inseparable part of the struggle for a progressive Jewish mass culture in the United States, along with concentrated efforts for the production and propagation in English of progressive Jewish cultural values, at the same time making available for the English-speaking Jews the treasures of Jewish people's culture embodied in the Yiddish language.

10. It is the task of Communists to find and present the Marxist answer to the needs and problems of the Jewish people as a people. According to the Leninist position, it is a people having only its national character and culture as common national attributes. Hence, it is not a single nation and is incapable of acting as such. But the Jews of all countries are capable, in the present period, of fighting as a people, in unity with all democratic forces, for uprooting fascism and anti-Semitism, for equality of rights, for a progressive mass Jewish culture, for the rehabilitation and upbuilding of Jewish life in the liberated countries, for help to the free national development of the Yishuv in an independent Palestine state of Arabs and Jews, and for help to the upbuilding of the Jewish Autonomous Region in Birobidjan.

While participating actively in the united anti-fascist activities of the Jewish people of all countries, the progressive forces of the American Jewish nationality group—and in the first place of the Jewish workers and especially the Communists—have the historic task of becoming an ever more intimate and organic part of the progressive movements of the American people as a whole, of the developing labor-democratic coalition to check and defeat the reactionary imperialist offensive of the monopolies. Only thus will the interests and rights of the American Jewish people, as well as the interests of the American people as a whole be effectively defended. Only thus will the American Jewish masses be able to make an effective contribution to the progress and well-being of the Jewish people of other countries.

11. Communists must systematically popularize among the masses the Marxist solution formulated by Lenin and Stalin, of the national and colonial questions in general and of the Jewish question in particular, as offering the only complete and final solution, which becomes possible only with the abolition of the capitalist system of class and national oppression and the establishment of Socialism.

THE NEGRO QUESTION

By JAMES S. ALLEN

(A DISCUSSION ARTICLE)

IN *Political Affairs* of July, 1946, Comrade Doxey A. Wilkerson argues that we should not revive the perspective of self-determination for the Negro people in the Black Belt. He holds that this position and its related concepts are "un-Marxist" and "undialectical," since they do not conform to American reality and fail to satisfy the requirements of tactics and practice.

Wilkerson recommends an "entirely new approach," based on the perspective of the Negro people moving toward the status of a national minority in the country as a whole, rather than toward further development as a nation.

While our previous position needs to be re-examined in the light of old mistakes and of recent developments, and some revisions have to be made, Comrade Wilkerson's "new approach" should be rejected.

His position fails to assess properly such economic and political changes as have taken place during the great economic crisis and World War II. It fails to take into account the historical and present-day roots of the oppression of the Negro people. It

tends to overlook the role of the Southern semi-feudal system as the source of a powerful stream of reaction that merges with the main stream originating in monopoly capital.

Wilkerson's position would leave us quite unprepared to assume our proper role in the new wave of the fight for democracy in the South and in the nation-wide fight for Negro rights. If accepted, it would return us to the confusion of previous days when the labor and progressive movement proved inadequate to the task of forging an alliance between the working class and the Negro people.

Wilkerson's position confuses the basic theoretical principles of Marxism in relation to the national question, and, therefore, also fails to supply the necessary tactical positions and programs of action required in the present situation.

These are the general grounds for rejection of Comrade Wilkerson's position. I will now show why he is so basically erroneous, beginning with some questions of general approach and then proceeding to questions of fact and interpretation.

I. DIALECTICS AND REALITY

In so far as Wilkerson seeks factual justification for his arguments, he bases his case upon a tendency toward the dispersal of the Negro population out of the Southern Black Belt. In fact, such a tendency has existed since the Civil War, and especially since the first World War

From this historical tendency, and from a superficial examination of some fragmentary statistics, Wilkerson jumps to the conclusion that within the next decades the concentration of Negro population in the Black Belt will disappear and the Negro people will assume the position of a "national minority" in the country as a whole.

WHY THE BLACK BELT?

To understand what is at issue, it is necessary to keep clearly in mind the factors that formed the Black Belt to begin with, and the reasons for its persistence to the present day. These can be summarized as follows:

1. The Black Belt was formed and reached its maximum extension under slavery, as the area simultaneously of Negro majority and of the slave plantation.

