

Gen

Political affairs

MAY 1949

25 CENTS

LIBRARY
MAY 16 1949
DARTMOUTH COLLEGE

GENERAL COMMITTEE
CP, U.S.A.

[1] Salute to the Chinese People's
Victories

[3] World Labor Unity for Peace and
Democracy

ARNOLD JOHNSON

[16] The North Atlantic Pact for
Aggression

HOWARD EAST

[29] Cultural Forces Rally for Peace

ZOLTAN DEAK

[39] Treason in Clerical Garb

KENNEDY

[54] The Crisis Character of U.S. Postwar
Economy

[71] The Mexican-Americans — Their
Plight and Struggles

FRAN MARINELLO

[81] The Situation in Puerto Rico

[94] From the Treasury of Marxism

RECENT INTERNATIONAL BOOKS

SOVIET ECONOMY DURING THE SECOND WORLD WAR

By N. A. VOZNESENSKY \$1.25

SOVIET ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT SINCE 1917

By MAURICE DOBB \$4.00

DOCUMENTS RELATING TO THE EVE OF THE SECOND WORLD WAR (two volumes)

Vol. I \$2.75; Vol. II \$2.50

TRENDS IN AMERICAN CAPITALISM

Prepared by LABOR RESEARCH ASSOCIATION

Cloth \$1.50; Paper \$.75

THE SCIENCE OF BIOLOGY TODAY

By TROFIM LYSENKO Cloth \$1.25; Paper \$.25

PEOPLE COME FIRST

By JESSICA SMITH 2.50

GIANT AT THE CROSSROADS

By M. Ilin and E. Segal \$2.50

NEW CENTURY PUBLISHERS

832 Broadway, New York 3, N. Y.

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

PRINTED IN U.S.A.



VOL. XXVII

A Mo

Editorial

National

NANKING

The c
is in the
ple! Nar
bol of fe
sion, cit
Chiang
Street, I
Chinese
their gro
The
U.S.A.

Americ
tory, a
the Far
native o
in the p
for dem
peace.

This
crownin
gle, is
people.

political affairs

A Magazine Devoted to the Theory and Practice of Marxism-Leninism

Editorial Board: V. J. JEROME, Editor, ABNER W. BERRY, ALEXANDER BITTELMAN,
JACK STACHEL, MAX WEISS

Salute to the Chinese People's Victories

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

NANKING IS LIBERATED!

The capital of Kuomintang China is in the hands of the Chinese people! Nanking, but yesterday the symbol of feudalism and colonial oppression, citadel of the corrupt power of Chiang Kai-shek, puppet of Wall Street, has now been won by the Chinese people's forces, headed by their great Communist Party.

The Communist Party of the U.S.A. joins all freedom-loving Americans in saluting this great victory, a milestone in the liberation of the Far East from its foreign and native oppressors, a historic advance in the peoples' world-wide struggle for democracy, national freedom and peace.

This victory of the Chinese people, crowning decades of heroic struggle, is a victory for the American people. It promises the early consoli-

dation of democracy throughout China; it is a gigantic advance in the direction of world peace. It strikes a powerful blow against the war-makers of our own country. The Chinese people have given a resounding NO to the bipartisan effort to reduce their nation to a Wall Street puppet. The imperialists' attempt by military, financial and political dictation to harness 450 million Chinese to their war chariot has been repulsed. Their dreams of dominating China and converting it into a huge war base from which to attack the Soviet Union and to throttle the national-freedom movements of all Asia have been blasted. All American democrats, lovers of peace and anti-imperialists have cause to rejoice in this hour of triumph of the Chinese people.

The Negro people, especially, press-

ing forward in struggle against national oppression by the white ruling class of imperialist America, respond in warm solidarity to the surge to freedom of the semi-colonial Chinese people too long held down by native oppressors kept in power with Wall Street collusion and aid.

In hailing the triumph of our Chinese brothers, we must warn our fellow-Americans that the imperialists and warmakers have been forced to maneuver, that they have not given up hope of eventually enslaving the Chinese people to their evil designs. They will seek by every means available to them to salvage as many sections of China as possible for their puppets, the feudalists and bureaucratic capitalists; to prevent the consolidation of the New Democracy in China, to stunt its growth, to nurture within China the seeds of counter-revolution, and to use it for its war preparations.

While basing their main war preparations on the North Atlantic Pact, the U.S. banker-generals are already dreaming of Pacific, South Pacific, Mediterranean and Near East military alliances.

The American people have the duty to raise the demand for the withdrawal of all American armed

forces and ships from Chinese territory and waters; for an end to all other support of the corrupt, decadent and counter-revolutionary elements; for an end to all imperialist intervention; for the defeat of all current proposals for new aid to the enemies of the Chinese people; for the establishment of a real "Hands off" policy toward China.

The common interest of the American and Chinese peoples, and of world peace, demands the complete recognition of the new Chinese Democracy by the United States Government and the establishment of normal trade relations on the basis of equality.

The historic victories of the Chinese people dramatically demonstrate the bankruptcy of the foreign policies of the Truman Administration and the G.O.P. These victories should spur labor and the American people to more resolute and united action for a reversal of these policies in all parts of the world, and particularly for a Pact of Peace and Friendship with the U.S.S.R.

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

William Z. Foster, Chairman
Eugene Dennis, Gen. Sec'y

(An Edi

SIXTY-TWO
since 1
struggle
class for
the birth
labor he
Down
has gro
tional
struggle
by the b
struggle
world o

It has
tent bec
toric ad
three ye

It has
kinds o
by hun
lions i
small g
very no
by neve
dungeo

Num
made b
this day
ing, an
of the
to proc
front,"
tators o
reactio
try, ar

World Labor Unity for Peace and Democracy

(An Editorial Article)

SIXTY-THREE May Days have passed since 1886, when the magnificent struggle of the American working class for the eight-hour day inspired the birth of this great international labor holiday.

Down the years, the First of May has grown into a symbol of international working-class solidarity and struggle. This day has been hallowed by the blood of heroes of labor in the struggle against their oppressors the world over.

It has become ever richer in content because it embodies the rich historic advances of labor in these sixty-three years.

It has been celebrated under all kinds of conditions in all countries by hundreds of thousands and millions in open demonstrations, by small groups of patriots under the very noses of the fascist police, and by never-to-be-forgotten heroes in the dungeons of the class enemy.

Numerous attempts have been made by the ruling class to subvert this day of labor, to destroy its meaning, and even to pervert it to the use of the bourgeoisie. Hitler attempted to proclaim it as a day of his "labor front," and our own American imitators of Hitler, with the support of reactionary labor leaders in our country, are once again attempting by

counter-demonstrations to do likewise.

But to no avail! They will no more succeed in 1949 than they have in the past!

May Day, 1949, will be the day when the millions of working people will demonstrate their unflinching unity, their unbreakable determination to halt the warmakers, to strengthen international labor unity, to defend labor's gains and all democratic rights against the attacks of reaction, and to march forward in the vanguard of mankind toward a socialist society.

Many and varied are the issues that confront labor in each individual country. In the Soviet Union, the millions will march with the banners of victorious Socialism on the way toward a Communist society. Their display of strength and unity will proclaim to all the world that the Soviet Union, having played the decisive role in defeating the fascist Axis stands at the head of the world forces for peace and independence of nations, against the threats of the imperialist warmongers.

In the countries of the new democracy, the working class and its allies—led by their Communist Parties—will demonstrate their determination to march forward toward a socialist

society. Millions of workers will express their firm resolve to guard their peaceful labors against the machinations of the imperialists from without as well as against the agents of imperialism from within, whether these agents be cloaked in the robes of the church or are the emissaries of Wall Street with a "labor" credential, or the agents of the traitorous Tito.

In the countries of Western Europe, and most particularly in France and Italy, the millions of workers will demonstrate their unshakable unity and readiness to fight against the plan of American imperialists, in cahoots with the reactionary forces of those countries, to turn their nations into bases for an anti-Soviet war. Millions of French men and women are now addressing themselves to President Truman in a letter which states: "We deny that our Government has the right to sign the North Atlantic Pact, which runs counter to the obligations the French people have assumed and to which they want to remain faithful. We refuse to consider that this pact binds France's word. We reject this war!" The same spirit prevails among the working class of Italy and will be expressed on May Day throughout the length and breadth of that country.

The people of China, under the leadership of their Communist Party, will this May Day celebrate the sweep of their magnificent revolutionary victory over the Kuomintang

puppets of American imperialism. They will hail the new era of uniting the toiling masses under working-class leadership, for the consummation of their democratic revolution, and for the consolidation and defense of their victories and of world peace.

Throughout Asia, the Communists will lead demonstrations of workers and their allies, demonstrations which will signalize the growth of the national liberation movement and the role of the working class as its leader.

In Spain and Portugal, in Western Germany, Japan, and Southern Korea, repressed by native fascists or occupied by the armies of Wall Street imperialism, the working people and all anti-fascists will on this day give evidence of their fighting spirit, of their unflinching confidence in the cause of democracy and peace and in the ultimate defeat of fascism and its Wall Street promoters. As an outstandingly heroic example stand the Communists and the working class of Greece who have proved that the power of Wall Street is no more invincible than was the military might of Hitler.

SPECIAL RESPONSIBILITY OF THE AMERICAN WORKERS

We American workers, legitimate heirs of the initiators of May Day, born of the struggles of the American workers and consecrated with the blood of the Haymarket Mar-

tyrs, ha-
bility to
to inter-
preme
moveme
vanguar
rally the
try, the
perialist
that tas
of inter-
darity e
cratic le
and the

On th
working
tional c
than ev
creases,
pay, an
and Jim
signaliz
struggle
equivoc
Taft-Ha
repressi
turning
state.

On th
darity,
struggle
years a
Square,
is faced
the fran
the Part
Commun
perpetra
garb in
The o
ing class

tyrs, have a special, urgent responsibility to our class, to our people, and to international labor. It is the supreme task of the American labor movement, and particularly of its vanguard, the Communist Party, to rally the forces of peace in our country, the very citadel of world imperialism. It is an integral part of that task to overcome the betrayal of international working-class solidarity engineered by the top, bureaucratic leadership of the A. F. of L. and the C.I.O.

On this May Day, to be sure, the working class will advance its traditional demands, now more urgent than ever, for immediate wage increases, a shorter work-week at full pay, and an end to discrimination and Jim Crow. Let this May Day signalize the intensification of the struggle for the immediate and unequivocal repeal of the infamous Taft-Hartley Law, for an end to all repressive legislation which is fast turning our country into a police-state.

On this great day of labor solidarity, rooted in the tradition of struggle against the frame-up 63 years ago in Chicago's Haymarket Square, the American working class is faced with the task of smashing the frame-up against the leaders of the Party of the working class—the Communist Party—which is being perpetrated by Wall Street in judicial garb in New York's Foley Square.

The central theme for the working class and the people, interwoven

with every concrete immediate issue, is today the demand for an end to the Wall Street policy of preparations and propaganda for war.

As Marxists, we know what are the underlying causes and reasons for the present war drive instigated by the men of the giant trusts. We know that American finance capital is motivated by an insatiable urge to rule the world.

Despite the inflated claims of Big Business as to the strength of capitalist economy, actually an economic crisis is developing here in the United States as well as in the remaining capitalist countries of the world.

Already, the warmakers and their propagandists are telling unemployed American workers that war will return them to their jobs. This exposes the utter bankruptcy of capitalist society, laying bare the gruesome fact that in its attempt to solve its insoluble contradictions, capitalism is prepared to slaughter the flower of humanity in fostering wars of conquest. It is this fact, inherent in the very essence of capitalism, which presents humanity with the ever-present danger of war so long as imperialism exists—a danger which can be halted and overcome only by the mass opposition to war of the working class and the people.

We know that behind the mask of "democracy" and "defense" of "Western civilization" there lurks the ugly visage of imperialism bent on world conquest, scheming to destroy the independence and democratic

rights of peoples, conspiring to foment counter-revolution and war against the Soviet Union, the countries of People's Democracy, and the long-suffering colonial peoples who are rising in glorious revolt against brutal exploitation, oppression, and repression.

We know the North Atlantic Pact for what it actually is: the rallying of the forces of reaction, under the leadership of American imperialism, for the purpose of preparing war bases against the Soviet Union and the other nations which have taken the road toward true democracy and Socialism.

But how are these war bases to be built? A sizable portion of the ingredients that will go into these contemplated war bases will be drawn from the sweat of the American working class. Lowered living standards of the masses: this is what the bosses seek in order to reap the profit of huge armament expenditures. But the American workers cannot and will not submit to this phase of the program without the most strenuous counter-offensive. Even those millions of workers who do not yet fully grasp the aggressive imperialist meaning and purpose of the North Atlantic Pact will nevertheless join in the struggle to protect their most immediate economic interests, which this new Unholy Alliance imperils. In the course of their mounting struggles, millions of American workers will learn that the protection of their every-day in-

terests is closely bound up with the fight to preserve peace. They will see that the struggle for peace must be directed, not against the workers of Eastern Europe nor against the Soviet Union, but against the warmakers here at home who are solely responsible for the war danger.

But it would be fatal to wait for this realization to come about spontaneously. Unfortunately, it must be said, to the shame of the American labor movement, that large sections of the workers have permitted themselves to be deceived by the pro-imperialistic, national chauvinist shibboleths of the bourgeoisie and its agents in the labor movement. American trade unionists have all too little repudiated in demonstrative fashion the false "labor" spokesmen, who roam abroad and presume to speak in the name of our labor movement in support of the aggressive imperialist Marshall Plan and North Atlantic Pact. This serious situation demands that every militant trade-union rank-and-file member and leader, Communist and non-Communist, rise to the task demanded by this grave hour to rally the healthy mass working-class sentiment for peace and social progress—before our working class is betrayed into following the path and suffering the fate of the German working class under the Hitler regime. Let no one say that the labor lieutenants of imperialism express the will and the interests of the working people. The American

workers
democra
Their
tradition
class soli
shown b
examples
out the
important
working
steps tow
peace m
trade un
The
Internati
Warehou
and of t
ers Unio
the Nort
eral emp
unions
tions de
oppositio
genderec
is ideol
Also,
leaders i
in a pub
against t
The l
of the
Union, I
forward
denounc
as a war
Of gro
ment iss
presiden
Ohio, e
of Amer
war and

workers want peace. They want democracy. They want a better life. Their movement is founded upon traditions of international working-class solidarity. How true this is, is shown by the fact that numerous examples are accumulating throughout the country which indicate that important sections of the American working class are taking the first steps toward developing a powerful peace movement based upon the trade unions.

The recent conventions of the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union (I.L.W.U.) and of the Farm Equipment Workers Union (F.E.) have condemned the North Atlantic Pact and in general emphasized the role of the trade unions as working-class organizations devoted to peace, to steadfast opposition to the war hysteria engendered by the capitalist class and its ideologists.

Also, some 267 local trade-union leaders in New York recently joined in a public statement for peace and against the North Atlantic Pact.

The largest district organization of the Packinghouse Workers' Union, District 1, Chicago, has come forward with a forthright statement denouncing the North Atlantic Pact as a war pact.

Of great significance is the statement issued by 16 local trade-union presidents and officers in Cleveland, Ohio, expressing the unwillingness of American workers to produce for war and death and calling upon Pres-

ident Truman to return the country to the road of peace, based upon friendship with the Soviet Union. Officers of Right- as well as Left-led unions have joined with the initiators of this letter in what is already beginning to take on the character of a national movement.

THE STRUGGLE AGAINST THE SPLITTERS OF WORLD LABOR UNITY

On this day of international labor solidarity, we must emphasize that the North Atlantic Pact is designed not only to prepare war bases, but also to destroy the labor movement throughout Western Europe. Only neo-fascist governments, or governments of Social-Democratic lackeys who do the anti-working-class bidding of their fascist-minded masters, can harbor anti-Soviet war bases. So long as the labor movements in Western Europe, and most particularly in France and Italy, remain independent and strong, the plans of the imperialists will be fruitless. The imperialists and their agents within the working-class movement know this, and it is for this reason, among others, that the monopolists have instructed their labor lieutenants in the C.I.O. and the A. F. of L. to speed up their destructive efforts to divide and weaken the labor movement in Europe.