2. The democratic revolution of the Civil War and Reconstruction succeeded in one of its main tasks, the abolition of chattel slavery, but failed to accomplish its other main task, the establishment of democracy in the South. A consequence of the reactionary victory in the second phase of the revolution was the retention of the plantation system in which slavery was replaced by sharecropping, an intermediate form between slave labor on the one hand and free wage-labor, capitalist tenancy, or independent farming on the other hand.

The economic survival of slavery in the form of plantation-sharecropping not only bound the former

slaves to the plantation, but also supplied the base for the continuing political power of the former slave-masters, who increasingly had to share this power with industrial and banking capital centered in the North and later, in the era of imperialism, to subordinate themselves to finance-capital.

The continuation of the plantation-sharecropping system during the entire period of industrial expansion, including World War II, is the main factor accounting for the persistence of the Black Belt, as the area both of Negro majority and of semi-feudalism. It provides a continuing base for white chauvinist ideology, handed down from slavery, and also utilized by forces of reaction on a nationwide scale. This social-economic system of the Black Belt South is the main obstacle to the development of the South as a whole. It also radiates out on a nationwide scale the racial prejudice and social practices that operate against the Negro, wherever he may be, to keep him in a position of economic, social, and political inequality.

3. The movement of history is dialectical: it develops in contradictions, and by the solution of contradictions. While the plantation Black Belt persisted, other forces operating simultaneously, since the Civil War and particularly since 1910, tended to weaken and undermine the semi-feudal economy and to broaden the area of Negro freedom. The most important forces operating in this direction are:

(a) Industrial expansion in the North continuing over an extended period sporadically tapped the Black Belt for labor, particularly after the cessation of immigration from abroad, and resulted during recent times in the creation of a Negro industrial proletariat situated for the most part in the North, in close association with the white workers.

(b) Industrialization in the South, limited at all stages by the semi-feudal economy and restricted by the established concentrations of monopoly power in the North, nevertheless exerted an additional pressure from time to time upon the Black Belt for labor, particularly during periods of high production and limited labor supply.

(c) Directly or indirectly, the competitive position of the share-cropping plantation is weakened by the extension of cotton-growing into regions employing modern machinery and wage-labor, and by the slow and sporadic penetration of these newer methods into some sectors of the plantation South.

(d) Finally, but most important, are the political effects of these developments: the growing integration of Negro workers in the labor and progressive movement; the growth of trade unionism in the South, touching also the sharecroppers; the emergence of Negro middle-class political forces which tend to associate their struggle for equal rights with the working-class movement because of the inner weaknesses and extreme instability of the Negro middle class;

and the rise of a relatively new middle-class liberalism among Southern whites which is directed largely against semi-feudalism in the economic and political life of the South.

THE "BROAD" PERSPECTIVE

Thus, forces are constantly arising and developing that stand in opposition to the backwardness and reaction *simultaneously generated* by the plantation - sharecropping system, which is bolstered by monopoly capital. "Blind" economic forces, such as the penetration of capitalist forms of development in the South, play a significant role, but they cannot be counted upon automatically to modernize the South, especially since they exist in closest association with the backward semifeudal formation. The uprooting of semifeudalism and the establishment of democracy in the South is primarily a political process, the result of conscious activity by the working class, farmers and middle-class allies, directed against the real sources of reaction through all the ups and downs of the economy.

This essential concept of the historical process is absent from the "entirely new approach" suggested by Comrade Wilkerson, whose "dialectics" consist in seeing only one aspect of this process, without the contradictions, conflicts, and richness of struggle. He asks us to rely upon "the broad political perspective," "that the forces of progress will organize the future of our own country and all the world," a perspective within which we are to envision the

transf
into
ing a
equali
to ach
worki
again
new o
today
the U
Inde
forwar
though
along
necess
gies, a
the ver
is atte
interv
It is
perspe
expans
dissolu
semife
immed
of the
people
out the
the Bl
must a
might
Comm
pared
tation-
appear
produc
will be
ception
contin
the Sc
will ab
sharec

transformation of the Negro people into a "national minority" approaching a status of full equality. Full equality the Negro people are going to achieve, but only if they and their working-class allies fight effectively against the very real obstacles and new out-croppings of reaction which today block the path to progress in the United States.

Indeed, if we are to march straight forward, as Wilkerson imagines, "although serious struggles still lie along the way," it would hardly seem necessary to expend our utmost energies, as we are doing today, to fight the very real threat of reaction which is attempting to present us with an intervening stage of fascism.

It is within the "broad political perspective" of continuous capitalist expansion that Wilkerson sees the dissolution of the Black Belt and the semifeudalism operating there. If the immediate future holds the prospect of the redistribution of the Negro people more or less evenly throughout the country and the dispersal of the Black Belt concentration, then it must also provide the conditions that might make this possible.

Comrade Wilkerson must be prepared to defend the thesis that plantation-sharecropping will soon disappear, and that machine-wage labor production in the old plantation area will become the rule and not the exception. He must convince us that continuing industrial expansion in the South as well as in the North will absorb the displaced tenants and sharecroppers. He must prove that

we are in an extended period of overall national prosperity which will create new opportunities for Negro farmers, small businessmen, and professionals, in all parts of the country. And, not least, he must be ready to hold by the thesis that white chauvinism in all classes will be sufficiently uprooted during the extended Victorian Era of prosperity to accord the Negro people their rightful position as equal Americans.

It is more profitable to stick to the facts of reality in America and the world. During World War I and in the years immediately following, when the first mass migration of the Negro people into the North occurred in the midst of an industrial upsurge, similar predictions about the solution of the Negro question were heard. It was not until 1930, when the economic crisis was in full blast, that the Communist Party began to understand the essence of the Negro question through the fog of wishful thinking generated in the preceding decade. It was only then that we took the first major steps, more important than any previously made by a working-class party, to create an alliance between the working class and the Negro people. Surely, after World War II, we should not need too long a period to re-establish a balanced and effective approach on this question.

II. THE BLACK BELT IN 1940

To support his thesis that the Negro people are becoming a "national minority," Wilkerson leans

heavily upon the "tenuous majority" of the Negro in the Black Belt.

Of course, Wilkerson must recognize that the theoretical validity of Negro nationhood does not depend upon a numerical majority alone. In fact, he does recognize the historical role of the Black Belt as a continuous common territory upon which the Negro people developed many elements of nationhood. But as proof of a present-day "tenuous majority" which becomes more and more "tenuous" with each passing year, he cites the figure 50.3 per cent, which is the Negro majority of the Black Belt in 1930, as defined and calculated in my book, *The Negro Question in the United States*.

DEFINITION OF BLACK BELT

Since this book is now out of print*, and many who have recently joined the Party may not be acquainted with it, it is necessary to explain the method I employed in defining the Black Belt. My main purpose was to prove the following: (a) that the Black Belt was formed over a whole historic period, beginning with the early settlements of colonial days and extending into the present period; and (b) that the area of Negro majority is simultaneously the area of the old slave plantations and of the present-day sharecropping plantations. Once this is established, the main conditions are shown to be present to substantiate the theory that

the Negro people in the United States have developed as a nation and that their struggle for fuller nationhood is integrally connected with the struggle for democracy in the South.

From the location of Negro majority counties as reported by the Federal Census of Population for each decade, and from studies of the plantation economy over a whole period, it was obvious that the plantation area and the area of Negro majority coincide, and that this area is more or less continuous, even if within it there are numerous counties which taken individually do not show a Negro majority. Accordingly, on the basis of the 1930 census, the latest then available, I calculated an area in which the Negro formed just over half the population, and studied the historical and present-day characteristics of this area, as well as of its periphery, which I termed Border Territory.

I purposely chose to calculate a maximum area of Negro majority from the latest census available, for a study of such an area would show most clearly the various forces at work over an historical period that tended to retain or to weaken the basic semifeudal formation. In other words, if I simply wished to show a decided present Negro majority, without regard to the forces tending to reduce it, I could have discarded from the total parts of the Virginia and North Carolina areas, and some isolated and sparsely settled sections elsewhere. The result would have

* The author is now preparing a new edition, which he hopes will be available some time next year.

been a Black Belt in 1930 in which four million Negroes constituted about 60 per cent of the total population.

This would make a much stronger case for the slogan of self-determination mechanically conceived, without regard to the contradictory forces at work and the many elements which must enter into such a solution. It was not my purpose to establish immutable and permanent boundaries for some future new state or political entity corresponding to the area of Negro majority in 1930, as I warned in the very first chapter. If in 1930 such a solution had proved politically feasible, with the necessary class alliances and general political maturity of the country at the required level, the material conditions were present, although boundaries of such a new state would have to be determined not on the basis of population statistics alone.