In the service of the war camp, on the orders of their imperialist masters, the Careys and Deakins set out

to destroy that powerful force for peace and international labor solidarity, the World Federation of Trade Unions. With the arrogance of the servant imitating the master, James B. Carey, Secretary of the C.I.O., announced the withdrawal of the C.I.O. from the W.F.T.U. The capitalist press heralded this act as the very "death" of the international labor organization.

But Mr. Carey, who considers himself a kind of "labor ambassador" for the imperialist State Department, miscalculated badly. Far from destroying the W.F.T.U., the Careys have succeeded only in demonstrating their own complete servility and the craven nature of their class-collaborationist associates. In carrying out the dictates of the State Department and of Wall Street, these gentry have but revealed the most arrogant contempt for the affiliated unions and membership of the C.I.O. These unions and union members were not consulted on this move, which fundamentally reverses the decisions of wholehearted support to the W.F.T.U. that have been adopted by virtually every International union affiliated to the C.I.O.

A number of unions have already repudiated this rotten maneuver. Outstanding in this respect is the resolution adopted by the recent convention of the International Longshoremen Workers' Union:

We therefore resolve:

1. To notify the National C.I.O. and

W.F.T.U. that no individual or organization is authorized to pull the I.L.W.U. out of the W.F.T.U.

2. That we propose to National C.I.O. that the question of withdrawal from the W.F.T.U. be submitted to a referendum vote of all C.I.O.-affiliated unions before any final action is taken on this matter. In the event the National C.I.O. should not submit the question to referendum, that the I.L.W.U. officers are authorized and instructed to conduct a referendum among the I.L.W.U. membership on the question.

3. Call upon the W.F.T.U. to establish as soon as possible an Inter-Marine Transport Department of the W.F.T.U., and to initiate a world conference of maritime unions as a part of the program of setting up such a department.

The conventions of the Food and Tobacco Workers' and Farm and Equipment Workers' Unions have similarly gone on record, as have also the Executive Board of the Mine, Mill, and Smelter Workers' Union and numerous other trade-union officials, including leaders of the United Electrical Workers' Union. In the latter instance, it was made clear that their relations with the W.F.T.U. are governed, not by the undemocratic and disruptive action of James B. Carey, but by the decisions of their most recent union convention.

HISTORY OF THE W.F.T.U.

On this day of international labor solidarity, it is appropriate to trace

the his
which o
very es
its cont
of the v
our cou
the uni

In 10
still fal
sentativ
together
unions
France,
London
of an in
which
instrum
peace."

The
unanim
of 50,0
"the we
achieve
mising
ers tha
destruct
racy."

The
with in
fascists
imperia
erated
press,
associat
zation
clared t
ments s
people.
detailed
as: how
nals, de

the history of this organization, which expresses in concrete form the very essence of May Day—to assess its contribution to the working class of the world and to expose those in our country who attempt to destroy the unity of world labor.

In 1945, when the bombs were still falling on London, the representatives of the Soviet trade unions, together with those of the trade unions of Great Britain, America, France, and other nations, met in London and hailed the formation of an international trade-union body which would serve "as the greatest instrument for stable and enduring peace."

The declaration that was adopted unanimously by the representatives of 50,000,000 workers called upon "the workers of the world to help achieve a complete and uncompromising victory over the fascist powers that sought to encompass the destruction of freedom and democracy."

The declaration concerned itself with immediate victory over all the fascists in Europe and the Japanese imperialists. It stated that in all liberated countries freedom of speech, press, assembly, religion, political association, and trade-union organization should be guaranteed. It declared that the formation of governments should have the support of the people. The delegates adopted a detailed program on such questions as: how to penalize the war criminals, destroy German militarism and

Nazism, break up for all time the German General Staff, and bring German industries under Allied control. The declaration called for the elimination of the international cartels and combines; it condemned Franco-Spain and the Argentine. It hailed the formation of the United Nations, and it delegated a commission to prepare for the World Trade-Union Congress to take place in Paris in September of 1945.

The call ended with the following declaration:

Organized labor has made its full contribution both in the field of the armed struggle and in that of production by creating and sustaining the gigantic forces which have already brought fascism to its knees and will tomorrow destroy it completely and forever. Our historic Conference, meeting in the midst of the armed struggle still raging, is itself a demonstration of the unity of the working class and evidence of the moral victory of the United Nations over the evil forces of fascism. Organized labor, with so great a part in winning the war, cannot leave to others—however well intentioned they may be—the sole responsibility of making the peace. The peace will be a good peace—an enduring peace—a peace worthy of the sacrifices by which it has been won—only if it reflects the deep resolve of the free peoples, their interests, their desires, and their needs. We, therefore, send forth from our World Conference this appeal to all the workers of the world, and to all men and women of good will to consecrate to the building of a better

world the service and sacrifice they have given to the winning of the war.

The American trade-union movement was officially represented at the London conference through the C.I.O. by the late Sidney Hillman, by R. J. Thomas, John Abt, Michael Ross, and James Carey. The A. F. of L. officially refused to participate, but the rank and file had its own representative there, Courtney Ward, Secretary-Treasurer of the Painters District Council of Cleveland. Before Ward went to England, an unofficial referendum was conducted among the members of the Brotherhood of Painters. More than 300 local unions voted "yes" to participate in the formation of the new international labor body; not a single local union voted against it. L. P. Lindelof, International President of the Brotherhood of Painters, in a letter to Louis Weinstock, wrote as follows: "I know that had President Green spoken just briefly in favor of delegating a representative or observer to the London labor conference, the A. F. of L. convention delegates would have voted practically unanimously in favor of such action."

The Paris Congress of the W.F.T.U. was held in September 1945 as scheduled. The Allied armies were celebrating the defeat of the Nazis in Europe, and of the Japanese warlords. The United Nations Organization was a concrete fact. And 70,000,000 workers sent their representatives to this historic international labor gathering that created the

World Federation of Trade Unions.

The American delegates, again headed by Sidney Hillman, participated in drafting the program, formulating the resolutions, and working out the plans to organize the millions of unorganized workers in the colonial, semi-colonial, and dependent countries, and to secure the affiliation of those trade-union centers that were not represented at the congress.

The A. F. of L., headed by William Green, Mathew Woll, and the reactionary Social-Democrat David Dubinsky, failed to send representatives to the Paris congress, but the rank and file of the A. F. of L. was represented by three official observers. Further, the rank and file established a committee for the support of the W.F.T.U. and issued regular monthly publications informing the A. F. of L. members of the progress of the organization and calling upon them for support.

With the exception of the diehards in the A. F. of L. leadership, the objectives that were adopted by the Paris Congress met with the approval of American trade unionists. In 1945, the C.I.O. convention endorsed the formation of the new international labor organization.

Since its formation, the W.F.T.U. has come forward as the voice of organized labor throughout the world. It gave great encouragement to trade-union organization in the countries formerly occupied by the Nazis. It championed the cause of labor in

South Africa. the for nu many Amer ers can record experien clared a

In so concern enormous the past for an could n we migh feats du W.F.T.U. in 1946 them in gates w major st 1946. Jo time un ton, D. phere w been bro islation gress. A Presiden forces to and with the emp time the W.F.T.U. other lan ate and rible pri people of World V that not scabs or

South America, in Asia, and in Africa. It inspired and organized the support of international labor for numerous strike struggles in many lands.

American seamen and dock workers can testify to this magnificent record on the basis of their own experiences. Thus, the I.L.W.U. declared at its recent convention:

In so far as our organization is concerned, the W.F.T.U. has been of enormous assistance in our battles of the past few years. Had it not been for an international organization that could mobilize and render assistance we might very well have suffered defeats during the past few years. The W.F.T.U. was only a year old when in 1946 we were compelled to call on them in a great emergency. The delegates will recall the launching of a major strike program on June 15th, 1946. Joint negotiations of the maritime unions culminated in Washington, D. C., in a deadly hostile atmosphere where the railroad strike had been broken and where anti-labor legislation was wheeling through Congress. As June 15th approached the President threatened to use the armed forces to break the maritime strike, and with these assurances behind them the employers toughened up. At that time the marine unions appealed to the W.F.T.U. and maritime unions in other lands. The response was immediate and wholehearted. Despite the horrible privations and suffering of the people caught in the backwash of World War II, these unions pledged that not one pound of cargo loaded by scabs or by the armed forces would be

unloaded. With this backing, together with the solidarity of the maritime unions, we were able to go back into negotiations and win the greatest gains in maritime labor history. *In the recent longshore strike we again called on the W.F.T.U. and obtained their pledges of full support.*

From this partial description of the activities engaged in by the W.F.T.U., it can readily be seen that the organization has been of tremendous help to the working people of all countries, including the workers organized in the C.I.O. There is certainly nothing in its record to justify anything but increased support for the W.F.T.U. on the part of all American workers.

It should be clear to every thinking person that Murray, Carey, and Co. have wilfully performed an act of sabotage in attempting to destroy the world labor organization which has already greatly assisted, and is in a position to aid on an even greater scale in the future, the struggles of American workers against the Big Business union-busters. It can and must be made clear to every worker that the reformist and Social-Democratic bureaucrats are guilty of betraying, not only the fundamental principle of working-class solidarity, but also the immediate and long-run welfare of the American working class. The workers must be shown that this betrayal is carried out in conformity with the political dictates of Wall Street, in line with political considerations hos-

tile to the interests equally of American labor and international labor.

It will be very instructive for the American working class to learn about the strict adherence to trade-union democracy which has been characteristic of the conduct of the W.F.T.U., as against the high-handed arrogance and dictatorial attitude assumed by the reactionary Carey and his associates. The cynical ultimatum of Carey and Deakin—that the W.F.T.U. support the Marshall Plan or suspend operations for one year—was rejected by the overwhelming majority of the Executive Board. In insisting that their minority position be accepted by the majority, "or else," Carey and Co. provided a clear-cut demonstration of their brazen anti-democratic character, which contrasts sharply with the thoroughly democratic practice of the representatives of the Soviet unions, the unions of the People's Democracies, and the Left-led unions of other lands.

American workers will undoubtedly be very much interested in learning that—in marked contrast to the dictatorial railroading tactics pursued by the bureaucratic leadership at the recent conventions of the A. F. of L. and C.I.O.—the majority at the recent session of the Executive Bureau of the W.F.T.U., in its effort to maintain international working-class unity, did not insist that the majority will be forced upon the minority. Rather, the Executive Bureau proposed that this issue be set aside and that the organization pursue a

course based upon the fundamental program adopted when the W.F.T.U. was launched; it respected the right of the autonomous federations to pursue their own course on matters where agreement could not be reached. What a contrast between this proposal and the Murray-Reuther edict to a number of progressive C.I.O. unions to kow-tow before the political dictates of the national office of the C.I.O. or "get out" of the C.I.O.!

It should be clear that the Social-Democratic and reformist lieutenants of the bourgeoisie are trying to "export" their high-handed domestic tactics—tactics which go hand-in-glove with their pro-imperialist policies.

It should also be clear that in so doing, the labor lieutenants of Wall Street are mimicking their masters, whose delegation in the U.N. is wielding a whip over numerous countries in order to impose its will with utter disregard for the principle of unanimity by means of a mechanical majority. In marked contrast, that powerful force for peace, the W.F.T.U., stands by the principle of unanimity as the only practical basis for the co-operation of autonomous labor federations, just as it is the only possible basis for co-operation among sovereign states. What makes the Careys howl is the fact that, unlike the representatives of their masters in the U.N., they are not dealing in the case of the W.F.T.U., with cringing puppets of the stripe to be

found
govern

The
to every
rary to
Carey,
nated b
contrar
led uni
practice
union c

The
cratic th
of "Con
ly a wr
cover u
poses a
and his
out of

What
Murray
W.F.T.
of the
world
to carr
collabo

Thes
cause th
of stre
ternati
against
who an
imperia
aggress

They
because
instrum
ing cla
of anti
fuses t
the im

found among the delegates of some governments.

The foregoing should make it clear to every American worker that, contrary to the claims of Murray and Carey, the W.F.T.U. is not "dominated by the Communists"; to the contrary, the Communist- and Left-led unions have proved, in life, in practice, their full adherence to trade-union democracy.

The W.F.T.U. is far more democratic than the C.I.O., and the charge of "Communist domination" is merely a wretched subterfuge designed to cover up the real, pro-imperialist purposes and policies pursued by Carey and his cohorts in pulling the C.I.O. out of the W.F.T.U.

What is not to the liking of the Murrays and Careys is that the W.F.T.U., in acting as a bulwark of the interests of the workers the world over, is cramping their ability to carry out their program of class collaboration and betrayal.

These people are fulfilling because the W.F.T.U. has been a tower of strength in the struggle for international working-class solidarity against the fascists and reactionaries who are now the allies of American imperialism in its preparations for aggressive war.

They are Red-baiting shamelessly because the W.F.T.U., the faithful instrument of the international working class, refuses to become a center of anti-Soviet intrigue, because it refuses to produce a "majority" for the imperialist bloc in the manner

of certain "representatives" in the U.N.

It is because the W.F.T.U., by its very existence and activity, shows that the overwhelming majority of the workers of the world are for peace, democracy, and social progress, that the Big Business militarists have ordered their obedient servants to "do a job" on the W.F.T.U. It is for such reasons that Wall Street has mobilized its labor lieutenants in the C.I.O. and A. F. of L. to tour European and other countries with the express purpose of splintering and hog-tying the labor movements of those lands.

It is for these reasons that the plan was hatched to destroy the W.F.T.U.

But it is not possible to buy genuine working-class leaders as it is to buy leaders of tottering governments, and it is impossible to subvert the international working class to serve the interests of Wall Street. Mr. Carey has already discovered he must not judge the working-class leaders of other countries by the standards that he sets.

Despite the disruption of Carey, Deakin, and the leaders of the Dutch unions (who have the "distinction" of openly supporting their government in the war against the people of Indonesia), the W.F.T.U. continues to be the international federation of world labor. Despite the withdrawals, the membership of the W.F.T.U. will soon be larger than ever as the Chinese, German, and Japanese labor federations are admitted and as the program of or-

ganizing the workers of Asia and Africa proceeds to fruition.

Nor should the Careys delude themselves into believing that the American workers will obey their command to cease and desist from supporting the W.F.T.U. or from finding means of maintaining international ties with it. It can be said with certainty that these disrupters of international labor solidarity will no more succeed in isolating the American workers from international labor than they have succeeded in destroying the W.F.T.U.

Even Carey and Green recognize that the American workers are eager for international working-class solidarity, and so they have concocted a scheme to set up a new "labor federation," which would in fact be nothing more than an international company union devoted to carrying into the international arena the practice of back-door contracts and of servility to the desires of Wall Street and international reaction.

But here, too, these gentry face some real problems. In the first place, they will find no little difficulty in getting more than a corporal's guard of labor "leaders" in Europe to carry their banners. And in the second place, they are doomed to failure, because any such organization, even if formally set up, would not have the backing of the rank and file and would only demonstrate before the whole world the incontrovertible fact that the overwhelming majority of the international working class ad-

heres to the principles of the great organization of world labor, the World Federation of Trade Unions.

American workers cannot condone these attempts to impair and destroy international labor unity. They cannot be passive.

It should be clear to every progressive and militant worker that the struggle to maintain and build the W.F.T.U. is an indivisible part of the fight for peace, of the battle for the most immediate and vital needs of American workers. It is part of the fight against repressive legislation and the whole fascization process. It is closely bound up with the battles of the Negro workers and the whole Negro people for full and equal rights, for national liberation.

Hence, this question of affiliation and fraternal relations with the W.F.T.U. cannot be left to the Careys, Murrays, and Greens, but must become the concern of millions of American workers and trade-union leaders. From every local union, from every shop and working-class community, must come a resounding expression of demands for proletarian internationalism, for affiliation with the W.F.T.U. The rank and file must let the Careys know that they are getting on to the facts about the W.F.T.U., that they want a real international labor organization which will be a genuine instrument to maintain peace, to halt the rebirth of fascism, and to advance the cause of world labor.

American workers, in the hun-

dreds
must le
Greens
to set
front"
scorn o
Asia, a
the acti
class of
On t

of
or
ali
in

or
as
ob

an

at

th

vi

d

w

dreds of thousands and millions, must let the Careys, Murrays, and Greens know that their tricky scheme to set up an international "labor front" will meet not only with the scorn of the workers of Europe, of Asia, and of Latin America, but with the active opposition of the working class of the United States.

On this 63rd May Day, we hail

the W.F.T.U., the living proof that international working-class solidarity will grow and triumph over the forces of disruption, reaction, and war-incendiarism, and will be successful in rallying the peoples of the world to maintain world peace and to guarantee their security and social progress.

MAY DAY APPEAL OF THE W.F.T.U., 1949

Men and women workers of the whole world! The World Federation of Trade Unions, uniting in its ranks the immense majority of the organized workers of the entire world, irrespective of their race, nationality, sex, religious and political convictions, sends you its fraternal greetings on May Day—the great traditional celebration of all the workers.

It calls on you to give this celebration the greatest possible sweep in order to demonstrate to the whole world your strength and will, your aspirations and hopes, and your firm decision to fight to achieve the objectives which the working class has given itself in all countries. . . .

The World Federation of Trade Unions appeals to you to consolidate and develop this unity of the trade-union movement, both nationally and on the international level.

Fight untiringly against splits and the splitters!

Unite to defend peace against the instigators of a new war!

Support the struggle of the W.F.T.U. for a radical improvement in the working and living conditions of the workers, for support of their vital interests, for democratic liberties and for the maintenance and development of trade-union rights.

Long live the First of May, International Labor Day!

Long live international workers' solidarity and friendship between the workers of every country!

Long live world trade-union unity!

Long live the World Front of Struggle for Peace!

Long live the World Federation of Trade Unions!

The North Atlantic Pact for Agression

by Arnold Johnson

THE DANGER of an atomic war instigated by Wall Street was put on a new plane when representatives of twelve countries affixed their signatures to the North Atlantic War Pact on April 4 in Washington. That event also indicated a new advance in the domination of American ruling circles over the very countries which joined in signing the pact. That event also indicated a brazen disregard by U.S. officials for the welfare and thinking of the American people. Wall Street now has a new instrument to advance its insane program for world domination. This makes the struggle for peace *now* the center of everything for the labor movement and the American people!

A NEW "ANTI-COMINTERN" PACT!

The similarity of the North Atlantic Pact to the "anti-Comintern" Pact of November, 1936, is significant. That pact was also accompanied by slogans of "peace and order." Thus, Mussolini's organ *Giornale d'Italia* declared, "The Berlin agreement is of a defensive and not aggressive

nature." Hitler's *Völkischer Beobachter* proclaimed that the anti-Comintern pact is "elaborated as safeguarding peace." And from Japan the government organ, *Gauko Dziko*, maintained that the pact was concluded "for the purpose of self-defense against Bolshevization."

Nazi Foreign Minister Ribbentrop sought to cloak the Nazi war program with pleas for "peace" at the signing of the anti-Comintern pact, when he declared: "The conclusion of today's agreement is an epochal event. It is a turning point in the struggle of all nations which love order and civilization against the powers of destruction. . . . This agreement is a guarantee of peace for all the world."

Similar statements were made by the signers of the North Atlantic Pact. President Truman directed his remarks against "one of the major powers." He used words of "peace" and charted a course toward war. Dean Acheson spoke about the "reality" of the pact in terms of "centuries of common thought and of the bloc of many simple and brave men and women." He called for "defense" "by all possible means."

Paul-Henri Spaak of Belgium pro-

claimed that "the North Atlantic Pact is an act of faith in the destiny of Western civilization." Lester B. Pearson of Canada raved against the "policies of Communism" and "Communist states" and then boasted that the treaty "is the point from which we start for yet one more attack on all those evil forces. . . ." And Jose Caeiro de Matta spoke about Portugal as a "depository of the ideals of Western civilization."

The dangerous and vulgar theories of "Anglo-Saxon superiority" and "white supremacy" course through all the documents. There is a strident note of insanity in all the speeches and the preparations. Every feature of this pact is as contrary to the interests of the American people as was Hitler's anti-Comintern Pact which speeded the world on the road to World War II.

AMERICAN IMPERIALIST DOMINATION OVER ATLANTIC PACT COUNTRIES

In the State Department White Paper of March 19, there is a clear warning to all countries as to what to expect from the Atlantic Pact. Greece and Turkey are singled out as models of "self-determination" and the "development of healthy political and economic life," and there is a glowing reference to the Marshall Plan.

The demand that the respective countries shall abide by the dictates

of Wall Street agents and surrender to the rule of the American military is to be expected. The future of trade unions and other organizations of the people in the Atlantic Pact countries is obviously indicated by the example of Greece. That is an additional reason why there is mass resistance to the Atlantic Pact in all of these countries.

Trade unionists in all countries must heed the warning which is embodied in the effort of the Truman Administration and the ruling class, to smash the labor movement through a re-enacted Taft-Hartley Act with a new name.

The brazen betrayal of all promises to labor which this represents should put all countries on guard. In the course of the past two years, the Truman-appointed anti-labor administrators of the Taft-Hartley Act have revealed a callous and cold-blooded attitude characteristic of the Truman Administration and a danger signal to the working class and peoples of all lands. The Atlantic Pact will result in intensified efforts to Taft-Hartleyize labor in one country after another.

Another set of warnings to all Atlantic Pact countries is to be found in the efforts of the Truman Administration and the ruling class to outlaw the Communist Party, to scrap the Bill of Rights, to imprison Communist leaders through the frame-up trial in Foley Square and by repressive legislation in Washington and in

the various states. The Marshall Plan countries have already experienced part of Truman's repressive program in the form of dictation of cabinet membership and policies in various countries, with attendant unemployment and economic breakdown. The full brutality of American imperialist oppression is expressed against the Negro people. Hypocritical double-talk by Truman about "civil rights" only makes the denial of such rights more pointed. Surely, the peoples of the Atlantic Pact countries are not going to welcome the imposition of such policies as an expression of "Western civilization." Yet all of that is involved in the pact. Such are some of the additional reasons why the people of all lands resist this pact. The suppression of peoples of other lands and their subversion to the service of Wall Street is likewise contrary to the interests of the American people.

The most violent forms of intervention into the affairs of other countries was promised by Secretary Acheson in a radio speech and at a press conference on the pact. In discussing Article 4, Acheson declared that purely internal revolutionary activity (as though there is any other kind) would not be regarded as an armed attack; a revolutionary activity inspired, armed, or directed "from the outside," however, is another matter, according to Acheson. The ruling class of the United States can

be relied upon to declare that any strike or mass movement is "inspired . . . from the outside." Thus, the armed forces of the United States would be at the disposal of every reactionary government in order to suppress any democratic movement of the people and Wall Street would enforce its demands upon the Atlantic Pact governments. The experience of Greece is an illustration of this fact. This pact would underwrite butcher Franco in Spain.

A careful reading of Article 4 is revealing. This article says: "the Parties will consult together whenever, in the opinion of any of them, the territorial integrity, political independence or security of any of the parties is threatened." This clause means that a United States Gestapo, backed up by military might on the spot, will pry into every phase of the life of any Atlantic Pact country to determine whether the "political independence" of that country "is threatened." The U.S. armed forces can be used to police all meetings and organizations. Under the false pretext of "defending freedom and security," this pact will be used to destroy every vestige of freedom and security. And as the military appropriations and Wall Street investments in these countries increase, the brutal character of military domination over the peoples of these countries will increase. Such a program will only increase the hatred and determination of the peoples of

these
of or
A PL
UN
All
the
ens"
flat.
the s
on th
the p
Unit
reason
The
build
stitut
peace
lip-se
ple in
prean
passi
Char
Th
to th
tions.
not i
vious
not i
doe
the p
or th
ern I
the a
Atlan
the f
again
open
Unio
Unit

these countries to cast off the shackles of oppressive American imperialism.

A PLOT AGAINST THE UNITED NATIONS

All declarations to the effect that the North Atlantic Pact "strengthens" the United Nations have fallen flat. As people study more closely the speeches in the United Nations on the pact, it becomes clear that the pact is calculated to supplant the United Nations. That is another reason why the people oppose the pact. The people want to preserve and build the United Nations as an institution for the maintenance of peace. The framers of the pact offer lip-service to this demand of the people in the opening sentence of the preamble and in Article I and by a passing reference to Article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations.

The pact in its essence is contrary to the purposes of the United Nations. It includes countries which are not in the United Nations. It obviously has no regional basis. It does not include the Soviet Union and does not leave any basis for inviting the participation of the Soviet Union or the Peoples' Democracies of Eastern Europe. This fact itself exposes the *aggressive*, war character of the Atlantic Pact. The pact constitutes the formation of a bloc of nations against the United Nations. It is openly directed against the Soviet Union. It is calculated to split the United Nations and to render it in-

effective. It provides the basis for rapid increase in armaments contrary to the desires and needs of the peoples. This is a war pact!

There are those, led by the U.S. delegation to the U.N., who have been trying to destroy the peace character of the United Nations Charter by scuttling the policy of unanimity of the major powers in coming to decisions. They have tried to subvert the United Nations from within. They seek to establish policy by the formality of rigged votes instead of by agreement. They have been hacking away at the peace character of the United Nations. These are the same forces which also have been trying to destroy such peace-strengthening organizations as the World Federation of Trade Unions. These are the same servants of Wall Street imperialism who now seek to impose on the world the North Atlantic Pact. When the American people become fully aware of the character of this plot against the United Nations, they will reject the pact.

A VIOLATION OF THE U.S. CONSTITUTION

During the earlier stage of the debate on the pact, it was generally admitted by imperialist apologists that the pact takes the power to declare war out of the hands of Congress. This is most obvious in Article 5, which states that an armed "attack" against one (as though such

an attack would not be launched by Wall Street!) is "an attack against them all" and pledges "such action as it deems necessary, including the use of armed force, to restore and maintain the security of the North Atlantic area."

In the background and setting of the war pact, the pledge of the "use of armed force" constitutes a pre-determined war declaration. The "use of armed force" is not left for Congressional action in accordance with the Constitution. Similarly, the definition of what is an "armed attack" is not left for Congressional decision, but is defined in Article 6. Thus, the Atlantic Pact is an imposition of the will of Wall Street imperialism in flat disregard of the rights of the people as protected, to the degree possible under bourgeois democracy, by the Constitution in granting certain responsibility to Congress.

The pact is also an expression of the domination of Wall Street imperialism over other countries. That is why there is no respect for the national sovereignty and the rights of the peoples of those countries. Wall Street may be cynically confident about the course which its bipartisan agents in Congress may take, but it is seeking unconstitutionally to bind all future Congressional action to its imperialist program. At issue here are the constitutional rights of the people, which this treaty cynically violates.

The debate about the "meaning" of words in relation to this constitutional question—a discussion aimed at dishing up the most palatable language to mislead and confuse the people—kept the Senate Foreign Affairs Committee busy for many days. Secretary Acheson, donning his "fellow-citizen" garb, offered a "solution" to this "perplexing problem" which consists in frankly admitting the Constitutional violation, and then attempting to explain it away. In the State Department White Paper, in Acheson's and other speeches delivered upon the signing of the pact, and in the wording of the pact itself, the constitutional violation is evident beyond doubt.

Mr. Acheson's effort to explain this fact away only indicates that the same method of hypocritical evasion is used against the American people as is used against the peoples of other countries. The fact is that the scuttling of the U.S. Constitution by the Truman Administration in this particular instance is in keeping with the wholesale scrapping of the Bill of Rights as regards labor, the Negro people, Communists, and all progressives. It is in keeping with President Truman's wild charge of "treason" directed against the leadership of our Party when Comrades Foster and Dennis spoke up so challengingly for peace. The flagrant disregard of the U.S. Constitution and the theft of certain fundamental rights from the people indicate a dangerous

deve
coun
Pr
ratio
drop
shock
the s
is w
ence
about
Sovi
Tru
hom
Me
Russi
after
at th
our a
not c
win.

In
non
Pact
Presi
sive
wor
Stree
stark
Bu
mean
cann
face
day,
ment
liver
myth
ribly
a wa
week

development toward fascism in our country.

President Truman's brutal declaration that he would not hesitate to drop the atomic bomb again should shock the people into realization of the serious danger facing them. That is what has made Congressman Clarence Cannon's blustering words about atomic bomb war against the Soviet Union so serious. Cannon is a Truman Democrat from Truman's home state of Missouri.

Moscow and every other center in Russia, we must hit within one week after the war starts. . . . We will blast at the centers of operation and then let our allies send the army in, other boys, not our boys, to hold the ground we win.

In these unabashed words, Cannon blurted out what the Atlantic Pact means to close associates of President Truman: aggressive, offensive war. In these warmongering words of its depraved politicians, Wall Street's guilt as fomentor of war is starkly revealed.

But Cannon's words, dangerously meaningful as they are hair-raising, cannot, of course, be taken at their face value. Events of every passing day, and the more sober pronouncements of imperialist ideologists delivered in greater privacy, belie the myth that a few atomic bombs, terribly destructive as they are, will "win a war" in one week or a hundred weeks. This is so much nonsense

for popular consumption. The sooner the American people come to realize that hundreds of thousands, indeed tens of millions of Americans, —young and old, men and women —will become cannon-fodder overnight in the event of a new war, the better. No other peoples will sacrifice themselves on the altar of the dollar, and should Wall Street succeed in plunging the country into an imperialist and anti-Soviet war, the terrible fate which the imperialist warmakers would bring upon our people would pale that of the German people into seeming insignificance.

Still, Cannon's speech discloses the type of thinking which underlies the madness of the Forrestals. It lays bare the rotten slave-master attitude toward the peoples of the Atlantic Pact countries, the whip-lash "morality" of the "defenders" of "Western civilization." This pact must be considered as part of the whole setting of Wall Street's drive for world domination. The fact is that the United States possesses 484 military bases in all parts of the world and that the Anglo-American Combined Chiefs of Staff have continued to function uninterruptedly at their headquarters in Washington. The background of the pact includes the setting up of a system of military blocs, such as are provided for in the Rio de Janeiro and the Brussels treaties of the past, and the contemplated Mediterranean, Middle East, and Southeast Asian military pacts.

Part of this setting is to be found in the speech of Winston Churchill at Fulton, Missouri, three years ago, and the warmongering tirades he delivered during his most recent trip. It is to be found in the fact that the United States has already sent an Atomic-Bomb Long-Range Bomber contingent to Britain.

Such are some of the factors which cause deep concern among the American people, who are demanding to know why the Constitution and the rights of the people are being sacrificed on the altar of war preparations. It is because of such considerations that the American people, together with the peace-loving peoples of all lands, must repudiate and reverse this entire course of Wall Street.

TAXES FOR DEATH

Even before the people have had an opportunity to voice their sentiments at the scheduled Senate hearings on the pact, the State Department is demanding huge appropriations to rearm Western Europe. The first request is for \$1,200,000,000. That sum is considered a small, immediate "down payment." Every worker, who is already being taxed to the point where living standards are being destroyed, wants to know: why this cost?

The appropriation for direct military purposes is now about 16 billion dollars, or fifteen times what it was before the past war. This means tre-

mendous profits for the munitions makers and battered living standards for the people.

The North Atlantic Pact constitutes a blank check for many additional billions to gear the economy ever more closely to war production. The result can only be further impoverishment for the people and bloated profits for the Wall Street bankers.

As a matter of fact, the North Atlantic Pact signifies that any and every reactionary government of Europe can saddle its mounting military expenditures on the backs of the American taxpayer. Article 3 of the pact, filled with the hypocritical double-talk of the imperialists, declares: "the parties, separately and jointly, by means of continuous and effective self-help and mutual aid, will maintain and develop their individual and collective capacity to resist armed attack," and Article 9 establishes a Council to implement this.