The most important results shown by tracing the history of the 1930 Black Belt back to 1860 are: (a) the continued existence of the basic Black Belt through the entire period of industrial expansion in the country as a whole; and (b) a tendency for the Black Belt to contract during this period. In other words, if the Black Belt were to be calculated anew for each ten-year period in terms of a Negro majority it could be shown that it was slightly larger for each preceding decade back to 1900. Or, to put it in another way, it can be shown that the area in which the Negro people number more than

half the population has tended to become smaller since 1900, when the pressure of capitalist expansion in the country as a whole began to affect the Black Belt. This tendency continued right up to 1930, the latest census data covered in my book.

POPULATION IN 1930-1940

To complete the record up to 1940, I have now analyzed the population statistics of the last census for the area in which the Negro people were in a majority in 1930. The net result is shown in Table I, which also traces back to 1860 the population of the area included in the 1930 Black Belt.

TABLE I. POPULATION OF THE BLACK BELT, 1860-1940

Census Year	Total Population	Negro Population	% Negro of Total
1940	10,256,289	4,993,612	48.7
1930	9,525,865	4,790,049	50.3
1920	8,968,132	4,806,565	53.6
1910	8,387,958	4,842,766	57.7
1900	7,498,900	4,488,991	59.9
1890	6,465,307	3,866,792	59.8
1880	5,750,410	3,466,924	60.3
1870	4,431,597	2,560,263	57.8
1860	4,362,009	2,461,099	56.4

The following facts are immediately ascertainable from the table:

1. The tendency beginning in 1900 for the area of Negro majority to become smaller continued through the decade 1930-1940. Within the area in which there was a bare Negro majority in 1930 the Negro population was slightly below half, 48.7 per cent, in 1940.

2. At the same time, the rate of

contraction of the Black Belt was less than at any time since 1900.

The latter is shown by the following, which can be checked in the table:

(a) In the decade 1930-1940, the proportion of Negroes in the total Black Belt population declined by only 1.6 points, as compared with 3.3 points in 1920-1930, 4.1 points in 1910-1920, and 2.2 points in 1900-1910.

(b) During this decade, the Negro population of the Black Belt increased by 4.2 per cent, from 4,790,049 in 1930 to 4,993,612 in 1940. *This was the first time since 1910 that the Negro population in the Black Belt had increased*, although the rate of increase remained below the ratio for the Negro population in the country as a whole, which stood at 8.2 per cent for the decade 1930-1940.

(c) The white population of the Black Belt increased by 11.1 per cent, *the lowest rate of increase since the decade 1870-1880*, although above the national average (7.2 per cent) during 1930-1940.

This slowing down of the contraction of the Black Belt is to be ascribed primarily to the effects of the great economic crisis, which reached its lowest point in 1932, slow recovery from the crisis extending through most of the remaining decade, including a relapse in 1938, before the transition to war economy started.

Among other things, the crisis halted the movement from the land into industry, for a while reversing this tendency as more people migrated to the countryside than city-

ward. Negro migration from the Black Belt ceased, and the slow industrialization of the South was suspended. Thus, while many tenants and sharecroppers were ousted from agricultural production, there was no place for them in other sectors of the economy, and most remained in the rural areas or towns. During the period of recovery in the last half of the decade, migration cityward was resumed, but at a very slow pace. Between 1935 and 1940, the net migration of Negroes out of the 12 states in which the Black Belt is situated was only 107,243. Net Negro migration into 14 selected cities of over 100,000 population in North and South was only 26,471*.

SHARECROPPING IN 1930-1940

The crisis, of course, also directly affected the plantation economy. From study of the 1940 Agricultural Census it becomes immediately apparent how extensive was the eviction of tenants and sharecroppers from the land during the crisis. While the Negro population of the Black Belt rose by 4.2 per cent, *the number of Negro farm operators declined by almost one-fifth between 1930 and 1940*. The number of white farm operators remained about the same. This development brought down the proportion of Negroes among all farm operators in the Black Belt from 60.3 per cent to 54.4 per cent.

Thus, while many Negro tenants

* 16th Census, Population: "Internal Migration, 1935 to 1940, Tables 15 and 17, Washington, 1946.

and sharecroppers were evicted from production, Negro farm operators still remained in a decided majority. Furthermore, the decline of Negro farm operators occurred mostly among the tenants. Of the total loss of 116,184 Negro farm operators in the Black Belt between 1930 and 1940, 63 per cent were tenants other than sharecroppers, 35 per cent were sharecroppers, and the remainder were landowners.