Wall Street's militarization program is breeding mass impoverishment at home and abroad. Direct and hidden taxes are becoming an intolerable burden for millions of workers and farmers, whose income is dwindling steadily as the developing crisis unfolds.

The very fact that the Marshall Plan has disrupted the economy of the Marshallized countries and has produced large-scale unemployment, demonstrates that the reactionary

puppet
rely he
rearma
which
central
whole c
drastica
on an e
exploite
ope.
Grow
mean
of the
of peop
erated
sion, a
mean a
standar
ace of
Some
of reari
billion
of new
er is a
resistan
fit stand
THE F
MEN
BET
For
change
Henry
Stalin,
rising
people
Americ
laborat
again,

puppet rulers of these countries will rely heavily on the United States for rearmament. But the Atlantic Pact, which will make war production the central feature of the economy of the whole capitalist world, will also mean drastically reduced living standards on an even larger scale for the heavily exploited peoples of Western Europe.

Growing war production will only mean the continued deterioration of the living and working conditions of peoples that have not yet recuperated from the ravages of war, invasion, and Nazi occupation. It will mean a further breakdown in health standards and will increase the menace of famine and epidemics.

Some have estimated that the cost of rearming Europe will reach sixty billion dollars! This heavy burden of new taxes on the American worker is additional cause for vigorous resistance to the pact and everything it stands for.

THE BEGINNINGS OF A MOVEMENT FOR A PEACE PACT BETWEEN U.S.A. AND U.S.S.R.

For the past year, since the exchange of correspondence between Henry Wallace and Premier Joseph Stalin, there has been a constantly rising demand from all ranks of the people for the re-establishment of American-Soviet friendship and collaboration for peace. Again and again, the demand has been raised

for President Truman to accept the repeated invitations and proposals made by Premier Stalin to confer for peace. This was the central theme at the recent Scientific and Cultural Conference for World Peace in New York. More recently, it was the subject of a petition signed by hundreds of prominent Americans.

It is this central question, also, that makes the powerful clarion calls for peace sounded by our Comrades Foster and Dennis so profoundly significant to the American people. As their original statement concludes:

For our part, we will work with all those who seek peace, democracy, and social progress. The American people, assuming their historic responsibility, must reject the war policies of the Wall Street-Churchill cartelists and their bipartisan puppets and return our nation to the peace policies of Franklin D. Roosevelt, the "Grand Design" and cornerstone of which is firm American-Soviet friendship.

In the struggle for peace, there is a growing movement which goes far beyond the forces of the Left. This movement can and must encompass the greatest majority of the American people.

Thus, the annual meeting of the Race Street Friends, the oldest Quaker group in America, declared its opposition to the Atlantic Pact and sent letters expressing this position to Quaker groups throughout the world. In Madison, Wisconsin,

eleven clergymen sharply condemned the State Department and its pro-war policies.

That story is being repeated in many cities.

The Federal Council of Churches, which represents the greatest body of Protestants in America, declared at its Cleveland Conference: "no defensive alliance should be entered into which might validly appear as aggressive to Russia."

The Board of Directors of the National Farmers' Union, at a semi-annual meeting, denounced the Atlantic Pact as "directly contrary to American precedent and history."

The Progressive Party, the American Labor Party in New York, and Henry Wallace launched a Peace Crusade against the pact. This includes a nationwide broadcast, full page advertisements in various newspapers, the issuance of one million leaflets, and a whole series of meetings against the pact. Mr. Wallace denounced the pact as a "war alliance," declaring that "no group of men has the right to lead us into a war in the name of peace."

The desire of broad masses of people the country over to participate in the struggle for peace was dramatically demonstrated in the broad support which was given to the tour of the Reverend Hewlett Johnson, the dean of Canterbury, in the autumn of 1948. The fact that the State and Justice Departments prohibited the tour of those few scientists and cul-

tural leaders from other countries who managed to pierce the iron curtain the reactionaries erected in connection with the Cultural Peace Conference in New York, and then ordered them to leave the country, is concrete proof that the Truman Administration desperately fears the people's expression of their desire for peace. This serves to add to the importance of the projected peace tour of Henry Wallace.

An outstanding event in the struggle for peace was the highly successful Cultural and Scientific Conference for World Peace held in New York. The theme of that spirited assemblage was the need to re-establish American-Soviet friendship and peace. That is why the State Department, Governor Dewey, the Trotskyites and Social-Democrats around Sidney Hook and George Counts, clerical-fascist elements including discredited and expelled "refugees" imported from abroad, and the whole capitalist press, tried every trick in the book in order to smash the conference.

Yet, calls for 100,000 pickets brought only a few hundred lumpen and clerical-fascist elements. There were more veterans and perhaps more Catholics participating in the conference than were on the picket lines. Simply, people would not picket against peace.

As a conference of men and women from the world of culture and science, the sessions were highly suc-

cess
and
and
of t
the
spok
of g
in t
tude
the
vide
pow
solic
ples
T
mai
siti
supp
ence
as th
tion
issue
the
in r
right
ing
the
ers.
ferer
Arts
laun
Atla
of th
histo
a re
force
Am
T
gro
son,

cessful, uniting many outstanding and rank-and-file workers in the arts and sciences. But the limited scope of the conference was to be seen in the noticeable absence of labor spokesmen. However, the presence of guests from abroad—particularly in the light of the very hostile attitude and witch-hunting practices of the State Department—served to provide enormous encouragement and a powerful feeling of the international solidarity and unanimity of all peoples in the struggle for peace.

The unity of the conference was maintained in a high spirit of opposition to the North Atlantic Pact and support for the great world conference for peace which opened in Paris as this is being written. The resolutions were not specific on these two issues, which was a shortcoming of the conference. This was also true in reference to the struggle for civil rights and the fight against outlawing the Communist Party and against the frame-up trial of the Party leaders. However, as a result of the conference, the National Council of Arts, Sciences and Professions is now launching a campaign against the Atlantic Pact. Thus, the total result of the conference was a positive and historic contribution for peace and a real demonstration that the latent forces for peace are powerful in America.

The outstanding role of great Negro leaders, especially of Paul Robeson, Dr. W. E. B. Du Bois, and

Mary Church Terrill in speaking out for peace, is an indication of the profound peace sentiments among the Negro people, sentiments which, however, must be organized quickly. The statement of Paul Robeson, a member of the American delegation to the World Peace Congress in Paris, is highly significant in this regard. "It is unthinkable," said Mr. Robeson, that American Negroes "would go to war on behalf of those who have oppressed us for generations" against a country "which in one generation has raised our people to the full dignity of mankind."

The youth and women's organizations have as yet been only partially mobilized. These organizations have always been in the forefront of the peace struggle and must rapidly become a vital force in winning the majority of the American people against the North Atlantic Pact. The student peace strikes during the week of April 12 were but a beginning in this developing struggle for peace. On a world scale, the Women's International Democratic Federation was one of the forces initiating the World Peace Congress in Paris.

In this entire struggle, the role of labor is decisive. But at present this is also the point of greatest weakness. The ruling class is also aware of the decisive role of the working class, and for the past year Wall Street has been conducting an intensive campaign to line up labor leaders in support of its imperialist ven-

tures. This was evident at both the A. F. of L. and C.I.O. conventions, which took place in November 1948, when the North Atlantic Pact was being negotiated.

The alarming weakness of organized labor to date in the fight for peace and against the North Atlantic Pact lies, not in the fact that labor leaders have not spoken out, but, on the contrary, that so many union heads have spoken out—the way they did! Of course, they were able to advance their reactionary, pro-imperialist policies only because the bulk of the membership has not yet been boldly approached in a clear way with a peace program intimately bound up with the immediate issues which are troubling the workers in the shops and factories.

The Greens, Murrays, and Reuthers have been most active in mobilizing support for Wall Street's program. That is why the struggle becomes sharper in the ranks of labor. For, those who are fighting for wage increases and in defense of hard-won rights at home are also beginning to see that this struggle must also be waged against American imperialist policies of world domination.

Thus, it is encouraging that some voices in the labor movement are beginning to speak up against the policies of the labor lieutenants of Big Business in the A. F. of L. and the C.I.O. The recent conventions of the West Coast longshoremen, the Food and Tobacco Workers' Union,

and the Farm Equipment Workers' Union; the declarations of the local and higher leaders of the Mine, Mill, and Smelter Workers' Union and of other local and International unions; the joint letter to Truman by a whole number of Ohio union leaders; the statement released by 300 labor leaders in New York—all these indicate a perspective that must be brought to union members and workers everywhere.

All of this, however, represents only the beginning of the struggle for peace on the part of the labor movement. The fact that the C.I.O. top leadership withdrew from the World Federation of Trade Unions and that the C.I.O. and the A. F. of L. are trying to organize support for Wall Street's program in one country after another, places an even greater responsibility upon the rank-and-file and progressive forces in the American labor movement. The fight against the North Atlantic Pact is decisive, and every step must be taken, especially by labor, to move the whole people into action. This is also the key issue in giving a peace content to expressions of international working-class solidarity on this May Day.

Undoubtedly, there will be hundreds of people who will want to be heard in opposition to the Atlantic War Pact in the hearings of the Senate Foreign Affairs Committee, of which Senator Tom Connally of Texas is chairman.

If the fight to reject the war pact is not won at that stage, then the fight will necessarily go to the Senate floor, where a two-thirds majority is required for passage. The fight will then continue, if the pact is approved, in both the House and the Senate (on the issue of appropriations).

The campaign against the Atlantic Pact must place the entire issue before the American people. Wall Street and its bipartisan agents are aware of the people's overwhelming desire for peace, and one may expect that they will try to rush the pact through Congress on a wave of hysteria. That is why the warmongers are trying to suppress all opposition to their war plans by their police-state measures to outlaw the Communist Party, the Party of the working class which champions the cause of peace.

When the masses are called on to discuss and act for peace, there is the possibility of a mass political development which will affect the whole course of American history. In the course of a thorough discussion, the American people can be won for a policy of sharp struggle against the Wall Street profiteers, and against the agents of American imperialism who function in the labor movement and in mass organizations of the people. Such a struggle against the North Atlantic War Pact will require a mighty ideological offensive to counteract and wipe out the slander

and falsehood regarding the Soviet Union. With that, there will arise the necessity for popular understanding of the basic elements inherent in a genuine peace policy. The broad masses must learn that the Soviet Union, the land of Socialism, is a bulwark for peace, and why an American-Soviet Peace Pact is in the deepest interests of the American people. Such a campaign will necessarily explain why war is not inevitable and how the working class and the whole people can win the fight for peace, and along with it, the struggle for jobs, higher wages, security, and democracy.

With the Atlantic War Pact, the mailed fist and the atomic bomb are on the table. It is at such a time as this, when the war plans of the ruling class can best be exposed, that the working class and the masses of people can be won to a correct policy. Time is short. Action is needed. That action will necessarily include thousands of letters to the Senate Foreign Affairs Committee, to the Senators, the Congressmen, and the President. This issue is of such moment that it should be made the subject for action by every public institution, including city councils and public officials. This is of such importance to the future of labor and the people that it must become a point for decisive action by every local union, by meetings of shop stewards, and central bodies, by fraternal and civic organizations of the people,

by educational and religious spokesmen and organizations. This is of such consequence as to call for special mass meetings, demonstrations, peace parades, and mass delegations to the homes of Congressmen and Senators and to Washington. The forms of action will vary according to the circumstances. The basic ap-

proach must be grounded in full confidence in the masses of the people. The American people can be won for peace. The initiative in this fight must be taken by the forces of labor and by the mass organizations. That initiative can defeat the North Atlantic War Pact and win an American-Soviet Peace Pact.

The World Peace Congress proclaims that henceforth the defense of peace is the task of all peoples.

In the name of the 600,000,000 women and men represented here, the World Peace Congress sends forth a message to the peoples of the world—it says to them:

“Courage, more courage and again courage!”

We have learned how to unite.

We understand how to agree.

We are prepared and resolved to win the battle for peace, which is the battle for life.

From the *Manifesto* of the Partisans of Peace,
Paris, April 1949.

Cultural Forces Rally Against the Warmakers

by Howard Fast

[Political Affairs is pleased to present the following estimate of the recently-concluded Cultural and Scientific Conference for World Peace held in New York City, by Howard Fast, himself a participant in that conference.

[The author of such outstanding historical novels as Freedom Road, The American, My Glorious Brothers, and other works of fiction, Howard Fast, in name and in fact, has been identified in our country and throughout the world with the peoples' struggle against oppression, with the cause of the working class, and with the defense of the democratic heritage of the American people.

[Howard Fast has sent this contribution to Political Affairs from Paris, where he is participating at the momentous World Peace Congress.

—Ed.]

FOR THREE DAYS during the latter part of March of 1949, a notable representative body of cultural and scientific leaders came together in New York City to discuss and take action upon various matters of world peace. If this were all that needed to be said in the way of description, if these men and women had come together

with the blessing and aid of the United States government, if the press had put no barriers in their way but hailed their action as a signal service to all the peoples of this earth — if all this were so, still the gathering at the Waldorf-Astoria from the 25th to the 27th of March would have been one of the most notable convocations of distinguished men and women in all our history.

But all of this was not so; the Conference of Intellectuals for World Peace was not aided by either the government or the press; the more than five hundred sponsors who gave their names to it were subjected to every manner of intimidation from subtle warning to blunt threat. They came together in an atmosphere of hysteria and fear which was consciously created by our State Department and our press; they were accused of being agents of a foreign power; they were publicly insulted and their monumental achievements in the arts and in the sciences were vulgarly deprecated.

About them were manufactured, by the amazingly venal press, every manner of lie, slander and abuse; and by the Hearst press in particular, a spectre of mob violence was con-

jured up with the threat that a hundred thousand pro-fascist pickets would surround the conference meeting place. The call for violence did not pause there, but became continuous, matter of fact, and utterly disgracefully—taking its moral tone and cultural level from the following editorial, which appeared in the *New York World Telegram* the afternoon before the conference: "The Russians, in addition to raising hell, generally also raise a lot of beets for borscht. But frankly, how can you get culture from a beet? How can the Soviets bring something they haven't got? . . . To the police and the F.B.I., we say happy hunting. To the cultural and scientific convention—phooey!"

Such was the level of American reaction's response to this great gathering of sponsors and participants from among artists, scientists, writers, educators, doctors, architects, sociologists, actors—people from the dance, the theatre, the film, people from the laboratory and the observatory; men like Harlow Shapley, Thomas Mann, Louis Untermeyer, Robert Morss Lovett, Clifford Odets, Paul Robeson, Frederick L. Schuman, Albert Einstein, Matthew Josephson, John Howard Lawson, Philip Evergood—women like Kay Boyle, Henrietta Buckmaster, Mary Van Kleeck, Erika Mann, Lillian Hellman, Judy Holliday, Lisa Sergio and many hundreds of others.

Indeed, the sponsors who drew this conference into being read like a

rollcall of American honor and dignity and achievement; and one would think that for them, who gave so much to American civilization, the rulers of America would have respect if not gratitude; but from the maw of the monopoly press, there rolled only a torrent of filth.

Meanwhile, the actions of our State Department gave evidence that this torrent of filth was by no means spontaneous. It was foreshadowed long before the conference opened, and like so many of the shameful deeds of American reaction, it bore the thoroughly recognizable twin stamps: made in Washington, made in Wall Street.

The following people, as the Program Committee, bore much of the responsibility for organizing this conference: Harlow Shapley, Dr. Allen M. Butler, Herbert John Davis, Marshall Dimock, Olin Downes, W. E. B. DuBois, Lillian Hellman, Hermann Herrey, John Martin, Philip Morrison, Rabbi Louis I. Newman, Anton Refregier, O. John Rogge, Guy Emery Sipler, Louis Untermeyer and Olive Van Horn. Some weeks before the conference began, they found a broad common basis for agreement—in simple terms, against war and for peace, and out of this broad agreement they issued a call to all men of good will to come together to discuss, to exchange ideas and to act in the interests of world peace. The substance of their common agreement was summed up thus:

The
in ma
coul
war i
We
that c
ing. V
regar
nomic
agree
Amer
operat
possib
mutua
cially
We
of del
ism a
Both
discus
accept
victory
alone
The
determ
Cultur
World
tists a
cuss a
tion o
as it
tions i
We
but of
will, t
The
mon
able
down
could
mean
docur
the h

The cold war has indeed been costly in material and moral terms. But who could reckon the cost of a new world war in the atomic age?

We agree that mankind must not pay that cost, which is beyond all reckoning. Whatever may be our views in regard to the social, political and economic policies of the Soviet Union, we agree that it is necessary to re-establish American-Soviet understanding and co-operation, which alone can make peace possible. The necessity for peace through mutual understanding has been officially recognized by many churches.

We do not think the question worthy of debate as to whether or not capitalism and socialism *can* exist together. Both *do* exist. The only question worth discussing is how to restore the mutual acceptance of that fact which brought victory in World War II and which alone can avert World War III.

These are the considerations that have determined us to call together, in a Cultural and Scientific Conference for World Peace, American artists, scientists and professionals; to meet, to discuss and seek a basis for common action on the central question of peace as it affects our work and our aspirations in the various fields of culture.

We call upon those of no one party but of all parties, on all men of good will, to join with us.

There was the substance of common ground, of a broad and reasonable coalition, and as it was set down, in such simple terms, no one could misunderstand either the literal meaning or the intent. It was this document which brought together the hundreds of distinguished spon-

sors and defined the areas of the conference. This call, aiming to bring together Communists and non-Communists in the common cause of peace, found, as I said, an area of agreement, of coalition. And the immediate and overwhelming response to it proved that such an area of anti-war agreement exists in broad masses of the American people. And in this case, the quick willingness of hundreds of intellectuals of political affiliation varying from Communist to Republican to work together for the common good proved that coalition for peace is a practicality rather than a dream in America of 1949.

Just as quickly, but with quite different intent, the State Department underwrote this proof. The moment the conference began to be an actuality rather than a goal, the State Department sprang into action, and from there on, their every tactic proved that peace was neither desired nor sought by American foreign policy.

Their first move was to attack the growing group of sponsors; and every device, every cheap subterfuge was indulged in here. Direct communication from the Department of State varied with secondary pressure from "friends of friends." Rumors were artfully cast out, mingled with veiled threats—all calculated to obtain individual withdrawals. Less than a dozen of the intellectuals responded to this initial pressure, and the first round was definitely a victory for the peace movement.

The State Department's second move was directed against the foreign guests. Early in the organization of the conference, the program committee issued invitations to distinguished intellectuals in almost every European country, in the Near and Far East, and in many of the Latin-American nations. As was the case in the United States the world response was immediate and overwhelming—reaffirming the international ties of progressive intellectuals. In the case of the Soviet Union and the Peoples' Democracies, the response was collective rather than individual, and with no exceptions, they expressed their willingness to send to America their best and most honored intellectuals. Thus, from the Soviet Union came men like Fadeyev, Oparin and Shostakovich — Hronek and Stoll from Czechoslovakia, Ossowski and Hoffman from Poland and many others of similar stature. Nor was the individual response from Western Europe and Latin America any less distinguished—men like Bernal and Golding of England, Eluard and Boulrier of France, Guillen and Marinello of Cuba, to mention only a few.

They desired to come in the interests of peace; it was no easy thing for most of them to come, yet they understood that war was not easy or desirable; some of them were Communists, others were not. But it was not on the basis of Communists or non-Communists that the State Department admitted some and ex-

cluded others. Rather, in a manner so infantile as to be almost unbelievable, the State Department worked out its second move against the conference. The Eastern European delegations, with the exceptions of Hungary and Romania, were admitted; the Western delegates, with a very few exceptions, were denied visas. By this idiotic device, the State Department hoped to establish the fact that the New York Conference was a Communist plot—and once again it is a tribute to the American intellectuals involved that such cloudy machinations failed to split or even noticeably impede the conference.

The third move of the State Department took on all the frantic qualities of hysteria. Indeed, not only the State Department, but the entire monopoly press was acting now, a few days before the conference was due to open, as if this gathering of intellectuals was a gargantuan enemy of American security; and in this mood, the State Department turned to those old and tried jackals of reaction, the Social Democrats and the Trotskyites, and inspired them to organize, for the same date, a rival "conference."

That worn and battered philosophical pillar of Trotskyism, Sidney Hook, was called upon to head up this effort. Such bruised stalwarts as John Dos Passos, John Dewey and James T. Farrell shored him up, and they in turn were surrounded by a choice collection of renegades, trait-

ors
from
vie
was
splen
Hou
Depa
bles
milli
lavish
press
Only
peare
Conf
joine
aspir
but c
class.

Th
of th
again
failed
the in
and i
volve
spond
forts
camp
organ
Hous
skyscr
ings
ruptin
every
or di
avowe
were
the pe
fough
strugg

ors and cheap turncoats, ranging from Max Yergan to the latest Soviet "refugees." Their conference was held in that misnamed but resplendant pile known as "Freedom House," and for all that the State Department gave it in the way of blessing and support, and for all the millions of kind and unctuous words lavished upon it by the monopoly press, it proved to be a dismal failure. Only a few hundred delegates appeared, and *not one* sponsor of the Conference of Intellectuals for Peace joined it. It represented no trend or aspiration of the American people, but only an aberration of the ruling class.

* * *

These were the three major moves of the American State Department against the conference, and all three failed of their purpose. In each case, the intent was to split the conference, and in each case the intellectuals involved in the cause of peace responded properly by resisting all efforts of the enemy to divide the peace camp. As the conference progressed, organized detachments of "Freedom House" Social-Democracy and Trotskyism invaded both the mass meetings and the panel discussions, disrupting constantly and stooping to every diversion that might impede or divide the delegates in their avowed purpose. These invasions too were resisted, and for the most part, the politically advanced intellectuals fought a consistent and successful struggle for unity.

In the case of Norman Cousins, however, a major mistake was made by the conference, and this cannot be brushed aside. Mr. Cousins is the editor of the *Saturday Review of Literature*, a man of stature and influence in the publishing industry, and also the head of a magazine that has a unique record of Red-baiting, falsehood, and anti-Soviet fabrication. Like Sidney Hook, he requested permission to speak at the conference. Quite properly, considering him outside the pale of either peace or progressive human endeavor, the conference denied this request of Mr. Hook. Mr. Cousins, however, was granted the right to speak at the dinner which opened the conference. None of the speeches at this dinner, which was a welcome to the foreign delegates, were politically argumentative in content; the tone was one of welcome and good will; the mood was one of warmth and hope. Into this, under the guidance of the State Department, as was later learned, Mr. Cousins interjected a savage and wholly uncalled for attack upon the integrity of the conference and its sponsors and upon the Soviet Union.

It was not enough for Miss Hellman, the only speaker to follow him, to chide him for his manners—which were abominable—ignoring the moral content of his words, a shrill and savage call to war and slaughter. The only positive purpose Mr. Cousins served was to define the limits of the peace coalition; quite understandably, it can never

include those who may cynically speak of peace but who basically desire war; and whenever such elements are included, the coalition faces the danger of being turned into its opposite.

Yet the conference survived Mr. Cousins, even as it survived the "hundred thousand pickets" of Mr. Hearst. By the end of the conference, such was the growth of the delegates in their own struggle for unity, understanding and action, that the voice of Mr. Cousins was a forgotten whisper—while the "pickets," who numbered no more than a hundred and fifty of the "lunatic fringe," dwindled to less than forty by the last day.

In all, the makers of the conference fought two fights—one for unity in organizing the conference, and a second for unity and common agreement in carrying it through. In all major aspects, the two fights were successful.

* * *

The content of the conference, quite understandably, fully reflected the nature of the coalition. Before and during the conference, the reactionary press hurled endless accusations at the people involved that they were serving as pawns of Wroclaw. This New York Conference was not an outgrowth of Wroclaw. However, it stands to reason that the Polish conference of intellectuals could not have failed to impress artists and professionals with the role

they themselves might play in the cause of peace. And without question, the thought of intellectuals banding together in the cause of peace took hold everywhere on earth. Things among free people are done in that fashion, not in the infantile manner of plot and counter-plot.

The New York Conference took its own shape and form, one peculiarly American and wholly suited to the political moment, as well as the traditions of the intellectuals involved. This was best expressed, I think, by the man who most wholly deserves the title of "Dean of American Culture," the eminent Negro writer and historian, W. E. B. Du Bois, who said, in the course of the conference:

Two barriers and two alone hem us in and hurl us back today—one, the persistent relic of ancient barbarism, war: organized murder, maiming, destruction and insanity; and the other, the world-old habit of refusing ourselves to think or to listen to those who do think.

Against this ignorance and intolerance we protest forever. But we do not merely protest; we make renewed demand for freedom in that vast kingdom of the human spirit where freedom has ever had the right to dwell—the expressing of thought to unstuffed ears: the dreaming of dreams by untwisted souls.

The address of Dr. Du Bois was itself a symbol of the integration of

the
gro
agai
time
ferer
a nu
ticip
bring
gro
chau
prof
of th
natio
mon
ance
ence
Squa
was
ness.

Ar
Dube
word
wrig

Th
peace
And
witho
vertis
and c
only
talkin
total
possib
men
jobs
They
after
for c
want
flung
abuse
All

the fight for Negro rights and Negro liberation with the struggle against war and fascism. At the same time, it must be noted that the conference as a whole, while including a number of outstanding Negro participants and sponsors, failed to bring into its deliberations the Negro issue, the struggle against white chauvinism in the arts, sciences, and professions, which is directly part of the struggle against the chauvinist nationalism fostered by the warmongers. The very limited attendance of Negro people at the Conference sessions and at the Madison Square Garden wind-up mass rally was one of the results of this weakness.

And to that statement of Dr. DuBois should be added the angry words of the great American playwright, Clifford Odets, who said:

They [the people of the earth] want peace with plenty, not merely peace. And they want it the whole world over without the brash beguilements of advertising agency slogans about liberty and democracy and free speech. The only free speech or articulation worth talking about is the articulation of the total human personality in all of its possibilities and talents. That is what men want today. They want steady jobs without depression breakdowns! They want a clear and proud old age after well-spent lives! They do not ask for charities and doles. They do not want your handful of Christmas candy flung at their feet after wasted and abused lives.

All over the world today man is

ready to spew out the moral imbecile who talks guns and ethics when he is asked for bread and secure noble life. Artists must help man in these large first tasks. Beginning with peace, we must fight for the future and be honored by that fight.

And to this overall framework of content, so ably articulated by these two men, Richard O. Boyer, speaking to the conference as a Communist, of. Communists, said:

If a member of the Communist Party does not approve of our goal of peace and socialism and complete racial equality, we demand that he leave. If a member of the Communist Party does not agree, and deeply agree, that the most important issue in the world today is world peace, if he is not ready and eager to submerge all differences and cooperate with any and all forces sincerely seeking peace, we say his conscience does not place him in our ranks.

This, the above, in the broadest terms of content, defines fairly well the direction the conference took.

Of course, the heterogeneous composition of the Conference meant that there was always a certain amount of struggle in the presentation of arguments and particularly in its resolutions. At that point where the Conference rose to its highest level of unity in the common struggle for peace, it also manifested its most serious weakness. Its very good resolution failed to include direct condemnation of the North Atlantic War Pact. In this respect, it

was incumbent upon the most advanced participants, particularly the Communists, to fight for full understanding, on the part of each and every person involved, of the Atlantic Pact, and the dreadful implications of that pact for all humanity as well as the American people. Thus, even in the last hours of debate, the resolution would have been better supported and the fight for peace better understood, had there also been vigorous condemnation of the North Atlantic Pact. The fight for peace would also have been better advanced, had American participants at the Conference come forward placing the onus for the war drive where it belongs—on Wall Street, and demonstrated an understanding of the consistent peace policy of the Soviet Union.

The manner of procedure was to take the sentiments expressed so generally here, add to them the problems posed by the original call, and discuss them in light of special interests, skills and crafts represented by the thousands of intellectuals present. Thus, in the science panel, the war danger was treated in the light of the awful advances made by scientific warfare, while in the writing panel, censorship and the destruction, by the drive to war, of the free processes of the mind, were first on the agenda. To this, the best of Europe's intellectuals added their thoughts and hopes; and the result was an impressive body of research and discussion.

As with us, Europe's intellectuals saw peace as the first and most critical need of mankind, and again as with us, they expressed it in the highest terms.

Any objective examination of their words proves this point; and perhaps for this very reason, our government saw fit to exclude them. Two men could speak for them, one the Communist writer, Fadeyev, delegate from the Soviet Union, and the other the non-Communist French priest, Abbé Jean Boulier. Here again, within the frame constructed by the words of these two men, the foreign participation in the conference was defined. The one, Fadeyev, was allowed to enter and play a personal roll in the conference, a role he played very well indeed. Speaking at Madison Square Garden, he said:

It is high time to understand that to confront a Soviet person with the question of the existence of or lack of freedom is more absurd than to have posed the same question to an American in the period following the War for Independence. An American of those times would have said: "This is my country. I have fought for it to gain the right to a free life. To hell with you!" We Soviet people have created the Soviet Union with our own hands, its fields are abundantly drenched with our blood, shed in the struggle for independence, in every brick there are drops of the sweat of our toil, in every book—the soaring of our genius.

And then, further:

If we take the respect of national

sovereign
base.
ple
ways
those
one's

In
swere
and a
Mad
Fader
poser
swere
churl
ernm
Ab
refuse
with

I de
part i
this r
and
united
ture of
wreak
all be
the ca
oppose
is too
mense
of the
people,
upon a
are in
even th
out of
ing fea
will br
lectuals
faith in
in the

And

sovereignty and national culture as our base and strive toward the goal of peoples living in friendship, one can always come to an agreement, even in those cases when something is not to one's liking.

In effect, these words were answered by the demonstration of love and affection, shown by the people in Madison Square Garden to both Fadeyev and the great Soviet composer, Shostakovich. They were answered in another fashion by the churlish manner in which our government treated these guests.

Abbé Boulier, on the other hand, refused entry to this country, said, with no note of anger:

I deeply regret not being able to take part in your labors. It seems to me at this moment—whatever their beliefs and tendencies—all those must be united who are concerned with the future of humanity. If again war were to wreak its horrible ravage, we would all be involved without distinction in the catastrophe; therefore we must all oppose it, without distinction, before it is too late. When I think of the immense possibilities of the United States, of the generosity, the optimism of your people, I cannot look without sadness upon all those God-given gifts which are in danger of becoming sterile and even themselves instruments of danger, out of the most irrational and paralyzing fear. . . . I hope your conference will bring to life again among all intellectuals and in all of public opinion faith in reason, faith in tolerance, faith in the peaceful future of humanity.

And at least some of what Abbé

Boulier called for came about in the course of the conference. It would be wrong, indeed, and dangerous too, to claim that this single conference represented anything like the mass of American intellectuals—yet it is not incorrect to state that it most certainly represented the aspirations of most American intellectuals. If so many thousands held aloof, it was for fear and confusion; and much of this fear and confusion was dissipated in the course of the conference.

A not inconsiderable number actually took part. In the panel discussions, 8,525 participated, in addition to the sponsors. Twenty thousand more were at Madison Square Garden and in addition to these, at least four thousand applications for the main discussions were turned down. Not only is this proof that this sort of peace coalition can involve enormous numbers of people, but it is also proof that so far, a substantial number of American intellectuals have continued to resist the war camp of Wall Street, and are earnestly seeking a way out of their dilemma. This was indicated wherever the organizers of the conference were able to make physical contact; in every case, the response was immediate and warm and welcoming; and the only limitation was imposed by the limited organizational facilities available.