From the viewpoint of the persistence of the economic slave survivals, the most important result of the period of the crisis was the increasing role of sharecropping, which is the best indicator of semifeudalism. *In fact, it can now be shown that the tendency for sharecropping to in-*

crease has existed for at least a period of 15 years before 1940, as can be seen in Table II. We cannot trace the movement back beyond 1925, because that was the first year in which the census listed sharecroppers separately from the various categories of tenants.

While sharecropping increased, tenancy other than sharecropping tended to decrease. Between 1910 and 1930, Negro tenancy in the Black Belt, including sharecropping, rose from 80 per cent to 83 per cent of all farm operators. But between 1930 and 1940, the first decline occurred, from 83 per cent back to 80 per cent. However, this is due to the declining role of tenants other than sharecroppers, as shown by Table II.

TABLE II. NEGRO TENURE IN THE BLACK BELT, 1925-1940.

	1925	1930	1940
Negro Farm Operators	548,785	592,687	476,683
Tenants and Croppers	445,643	493,844	379,619
% of Farm Operators	81.3	83.2	79.6
Tenants	207,873	223,239	149,554
% of Farm Operators	37.7	37.6	31.5
Croppers	237,770	270,605	230,065
% of Farm Operators	43.6	45.6	48.3

WAGE-LABOR IN 1930-1940

If sharecropping is a good indicator of semifeudalism, the extent of wage-labor is a reliable index to the penetration of capitalist methods of exploitation into Black Belt agriculture. I know there will be some who will cite the large decline of Negro farm operators as proof that machine-

wage labor production is replacing sharecropping on a large scale. As already stated, this decline is due primarily to the evictions during the crisis, and this conclusion is further substantiated by the fact that cotton production fell by 22 per cent between 1930 and 1940. We have also seen that the role of sharecropping has increased during this period.

In addition, we find that the number of farm wage-workers declined for the whole ten-year period—covering the crisis as well as the economic recovery—by less than one per cent for Negro workers and by 24 per cent for white workers. The fact that the number of Negro wage-workers remained about the same while the number of Negro farm operators dropped by one-fifth, would not necessarily indicate that wage-workers were replacing tenants and sharecroppers on any important scale. Negro workers may simply have taken the place of white farm workers during this period.

I do not wish to minimize the important effect of machine-wage labor production upon the semifeudal economy, or the potential development in this direction. There has been a slow penetration for some time of capitalist farming into the Black Belt, and this will undoubtedly continue. But it is obvious that *semifeudalism is the most pernicious obstacle to the modernization of agriculture*, and it is illusory to expect decisive expansion of machine-production in the plantation area, under present conditions. Actually, as Table II indicates, sharecropping can continue and *even expand*, side by side with the growth of machine-wage labor production, if such growth occurred during that period.

DISTRIBUTION OF NEGRO PEOPLE

As can be surmised from the data already cited, the tendency towards

wider distribution of the Negro population, which has existed since the abolition of slavery, was also slowed down during the decade 1930-1940. In the 50-year period beginning in 1860 and ending in 1910, the proportion of the total Negro population of the United States living in the Black Belt (as of 1930) fell from 55.4 per cent to 49.3 per cent, while the proportion living in the North (including the West) increased only from 13.6 per cent to 16 per cent. During this period the ratio of the total Negro population that lived in the non-Black Belt South (Border Territory and the remaining areas of the 12 Black Belt States) rose faster than the ratio for the North.

With the mass migration of over one million Negroes from the Black Belt to the North during the period of World War I, an important shift occurred. Between 1910 and 1930, the percentage of the Negro population of the United States living in the Black Belt was reduced to 40.3, while the portion living in the North rose to 26.1 per cent. For the non-Black Belt part of the South, the relation was changed very little.

In the decade 1930-1940, this tendency towards wider distribution was slowed down considerably. In 1940 38.8 per cent of the Negro people remained in the Black Belt (as of 1930), 19.6 per cent lived in the Border Territory, 13.0 per cent in other portions of the Black Belt states, and 28.6 per cent in non-Southern territory. Thus, in this decade the proportion of the Negro people living in the

Black Belt decreased only by 1.5 percentage points, as compared with a decrease of 5.4 points in 1920-1930 and of 3.6 points in 1910-1920. At the same time, the portion of the Negro people living in the non-South increased by only 2.5 points, as compared with 6.5 points in 1920-1930, and 3.6 points in 1910-1920.