Without question, the leadership of such men as Harlow Shapley, Olin Downes, Albert Einstein and

Thomas Mann played a very significant part in both the mobilization for the conference and the carrying through of its purpose. Particularly, were Shapley and Downes instrumental in the struggle for unity; with almost unbelievable patience and understanding, they resisted every attempt to split or sabotage the conference, and this position of theirs was maintained in the face of fierce public and personal Red-baiting. We must not underestimate the strength of such people, the integrity and consistency of them—and we must understand that they play their roll in one of the most difficult periods of our country's history. Theirs is the direct tradition of Thoreau and Emerson, and that tradition, with all it involves, must be studied and understood.

* * *

Finally, what were the results of this conference? The resolution adopted by the conference must not be underestimated. In spite of the fact that it does not deal with the North Atlantic Pact, it provides a firm coalition platform in a general sense, for others as well as intellectuals. It should be used, with its shortcomings in mind, as an initial

guide for coalition work in the middle class peace movement—not mechanically, but as a living basis of agreement.

The Continuations Committee, set up by the National Council of the Arts, Sciences and Professions, has a big task ahead. It can best fulfill its task when it is directed always outward into new organizational efforts—always with an increase in the size of the peace movement in mind. Peace movements of one sort or another must be started everywhere among intellectuals, on the campuses, in the professions, in the neighborhoods and towns.

This is the necessity; this is a first order of business for intellectuals. A tremendous responsibility has been given to us, and we must not fail. All that we value and love in this good land of ours is at stake, our culture, our traditions, our homes, families and lives. Peace is no private affair of ours, we must fight to extend organization for peace into every area of the nation.

And when the labor movement, leading the people, throws off its betrayers and unites for peace and a better life, we must march with them, giving what help and strength we can.

T
by Z
THE
the
trial,
Prim
natio
conce
politi
war p
the s
Easte
remn
cism
allies
financ
strugg
the fig
and st
perial
of dor
every
most
sue of
The
manki
peace.
power
whom
acteriz
groups
false n
oppose
peace.
propag

* Edito
paper pub

Treason in Clerical Garb: The Mindszenty Case

by Zoltan Deak*

THE CASE of Cardinal Mindszenty—the events leading up to the arrest, trial, and sentencing of the Prince Primate of Hungary and the international repercussions—presents in a concentrated form many of the basic political and social issues of the post-war period. Involved in this case are the struggles of the long-oppressed Eastern European masses against the remnants of feudalism and of fascism and against their reactionary allies in the camp of international finance capital; the centuries-old struggle of peasant masses for land; the fight for the separation of church and state; the role of American imperialism and the Vatican as an ally of domestic and foreign reaction in every country; and, above all, the most vital issue of our days, the issue of peace or war.

The overwhelming majority of all mankind yearns for lasting, stable peace. A willful minority of greedy, powerful men, however, people whom President Roosevelt once characterized as "selfish and partisan groups, who wrap themselves in a false mantle of Americanism," are opposed to this universal desire for peace. Through the most intensive propaganda campaign ever organ-

ized, in which almost all the elements of Hitlerite anti-Soviet and Red-baiting propaganda can be found, the United States embarked on a policy of militarism and expansionism of violently opposing every legitimate interest of our great wartime ally, the Soviet Union, of crushing the new Peoples' Democracies of Eastern Europe and the millions-strong movement of liberation from feudal and colonial oppression. They do this under the shamefully false pretext of "defending peace and democracy" from "totalitarian Communism."

It is the agents, allies and spokesmen of these war-bent elements who first of all encouraged and directed Mindszenty's activities which led to his arrest and then seized upon his arrest and trial as a pretext for the intensification of their war propaganda and war preparations.

They used the trial of Joseph Mindszenty, among other things, to divert the people's attention from the repeated peace proposals of Stalin offering practical means for settling outstanding differences between the United States and the U.S.S.R. by conferences and arriving at a mutually satisfactory general solution.

Their latest move, the reprehend-

* Editor of *Magyar Jovo*, daily Hungarian newspaper published in New York City.

sible political machinations behind the placing of the trial of Cardinal Mindszenty on the agenda of the General Assembly of the United Nations—together with a plan to “investigate” the observance of human rights in Hungary (and in Bulgaria)—marks an advanced stage of the debasement of that organization on the part of the Anglo-American imperialist bloc.

It would take the pen of a Swift to describe the hypocrisy, the travesty of justice and decency, involved in this maneuver at Lake Success. Governments which are responsible for the most heinous crimes against millions of human beings, who are drowning in blood the struggle for independence of many nations in various parts of the globe (Indonesia, Indo-China, Greece, China), who tolerate the denial to millions of their own citizens of their elementary civil rights (U. S. Negroes), are attempting to set themselves up as judges over a nation which refused to tolerate a conspiracy against its state order and democratic institutions.

The fact that this decision of the General Assembly was made on the same day when the latest “ally” of the United States, Portugal, moved to get the bloody fascist, Franco into the Atlantic Pact, might have been a coincidence—a rather significant one. But it certainly was no coincidence that the General Assembly, meeting at a time when world tension, as a result of the signing of

the Atlantic Pact, reached new and unprecedented heights, found nothing more urgent to discuss than the case of Cardinal Mindszenty.

This was, indeed, no coincidence. As a matter of fact it seems to be part and parcel of the plans of the master strategists of the cold war, an essential item in their time-table, a most important element in their propaganda campaign of lies and slanders through which they hope to gain the support of the masses, without which, they know, all their evil plans are doomed to fail.

If the reactionaries of the world, the allies of Salazar and of the Ruhr industrialists, the supporters of Franco, Chiang, and of the Greek monarcho-fascists attach so much importance to the Mindszenty case, then the forces of progress should be correspondingly well prepared to expose all their rotten schemes, to remove the poisonous cloud of lies and distortion from this issue, and to give documentary proof of the role of the Cardinal as a warmonger, and arch-reactionary monarchist, who wanted, at the risk of a third world war, to impose the hated rule of a degenerate royal house upon his people.

DOCUMENTS ON MINDSZENTY

Two books recently issued by the Hungarian government, *Documents on the Mindszenty Case* (Yellow Book) and *The Trial of Jozsef Mindszenty* (Black Book), are indispensable for those who want to

know
case
for
The
of the
evid
of th
cont
Card
prop
by th
zenty
“frie
The
of th
and
of M
ter of
steno
ing
from
ures
the S
fense
Mind
diti
intro
orous
paper
tionar
THE
WA
For
gary
last h
Austr
over
tive p
landlo
The

know the facts of the Mindszenty case and who want to use these facts for the enlightenment of others.

The Yellow Book contains some of the most important documentary evidences against Mindszenty, many of them in photostatic forms. It also contains a brief biography of the Cardinal which helps to dispel the propaganda so industriously spread by the agents of reaction that Mindszenty was an "anti-Nazi" and a "friend of the Jews," etc.

The Black Book contains the text of the indictment of the Cardinal and his six co-defendants, the text of Mindszenty's letter to the Minister of Justice admitting his guilt, the stenographic transcript of the hearing of the Cardinal and excerpts from the hearings of the lesser figures in the trial, the statements of the State's attorney and of the defense attorney, the final plea of Mindszenty, and the verdict. In addition, there is a very interesting introductory section containing a vigorous exposé of the vicious newspaper propaganda launched by reactionary forces to discredit the trial.

THE REPUBLIC MINDSZENTY WANTED TO OVERTHROW

For almost a thousand years Hungary was a kingdom. During the last hundred years, up to 1918 the Austrian House of Hapsburg ruled over Hungary with the help of native potentates, princes, barons, big landlords and the Church.

The Hapsburgs hated and despised

the Hungarian people and treated them as colonial slaves. Time and again, the Hungarians revolted against their Hapsburg oppressors. In 1848, under the inspired leadership of Louis Kossuth, they almost succeeded in shaking the Hapsburg yoke off their shoulders. Emperor Francis Joseph, great-uncle of Otto, the present pretender, had to beg for the Czar's aid. Suppressing with foreign aid the Hungarian fighters for liberty, the Hapsburgs took fiendish revenge. They shot or hanged thirteen heroic Hungarian generals. Hundreds of Hungarian patriots were executed or jailed. Kossuth had to flee for his life.

The big landlords and business elements later reached a compromise with the Austrian royalists for the joint exploitation of Hungary. The lot of the plain people, however, grew steadily worse. The misery of the Hungarian peasantry became so unbearable that during the 70 years between 1870 and 1940 close to two millions of them had to emigrate, most of them coming to the United States.

The Hapsburg dynasty dragged Hungary into World War I on the side of German imperialism. This criminal venture cost that dynasty its throne. Hungary lost a million of its youth. After a brief interlude of a democratic republican form of government, the domestic reactionaries came into power again under Admiral Horthy, who promptly sold out the country to foreign interests,

first to Italian fascism and then to German Nazism. Hitler used the Hungarians as cannonfodder in the Second World War. Horthy declared war on the United States as an ally of Hitler in 1941. His present praise of Mindszenty is thus not without significance.

When the Red Army drove out the Germans and their Hungarian hirelings early in 1945, a new democratic government was established which set out not merely to rebuild the utterly devastated country, but to effect a fundamental democratic reorganization of the political, economic and social life of the country.

When the democratic government was established, all industry, transportation, and agriculture was at a complete standstill in Hungary. The Germans and their Hungarian accomplices had removed practically the entire rolling stock of the Hungarian railroads, some 1700 locomotives and 40,000 freight cars, destroyed the more important railways, and blown up more than 1400 bridges, among them the seven world-famous bridges of Budapest. They had removed the equipment of the 500 largest Hungarian factories and most of the livestock. Not a single piece of fire-fighting apparatus, not one complete hospital, was left in the country. When the Hungarian Post Office resumed operations in February 1945 in Budapest, a city of one million inhabitants, its entire "equipment" consisted of . . . one horse and one carriage!

This is how matters stood when the present people's democratic regime took over. And today, four years after utter collapse, the industrial production of the country surpasses that of the last prewar year, 1938. Out of the 1400 railroad bridges destroyed 1200 are rebuilt; 1940 miles of railway have been restored; the livestock is replenished. Agriculture is being mechanized; cities and villages are being rebuilt; the countryside is being electrified. Anti-Semitism has been outlawed, and the main war criminals have been punished. The trade unions, with a membership of 1,600,000, are now an active factor in running the government. The school system is democratized; the doors of high schools and universities have been thrown wide open for the children of peasants and workers, who had always been almost completely barred. "The country reflects tremendous efforts for reconstruction and human rehabilitation," wrote the Budapest correspondent of the *New York Times* on September 11, 1948; he pointed out that infant mortality already shows a considerable decrease compared with the prewar average (11.2 per 100,000 in 1947 compared to 14.7 in 1937).

To accomplish these miracles of reconstruction, the government had to carry out certain long-overdue reforms in the economic, political, and cultural life of the country.

The basis for carrying out this reconstruction and these reforms is to

be fo
work
are i
but a
agers
per co
tablis
tries
nancia
of the
the pe
count
and n
ments
peasars

THE
MIN
TO

The
land r

Of
gary's
owned
these,
holdin
These
countr

Amo
Eszter
ily wa
dinal M
than 30
terich
acres,
Royal
and so
The
Hunga
1,400,00
gest lan

be found in the fact that today the workers and peasants of Hungary are not only theoretically and legally, but actually, the owners and managers of their country's industry. 75 per cent of the large commercial establishments, 90 per cent of all industries and mines, and all of the financial institutions, are the property of the People's Democracy. And it is the people themselves who run their country. 67 per cent of the directors and managers of industrial establishments are of working-class or peasant origin.

THE LAND REFORM MINDSZENTY WANTED TO UNDO

The first major reform was the land reform.

Of the 24 million acres of Hungary's arable land, about one-half was owned by 12,064 individuals. Among these, there were 1167 families whose holdings exceeded 1500 acres each. These were the real masters of the country.

Among them we find the Prince Eszterházy (the head of which family was indicted together with Cardinal Mindszenty) who owned more than 300,000 acres of land! The Festetics barons had close to 100,000 acres, the Earl of Pallavicini 50,660, Royal Prince Albrecht 42,640 acres, and so on.

The Roman Catholic Church of Hungary with lands in excess of 1,400,000 acres, was one of the biggest landowners of the country.

The old order "has countenanced, despite its 3 million landless peasants church ownership of the following estates: 105,420 acres at Eger [archdiocese] 98,180 acres at Veszprem [diocese] 59,240 acres at Kalocsa [archdiocese] 49,930 acres at Zirc [monastery] and 103,000 acres at Esztergom [archdiocese, seat of the Primate of Hungary]" commented the *Milwaukee Journal* (March 14, 1945) on this state of affairs.

At the same time 800,000 peasant families (three million people) did not own a single square foot of land. Another million and a half households eked out a bare living on plots smaller than 8 acres.

One of the first tasks of the new democratic government was to fulfill the profound land-reform aspiration of the landless and poor peasant masses. This was achieved by the land reform of 1945.

"The old class of landed barons" —wrote *The New York Times* on September 22, 1946, in a momentary vein of objectivity on Hungary which has since disappeared from its columns—"has been removed. In the past it was this class that lined up Hungary on the side of the war-makers—Hapsburg and Hitler. Hungary fought on Germany's side in both world wars."

"Within 18 months," wrote Leland Stowe in the April 1947 issue of *Foreign Affairs*, "one of Europe's chief strongholds of medieval feudalism had been liquidated. Landlordism could never be returned."

Altogether, some 642,000 landless, poverty-stricken peasants obtained land. About 8 million acres of land was divided among them.

Among the gigantic estates so divided was that of 1,400,000 acres owned by the Roman Catholic Church. *The government saw to it, however, that sufficient land should remain in the possession of the poor parishes and lower clergy to assure their livelihood; more than 93,000 acres were allotted to them.* Commenting on this aspect of the land reform, the *Christian Science Monitor* reported in a dispatch from Budapest on February 13, 1946:

The transfer of church land to landless peasants was not an anti-religious act. For one thing, the lower clergy could retain enough land for their own maintenance and for the support of their schools. And secondly, the transfer was free from any anti-religious campaign or violence.*

In the process of land redivision, the state took over 1,509 castles and manor houses and some 11,000 acres of adjacent private parks, which have been converted into hospitals, sanatoria, schools, and rest homes.

As a result of this historic land-reform measure, the centuries-old rule of a few thousand landowners

came to an end in Hungary. For the first time, the way was opened for millions of peasants to participate in running their own country, a right which previously was strictly reserved for the overlords and monopoly capitalists of Hungary and the social strata influenced or bribed by them.

Cardinal Mindszenty consistently and bitterly opposed the land reform!

He called it "an un-Christian act" (*The Nation*, January 9, 1949).

He denounced it as a step taken in "the spirit of revenge" (Pastoral Letter, October 18, 1945).

The distribution of land to 642,000 poor landless peasants an act of vengeance!

He denounced the peasants who obtained the land as "those who have neither the knowledge nor the material resources for its cultivation" (Minutes of Episcopal Conference, May 24, 1945).

The annulment of the land reform is and has been, one of the main objects of all those elements in and outside of Hungary who want to overthrow the People's Democracy.

Mindszenty's connection with this movement was observed as early as 1946 by the noted correspondent of the *Christian Science Monitor*, Mr. R. H. Markham. Writing from Budapest, he stated on April 13, 1946:

There does exist an extreme clerical element centered around Cardinal Mindszenty which wants to restore church lands and the old autocratic regime.

* The expropriation of gigantic church land-holdings was carried out in an incomparably more just and equitable manner than the expropriation of church property at the time of the Reformation in Western Europe. "The estates of the church," writes Marx in *Capital*, "were to a large extent given away to rapacious royal favorites or sold at a nominal price to speculating farmers and citizens who drove out *en-masse*, the hereditary subtenants and threw their holdings into one."

Here is the indictment against Mindszenty and the circles around him, drawn up by an observant American correspondent three years before the Hungarian government was compelled to act!

MINDSZENTY'S OPPOSITION TO THE EDUCATIONAL REFORM

Just as he opposed the land reform, so also did Mindszenty oppose the other long-overdue reform, that of the educational system.

In Hungary, two-thirds of all the schools were in the hands of the Church. As Hungarian democracy abolished the powerful remnants of feudalism in the sphere of land ownership when it redistributed the landed estates, so it became necessary to eliminate them in the sphere of education.

The nationalization of public schools had been advocated by every great fighter for freedom and progress in Hungarian life. Thus a hundred years ago, the revered national hero, Louis Kossuth, stated: "I consider it axiomatic that it is impermissible to leave public education a monopoly of various churches."

On June 15, 1948, the Hungarian Parliament, by a vote of 293 to 63, decreed that "all non-State schools, student homes and nurseries, with the exception only of schools specifically dedicated to religious instruction, theological seminaries and certain institutions of the Protestant

Diaceneze [should] be taken over by the State."

The Roman Catholic Church owned 3,000 out of the 4,500 schools in the country. When Mindszenty heard of the decision of the Parliament he declared: "*We will fight this law with every weapon at our disposal.*"*

He did. In July, he ordered all Catholic religious schools closed. In August, he forbade ordained teachers to continue their work in public schools. The tension engendered by his stand led to violence in many parts of the country.

In passing, let us note that last year the government provided 40 million forints (approximately 3 million dollars) for the support of the Roman Catholic Church, and that religious instruction is still compulsory in all nationalized schools. The government pays the salaries of all Roman Catholic priests, bishops, and archbishops; this included the salary of Mindszenty!

In the light of these facts, let us examine the concrete illegal acts for which he was indicted.

THE INDICTMENT

Immediately after the liberation, Cardinal Mindszenty began a campaign for the establishment of an organization aiming at the restoration of the Hapsburg regime in Hungary. After the enactment of Law VII

* Ruth Karpf, "Cardinal Mindszenty's Arrest," *The Nation*, January 8, 1949, p. 39.

(1946) for the protection of the republican state order, not only did he not call a halt to this activity: to the contrary, he took steps toward formal organization. His idea was that after the overthrow of the People's Democracy he would issue a manifesto by virtue of which he would seize power. In order to have a legal foundation for this decision, he had a historical study made by Professor Gruber of the historic and legal precedents.

He sought and made contact with Otto Hapsburg himself, first through Marquis György Pallavicini, then through the Belgian Cardinal Van Rooye, and finally through Joseph Közi-Horvath, a papal prelate and member of the Hungarian parliament who had fled from Hungary to avoid prosecution.

In June 1947, under the pretext of visiting the Congress of the Virgin Mary at Ottawa, he traveled first to Canada and then to the United States. Paul Zsamboky, an old acquaintance, the confessor of the Hapsburg House, arranged meetings for Mindszenty in the U.S. with the widow of Charles Hapsburg, Zita, and with Otto Hapsburg. Those present at these meetings agreed on the best means of organizing the overthrow of the republic. Among other things, Mindszenty was to contact Mr. Selden Chapin, the United States Minister to Hungary. Mindszenty had a discussion of the same nature with Cardinal Spellman whom he informed of the whole

plan in the presence of Dr. András Zakar, the archepiscopal secretary. He also had a conference with Tibor Eckhardt, friend of Horthy and former president of the anti-Semitic Hungarian terrorist gang, "Awakening Hungarians," who is now living in the United States.

Upon Mindszenty's return to Budapest, the royalist organization was founded. In addition to Mindszenty, the leaders were Dr. Jusztin Baranyai, Joseph Cziráky, and others.

As one can see from the documents seized, these gentry based their plans on a third world war. They thought a new war so imminent and their seizure of power so likely that they prepared a list of cabinet ministers as follows: Prime Minister: Lipot Baranyai; Minister of House Affairs: Ferenc Keresztes-Fisher; Commerce: Károly Peyer (the Social-Democrat traitor); Justice: Gyula Moór; Foreign Affairs: Gábor Apor.

An important objective in the plotted counter-revolution was to assure the retention of the royal crown of Hungary abroad. The crown was necessary for the restoration of the monarchy. Baranyai recommended Zoltan Csaky, who had returned illegally from the West to Mindszenty, to safeguard the crown. The Cardinal orally instructed Csaky whom he should see abroad, and gave him power of attorney and letters addressed to leading ecclesiastical persons. Csáky left the country illegally and called on Archbishop Innitzer of Vienna, Archbishop Faulhaber of

Munich, and Archbishop Rohracher of Salzburg. On January 14, 1948, he again returned illegally and visited Mindszenty, giving a verbal and written account of what he had done. He also gave Mindszenty copies of letters Innitzer had written to the Pope and Faulhaber and Rohracher to Cardinal Spellman of New York. Mindszenty also received a copy of the letter which, in accordance with his own directions, Miklos Horthy, former fascist dictator of Hungary, had written on the same subject to the Pope.

In accordance with these plans, Spellman wrote to Secretary of War Robert P. Patterson in July 1947. In that letter, according to the statement of Cardinal Spellman reported in the *New York Times* on January 9, 1949, the New York Cardinal pointed out that "the crown was a relic of the first king of Hungary, Saint Stephen, given to him by Pope Sylvester in the year 1000 and *also a juridical emblem of the apostolic kingdom of Hungary*" (my emphasis—Z.D.).

The month following his letter, in August 1947, Cardinal Spellman received a reply from Army Secretary Kenneth F. Royall (Patterson's successor), reporting that, inasmuch as the restitution of sacred relics "other than to the government of origin" was not within the discretion of the military, Spellman's letter had been referred to the State Department. Spellman then forwarded Royall's letter to Montini, the As-

sistant Secretary of State of the Vatican, and Montini, as a consequence of Innitzer's action of September 19, 1947, sent it to Mindszenty in order to reassure him.

Aware of the extreme importance of this matter, Mindszenty took it in hand himself and wrote a letter to Mr. Chapin, United States Minister to Hungary. Emphasizing the importance of this matter, he pointed out that "as a consequence of military advances the holy crown might meet a tragic fate." (Note the reference to "military advances.")

The other point of the indictment was that of treason. Mindszenty, according to a number of pieces of documentary evidence, contacted the United States Minister to Hungary, Schoenfeld, and after his departure, Chapin, urging military intervention. In his report of December 6, 1947, he emphasized that "the intervention is now extremely important." On December 16, 1947, he wrote: "I ask for the help of America, a solution is possible with outside help."

Mr. Schoenfeld, for public record, discountenanced the demand for open intervention. Nonetheless, Schoenfeld stated that:

I shall continue to welcome the expression of your views on any matters to which you may desire to draw my attention. . . .

On June 12, 1947, the indictment shows, Mindszenty addressed himself directly to President Truman and re-

quested, on the basis of false statements and distorted descriptions of measures taken by the government, that the American government should put an end to the Hungarian republic through intervention by force.

Mindszenty admitted in writing, as well as in open court, that he had committed these acts.

The people's court found him guilty as charged and sentenced him to life imprisonment.

RELIGIOUS FREEDOM IN HUNGARY

An unprecedented barrage of anti-democratic, pro-war propaganda was let loose as a result of the trial. Imperialist statesmen and high priests, publicists and politicians, vied with one another in denouncing democratic Hungary. The Pope excommunicated everyone who participated in the Cardinal's arrest and trial. President Truman called the conviction an "infamous act of a kangaroo court." Cardinal Spellman said it was "the crucifixion of humanity" and an unprecedented attack on religion.

Is there any truth to these accusations? Was Mindszenty's trial the product of religious persecution in Hungary?

Let the spokesmen of the Hungarian Catholic and Protestant churches answer this charge.

Andrew Hamvas, Roman Catholic Bishop of Csanád, declared on Feb-

ruary 1, 1949: "I acknowledge and declare that the free exercise of religion in Hungary is not impeded and there is complete religious freedom in our country."

The Protestant Church of Hungary, over the signature of Bishop Imre Révész, Chairman of the Ecclesiastical Synod, issued the following statement in January of this year:

Representatives of Western Christianity, . . . who visit us frequently, have themselves ascertained that our churches have the external and internal freedom to serve the Gospel. We, therefore stressed repeatedly that the Archbishop of Esztergom, Cardinal Mindszenty, did not fight for the freedom of religion, because there never was a need for such a fight, but that he fought a political battle.

Rev. Dr. Imre Somogyi, President of the Hungarian Baptist Union, issued this statement on January 27, 1949:

The smaller Hungarian churches, united in the Federation of Free Churches, enjoyed a period of religious liberty, during the four years following the end of the war, which was hitherto unknown to them. . . . The democratic Hungarian government has been ready to regulate state-church relationships in such a way that the churches should be able to preach and unfold their activities in all fields of endeavor freely.

The *Crusader*, official organ of the Northern Baptist Convention of the United States, carried the following

statement of a Baptist preacher just returned from Hungary in its March 1949 issue: "Baptists in Hungary are now enjoying freedom to preach the gospel and are undergoing a mighty revival of religion."

The *Living Church*, official organ of the Episcopal Church of the United States, reports in its September 1948 issue by its correspondent who visited Hungary "that the Church is free to conduct its services openly." To mention but one illustration he offers: on a visit to the countryside during a Catholic feast day,

. . . we passed a dozen or more processions of peasants, dressed in their colorful Sunday costumes, carrying a crucifix and singing litanies as they went. . . . These people appeared to be happy and carefree as they carried out their centuries-old picturesque religious observances; certainly no police, open or secret, were restricting them in any way.

Rev. Dr. Gabor Csiki, President of the Hungarian Unitarian Church declared:

The new Hungarian state has never limited the full liberty of the Unitarian Church in any way. None of the members of our church have ever suffered persecution, not even the slightest disadvantage on account of their religious belief. The state granted considerable sums to restore or rebuild churches damaged or destroyed during the war.

In conclusion, let us note the dec-

laration made on the one hundredth anniversary of the dethronement of the Hapsburg dynasty (April 14, 1949) by Bishop Révész of the Hungarian Reformed Church:

The Hungarian Reformed Church testifies that it considers the new state, social, and economic order in which our country is now developing, as more deeply rooted in Biblical principles than any hitherto existing. . . . May the Hungarian Republic, our young Hungarian People's Democracy, which rebuilt our churches, and which assures and defends the freedom of our religion, be blessed.

MINDSZENTY AS AN "ANTI-NAZI" AND "FRIEND OF THE JEWS"

Those circles which used the trial of Mindszenty as a pretext for intensified war hysteria tried to discredit the case of the Hungarian authorities and to create sympathy for him, by claiming that Mindszenty was an opponent of Nazism and a friend of the Jews. One of the Hungarian reactionaries in the United States claimed, for instance, that Mindszenty had saved the lives of 150,000 Jewish people.

Much is made of the fact that Mindszenty was arrested by the Hungarian Nazis in 1944. Those who mention this never add the reason for his arrest. One of the Nazi district leaders in his country (Dr. Siberna, requisitioned part of Minds-

zenty's residence as well as the vast store of underwear which the then-bishop Mindszenty had accumulated, as he stated, for distribution among the poor. When Mindszenty protested, he was arrested.

In his letter written to Szölössy, the Hungarian puppet Deputy Premier, on January 12, 1945, Mindszenty emphasized that there were no political reasons for his arrest, and that he had a long standing personal disagreement with Siberna. "His religious behavior does not befit a government headed by that leader [Szálasi] who takes part in retreat and leads the life of a devout Catholic."^{*}

Here is what the "anti-Nazi" Mindszenty said about the Nazi race theory in a book of his, titled *Mother* (published in 1942):

It is due to it [the Nazi race theory] that the German people became healthy and prolific.^{**}

Mussolini is responsible for Italy's present greatness.^{***}

In his newspaper *Zala News*, in 1942:

Dazzling vistas open up before heroic sacrifice. The Japanese living Stukas, living torpedoes, and living bombs show that the heroic soldiers are ready to sacrifice their lives, to go together with their tools of destruction towards their destination.^{****}

^{*} *Yellow Book*, p. 12.

^{**} *Black Book*, p. 16.

^{***} *Black Book*, p. 15.

^{****} *Black Book*, p. 15.

In the same newspaper he wrote this in September 1919:

Until now our press was the *avant-garde* of the Jews craving world power and striving for it by overcoming every obstacle.^{*}

On April 19, 1938, at a pastoral conference on political problems presided over by Mindszenty and Viktor Toth Zoltan, the dean of Dévaványa, Mindszenty stated that "we decided that the Jewish problem ought to be solved by way of racial law in the same way as the fascists wanted. We emphasized that it was the party we supported, the Christian Party [Wolff Party] that had so far introduced the only laws of racial protection and the *numerus clausus*."

Mindszenty also wrote "on settling the Jewish question":

It is our good fortune that the great reservoir of Galician and Bukovinian Jews, the millions of the Jewish masses in the ghetto have as a result of the German war of destruction been reduced to some 500,000. . . .

By restoring the legal status quo as of the 19 of March 1944, everyone appointed to public office after that date can be dismissed. Therefore all Jews and halfbreeds can and must be dismissed. They are not of course to be dismissed because they are Jewish, but because they were appointed after March 19, 1944.^{**}

No wonder that the leading or-

^{*} *Black Book*, p. 15.

^{**} *Yellow Book*, p. 81.

ganizations of the Jewish community of Hungary felt compelled to protest the portrayal of Mindszenty as the friend of the Jews or of any other minority group!

As the *Hungarian Bulletin* reported in January 1949, the Central Board of Jews, the Central Board of Orthodox Religious Jews, and the Hungarian Zionist Organization, issued the following statement:

It is with a great dismay that we see Jewish organizations and Jewish men in the field of public life in Western Europe and in America raise their voices on behalf of Cardinal Mindszenty, the arch-enemy of Jews in Hungary and in Eastern Europe. We are convinced that these organizations and their leaders are not sufficiently aware of Mindszenty's activities in the last four years, of his anti-Semitic past, of his anti-Jewish plots and also of the fact that among the documents seized were his projects to revalidate the Jewish laws. They do not realize that Cardinal Mindszenty and his accomplices, all of them contributors to and partly responsible for the terrible tragedy of Hungarian Jewry, now rallied around Cardinal Mindszenty, have made plots for a new Auschwitz.

THE POWERS BEHIND MINDSZENTY

The fact that Mindszenty's opposition to the Hungarian republic has been directed by forces outside of Hungary has been manifest to even the most superficial observers.

Mr. Morehouse, a correspondent

of the American Episcopal Church organ, the *Living Church*, wrote, on the basis of his visit to Hungary and interview with Mindszenty, in the September 1948 issue of that publication: "In the religious sphere, it is the Vatican and the Roman Catholic Hierarchy, not least of all Cardinal Spellman, who are the power behind Cardinal Mindszenty." Of course, it was not only in the religious sphere, but in the political sphere also, that the Pope and Spellman used Mindszenty in their pro-war designs against the People's Democracies, and against Hungary in particular.

And it is an equally well known fact that the Vatican's reactionary political activities were not confined to Hungary or to the present period. The Roman Catholic hierarchy is the oldest of all present-day reactionary political groupings. Until the twentieth century and even down to World War I, it derived its main support from powerful, though declining, political forces such as the feudal landowners in Poland, Spain, Hungary, etc. Much of this support was lost after the First World War, and the Second had even more drastic consequences for the Vatican, which banked on the victory of fascism. With the establishment of the new People's Democracies in a number of Eastern European countries many with substantial Roman Catholic populations—the exclusive political, as well as religious, sway of the Vatican over the body and

soul of tens of millions of peasants, workers, and intellectuals came to an end.

But the Vatican has not given up its aspirations for political leadership and domination in Europe. It has been working through a number of newly-established political parties, such as the M.R.P. in France, the Christian Democrats in Italy, and the Smallholders, and later the Liberty and Independence parties in Hungary.

The strategic aim of the Vatican's postwar political maneuvers is the creation of a federal system of reactionary Roman Catholic states in the form of three main groupings. The first would be the Western federation which would include Franco Spain, Salazar's Portugal, De Gaulle in France, and a clerical-dominated Italy. The second would be a Danubian federation, designed to include Bavaria, Austria, Hungary, and Slovakia. The third group would evolve around a reactionary, clerical-ruled Poland, with some border states scheduled to be "liberated" from Soviet rule.