IS THE BLACK BELT VANISHING?

We now have the pertinent facts before us for an objective judgment of Comrade Wilkerson's theory that the Black Belt is vanishing, together with its semifeudalism, and that the Negro people as a whole are becoming a "national minority." We find that instead of being accelerated, the tendency towards dispersal of the Negro concentration in the Black Belt has been considerably slowed down during the thirties. Plantation-sharecropping, which is the gauge of semifeudalism and the index to special exploitation of the Negro people, has continued to rise over a period of fifteen years at least. This period includes not only the crisis, but also the phase of expansion preceding the crash and the period of recovery from the depth of the crisis. No over-all shift from sharecropping to wage-labor took place, although there and there some plantations changed over to machine-production. All very well, it may be asked, but did not the tendency toward dispersal continue during the crisis, albeit at a reduced tempo? And are we not

to expect that a decided acceleration of this trend occurred during World War II on a scale comparable to World War I?

With respect to the first question, the surprising thing is not that the tendency continued, but that it slowed down so sharply after thirty years of constant increase of tempo. I say surprising, because the Black Belt and its dominant semifeudal economy is situated in the midst of the most highly developed capitalist economy in the world, and is subjected to pressures much greater than any colonial economy where pre-capitalist forms of exploitation prevail.

Yet, despite this, the economic survivals of slavery stubbornly persisted in association with the system of developing monopoly capital over a period of 80 years, including phases of industrial upsurge and of crisis in the country as a whole. In the past 30 years alone the Black Belt continued not only through a number of lesser crises and the great depression, but also through three great periods of expansion—World War I, the advance of the twenties and World War II.

Over the entire period since the Civil War, the closest approach toward uprooting semifeudalism and establishing democracy occurred during the great popular upsurge of Reconstruction. *It is only in terms of a similar upsurge, under new conditions and taking different forms, that it is possible again to approach the fulfillment of the tasks left incomplete by Reconstruction.*

WORLD WAR II

As concerns developments during the period of World War II, sufficient preliminary data is on hand to indicate the following:

1. Significant migrations out of the Black Belt occurred, but these did not approach the level of the great migratory movement of World War I. The direction of this movement was also significantly different in that many Negro migrants from the countryside came to the centers of temporary wartime industry in the West and also to cities and towns in the Black Belt and along its periphery, where many wartime plants and extensions have already shut down.

2. The extent of wartime industrialization of the South was not very substantial, although undoubtedly some of it will remain. Its limited extent is indicated by a War Production Board estimate that 93 per cent of the new industrial capacity was located in the previously existing manufacturing areas, only a very few of which were located in Southern regions.

3. Preliminary data from the Agricultural Census of 1945 indicate that in some portions of the Western Black Belt, particularly in Mississippi, machine production has made significant inroads into the plantation economy. This trend can be expected to continue, perhaps at an even faster pace, as long as the postwar boom lasts, but it can be expected to diminish and even reverse itself as large surpluses of labor again accumulate

in the plantation area, forcing living standards back to previous levels and making it more economical to employ sharecropping.

4. At the same time, the number of Negro farm operators is again rising in the Eastern portions of the Black Belt, and it is there particularly that sharecropping continues to increase.

These factors and trends influence the Black Belt, but they cannot be expected to alter it basically. More important are the political developments that occurred during wartime and that provide a new impetus to the democratic movement in the South. The extent of the Black Belt and the distribution of the Negro people will continue to fluctuate, but more or less around the relationship already established. This is what we must start from, and not from speculative theories built up on a one-sided and unscientific approach to historical and present-day development, an approach that ignores the most essential conditions for democratic struggle and advance.

Thus, on the basis of facts and the actual process of development, we must reject Comrade Wilkins' "new" theory, which actually is not new since it has been present in one form or another during the past century. If his position cannot stand up against the facts, then his whole theoretical and tactical contribution also collapses. To this aspect, as well as to other questions of perspective, program, and slogans I intend to turn in a subsequent article.

cing living
s levels and
cal to en

the number
s again
ons of
particular
nues to

ls influen
cannot
ically. P
political
ed durin
ide a m

movement
ent of
ution of
ue to fluct
und the
ished. T

om, and
built up
fic appro
lay devel
ignores
for des

nce.
facts and
velopment
Wilker

ually is
esent in
he past
annot st
n his wh
contribu
spect, as
perspect
intend
icle.