Correspondingly, toward the end of World War II and in the postwar years, intense activity of Vatican representatives developed in these countries. In Bavaria, Cardinal Faulhaber, a close friend of Pope Pius XII when the latter, as Cardinal Pacelli, was the Vatican's emissary in Germany, is one of the leading spirits behind the monarcho-clericalist Christian Socialist Union. The pre-

tender to the Bavarian throne, ex-crown prince Rupprecht, was also a close friend of his. Faulhaber tried to persuade Rupprecht to renounce his claim to the Bavarian throne in favor of his nephew Otto, a member of the Hapsburg dynasty, whose pretensions to the throne have the backing of influential people in the Vatican as well as in Washington and the Archdiocese of New York.

In the Rhineland, Cardinal Frings is the head of the monarchist clique. This is the high priest whose activities under the motto, "the enemy is on the left," greatly contributed to the defeat of the forces of democracy in Germany and facilitated the victory of Hitler in the early 'thirties. It is noteworthy that Frings was one of the main speakers in a recent protest meeting in Dusseldorf against the trial of Mindszenty.

The late Cardinal Hlond of Poland, who condoned the pogrom at Kielce, Archbishop Stepinac of Yugoslavia (condemned for collaboration with the fascists), and finally Mindszenty, the Vatican representative in Hungary, rounded out the leadership of Vatican strategy in Central Europe.

The Vatican realized, however, that its political aims cannot be fulfilled without the backing of a very strong political power sharing the same objectives generally in Central Europe and elsewhere and buttressed by practically unlimited financial, economic and military resources.

After the conclusion of the Second

World War, the United States, whose government departed from the path of Roosevelt's policies, turned out to be just the ally the Vatican was looking for.

American monopolists, directing the policies of the U.S., in turn regard the hold of the Vatican on the Catholic masses of Europe as a major social base and a mobilizing agency for attempting to rally millions behind finance capital's reactionary, anti-democratic and anti-Soviet policy.

This development was clearly pointed out by V. J. Jerome some two and a half years ago. Writing in the November 26, 1946, issue of the *New Masses*, he stated:

Between the Vatican and imperialism the motives are mutual and the historic compulsions parallel. The general weakening of the positions of world capitalism, as a consequence of World War II, forces imperialism to pursue desperate policies to maintain its system. Likewise, in a series of European countries the Vatican has been greatly weakened in political power and economic mainstay which were interrelated with the sway of semi-feudal landowners and quiescent monopolists. This is the foundation of the alliance between finance capital and the Vatican.

In this direct alliance with imperialism the Vatican and the Catholic hierarchy everywhere resort to flagrant political interference in international and national affairs.

The existence of an unholy alliance between the Vatican and U.S. finance capital has been obvious for years to many objective observers in Europe. Writing in the Spring 1947 issue of the *Public Opinion Quarterly* of Princeton University, Mr. O. W. Riegel, an officer at the Budapest American Legation for two years, declared:

The Americans gravitate toward the most dubious elements remaining in Hungary, the remnants of the gentry, industrialists, *the higher clergy*, and the motley assortments of fascists and opportunists. (My emphasis—Z. D.)

Coming from a member of our own diplomatic corps, this admission casts a great deal of light on the behind-the-scene activities linking our diplomacy with the Vatican in Hungary.

* * *

The act of the Hungarian people in trying and sentencing Mindszenty, an agent of the Wall Street-Vatican reactionary coalition who based all his calculations on a new world war, was part and parcel of the world-wide struggle of peace-loving peoples against the forces of imperialism bent on war. The Hungarian People's Democracy deserves the support of every decent person who wishes to contribute to the defeat of the war-makers, of the worst enemies of humanity.

The Crisis Character of the Economic Development of the U. S. in the Postwar Period*

by I. Kuzminov

THE SECOND WORLD WAR brought about a rise of production and an increase in the productive capacity of the U.S.A. based on the growth of production of the war industry and of military supplies and ammunition for the army. This increase in production, achieved for the first time over a long period of years, during which the American economy was under the stress of the crises of 1929-33 and also 1937-38, has served as the basis for the revival of all sorts of illusions and false "theories" regarding the possibility of a rapid and crisis-less development of the economy of the U.S.A. in peace time.

During the war there developed in the U.S.A. an enormous literature singing the praises of "the records of American production," "the American way of life," *i.e.*, American monopoly capitalism. If prior to the war the majority of American economists and politicians were under the influence of the deep shock administered by the crisis of 1929-33, by the enormous chronic failure to utilize the full capacity of the industrial

apparatus and by the chronic mass unemployment, then during the war period, under the influence of the growth of production brought on by war conditions, they again dragged out into the light of day all sorts of "theories" of "American exceptionalism."

PREDICTIONS OF BOURGEOIS ECONOMISTS

Of course, in reference to the postwar outlook there was no agreement among bourgeois economists. Some of them, who have not had time to forget the events of the pre-war period, were inclined to make pessimistic predictions and recommended to business all kinds of caution during the "dangerous period of reconversion." Others, whose vision was befogged by the "records" of war production, were prophesying "prosperity" and a crisis-free development of the U.S.A. in the postwar period. In this respect we might indicate as typical the very title of Harold Loeb's book *Full Production Without War*, published in 1946, and having as its basic thesis the attempt to prove that

* Translated from *The Bolshevik*, Moscow, December 15, 1948.

even after the war the development of capitalist production in the U.S.A. can move upward without crises and catastrophes. This position is also taken by many other apologists of American capitalism, the majority of whom combine this with a leaning toward "government regulation," or, in other words, the development of state-monopoly capitalism.

It is worth recalling these views, if for no other reason than that the proposition about the inevitable rise of production in capitalist countries after the war was defended also by some of our economists. Here it is necessary to name first of all Academician Varga. From a Marxian point of view, the only correct deduction to be drawn from the fact of the wartime rise of production in the U.S.A. would be that the transition from war to peace, signifying as a rule a sharp reduction of the "military demand," calls forth the sharpening of the contradiction between the increased productive capacity and the low purchasing power of the masses and inevitably leads to the fall of production, to economic shocks.

VARGA'S VIEWS

And yet, Academician Varga was predicting the *inevitable rise of production* in the U.S.A. and some other capitalist countries immediately after the war. In a report made at the Institute of World Economy and World Politics at the beginning of 1945,

Acad. Varga stated that "in those countries where the productive apparatus was preserved or expanded during the war, it may be expected that after the war there will be a rise in the economic situation for 3-4 years. . . ."¹

This point of view was later developed by Academician Varga in his book *Changes in the Economy of Capitalism as a Result of World War II*. In this book, on page 269, Varga wrote that after the end of the war, the economy of capitalist countries with undamaged or improved productive apparatus would experience an upward phase.

In his predictions Academician Varga was basing himself on the theory of the so-called "postponed demand," diligently preached by the learned lackeys of the bourgeoisie. This theory consists of the notion that the working people in capitalist countries earn well during the war, yet cannot spend their full earnings because supply lags behind demand. They therefore place their earnings into savings banks. After the war, this "deferred demand," according to Varga's expression, must inevitably "descend with full force upon the market-place" and "find its expression in a more or less prolonged excess of market demand over supply," which will be the basis for a new upward swing.

The concept of "deferred demand"

¹ Cited as given in the journal *World Economy and World Politics*, No. 2-3, 1945, p. 80.

is later developed in articles by L. Mendelsohn. In an article entitled "Crises and Cycles of the Epoch of the General Crisis of Capitalism,"² he writes that during the war even in such countries as the United States there must take place the lag of supply behind demand, "under-production," which becomes expressed in "deferred demand"!

Thus, he would claim, there occurs, not the further impoverishment of the working class and all working people, but their enrichment. There are created prerequisites, not for the sharpening of contradictions between production and consumption, but for their softening, and according to him, the basis is thus laid not for a postwar decline, but for a sure postwar rise in production.

ERRORS IN THE "THEORY" OF DEFERRED DEMAND

There is no need to spend much time on proving that the apologist "theory" of "deferred demand" has nothing in common with Marxism. It is in obvious contradiction to the law of absolute and relative impoverishment of the working class under capitalism, a law which operates in peace time, as well as in time of war. The "theory" of "deferred demand" is in obvious contradiction to reality.

Even if during World War II, the population of the United States accumulated certain means, the major portion of these means is concentrated

in the hands of the most prosperous top section. As a result of the increased profits, enormous means are accumulated in the hands of American monopolists. As far as the preponderant majority of the working people is concerned, it must be said in the words of an observer in the *Magazine of Wall Street*, that "savings are either totally lacking, or else they are insignificant." Under the influence of the spread of unemployment, the reduction of take-home pay, and inflation, these savings have quickly disappeared after the war, without exercising any substantial influence upon the general economic conditions.

Life has cruelly laughed at these boastful predictions of American bourgeois economists, and at the same time at the predictions of Academician Varga. The end of the war not only failed to bring a new rise, new "prosperity," but instead brought about, as was to be expected, a sharp decline in the production of the U.S.A., England, Canada and some other countries. As stated by Comrade Zhdanov in his report on the 29th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution, the postwar period in these countries is connected "with great economic and political crises. In capitalist countries the transition from war to peace time has brought on a sharp narrowing of the market, a fall in the level of production, the shutting down of plants, the growth of unemployment."

It must be noted that the economic

² *World Economy and World Politics*, No. 11, 1947.

barometer of the U.S.A. began to fall even before the end of the war. Just as soon as the Soviet Army drove the Hitlerite hordes toward the west, the curve of industrial production in the U.S.A., England, Canada, started creeping downward. While bourgeois economists and politicians of the U.S.A. continued their noises about the records of American production and about the superiority of "free," *i.e.*, capitalist economy, and while Academician Varga was composing his predictions concerning the postwar rise of American economy, this economy had already entered upon its path of decline. Suffice it to examine the figures below to become convinced of this.

And this decline of production reached such proportions in 1946 as are not known in the history of economic crises, with the exception only of the crisis of 1929-33. As compared with 1943, production of the entire American industry in 1946 fell by 29%, production of manufacturing fell by 32%, durable goods by 47%, machine-building by 46%, means of transportation by 70%. Certain branches of machine-building and the production of means of transportation reduced their production to an even greater degree. Thus, ship-building fell in 1946 to 1/20 of 1943; production of lathes to 1/4 of 1943. The extent of the decline of production would be even steeper if com-

CHANGES IN INDUSTRIAL OUTPUT IN THE U.S.A.

(1939 = 100)

Indices	Year						
	1940	1941	1942	1943	1944	1945	1946
All Industry	115	149	183	219	216	186	156
Manufacturing	116	154	194	237	231	197	162
Durable	128	184	256	330	324	251	176
Non-Durable	106	130	145	161	157	152	150
Steel	127	157	163	168	170	151	122
Machine Tools	131	212	327	426	422	330	231
Production of Means of Transport	141	238	450	714	698	473	214*
Textiles	102	136	140	137	132	130	144
Food	105	118	124	134	141	140	139

SHARP DECLINE IN PRODUCTION AFTER 1943

Thus, American production attained its maximum point as far back as 1943, after which it began to de-

clined in February, 1946, by 38% comparison were made in each industry between the highest point of the wartime rise and the lowest point to which it fell in 1946. Thus, for instance, the level of production in manufacturing in the U.S.A. declined in February, 1946, by 38%

* The first nine months of 1946.

from the highest peak of its wartime rise in November, 1943; the production of durable goods for the same dates fell by 63%; the production of the branches manufacturing means of transportation for the same period fell by 74%.

And here it is important to stress that the decline of production which has affected most deeply the branches manufacturing means of transportation did not miss the branches of industry producing consumers' goods. The output of the industries producing non-durable goods, which include consumers' goods, dropped 7% in 1946 as compared with 1943; included in this is a decline in the consumption of raw cotton of 18%. Here, even the notorious "deferred demand" was of no help.

The end of hostilities with Germany and Japan brought about the mass shut-down of industrial establishments, the firing of workers, the failure of hundreds of small businesses, the growth of unemployment. In August, 1945, the Associated Press, in a special survey devoted to conditions in industry, reported the mass shutting down of plants and the firing of workers. The number of workers and employees occupied in manufacturing concerns in the U.S.A. dropped from 17.4 million in 1943 to 14.1 million in 1946.

The number of totally unemployed in 1946 was, according to official, greatly underestimated figures, 2.3 millions, while the figure for partially unemployed was 5.4 million persons.

The monopolists did not fail to take advantage of the growing unemployment to reduce earnings. Workers were forced to resort to strikes. 1945 and 1946 are characterized by the enormous sweep of the strike movement in the U.S.A. In 1945 there were in the U.S.A. 4,750 strikes in which 3,470,000 workers took part, while in 1946 the number of strikes was 4,985, and the number of participants reached 4,600,000.

Under these circumstances there was very little left of the "deferred demand." Already in 1946 deposits in savings banks of the U.S.A. were down to 1/3 as compared with 1944. In addition, inflation had caused a tremendous decline in the purchasing power of these savings. Not only was the "deferred demand" unable to provide any kind of rise in production, but it also couldn't prevent the inevitable decline of production in the U.S.A. after the war, a decline which, as stated by Comrade Voznesensky, was taking place "in the circumstances of the growing antagonism between the social nature of production and the capitalist method of appropriating the results of production."

THE ARGUMENT OF "RECONVERSION"

Some of the workers of the former Institute of World Economy are attempting to picture the unusual drop in the production of the U.S.A. and other countries in 1944-46 as some sort of insignificant hitch in produc-

tion, which they explain as being caused by "reconversion," *i.e.*, simply the change-over of plants from an output of war goods to the production of goods for civilian use. But the transition of capitalist economy from war to peace is not simply "reconversion," it is not just a technical and organizational change-over of individual plants, but a complex and difficult process of the spontaneous, anarchic adaptation of capitalist production expanded by "wartime demand," to the new conditions of the market. By employing the term "reconversion" bourgeois economists try to cover up the crisis character of postwar economic development in the U.S.A.

In reality the drop in capitalist production in 1944-46 goes far beyond the limits of an ordinary economic hitch. This is evident from the unusual depth of the drop in production, its duration and its wide nature.

Academician Varga and his followers insist that during the war there can be no maturing of the prerequisites of a crisis. For the prerequisites of a crisis to mature, according to the opinion of the representatives of this point of view, it is necessary to have a new "normal" upturn after the war.

WAR—NATURAL RESULT OF CAPITALISM TODAY

The basis for this opinion is the view that war is something external, something alien to capitalist economy. Yet war, as stated by Comrade

Stalin, is for capitalist countries "just as natural and valid a state of affairs as the exploitation of the working class."

Contemporary world wars result from the development of world economic and political forces on the basis of monopoly capitalism. Wars arise as a development of the basic contradictions of capitalist economy. And this means, of course, that during a war period war cannot be viewed as something "abnormal" for the capitalist system of economy (especially in the period of the general crisis of capitalism, when it may be said wars have become part and parcel of capitalism).

EFFECT OF WAR ON NORMAL CYCLES

The influence of war expresses itself in the fact that war *deforms* the capitalist cycle, alters its "usual" course. Thus, for instance, war may soften the crisis and stimulate an upward swing and boom based on war orders. Such was the case in 1914 when the crisis which was about to start was cushioned and later on was, so to say, "absorbed" under the impact of war orders. Such was the case in 1939 when the economic crisis in the U.S.A., England and several other countries, was absorbed and changed into a revival and boom.

"However," as stated by Comrade Voznesensky, "the high level of capitalist accumulation, productivity of labor and techniques of production,

reached in the U.S.A. during the war, sharpens the contradictions peculiar to capitalism and creates the basis for a new devastating economic crisis and chronic unemployment."

As a result of the enormous destruction of a part of the productive forces the war has temporarily mitigated the contradictions between production and consumption. War is the sharpest and deepest form of this destruction, bearing witness precisely to the extreme depth of the contradiction between the productive forces and the production relations.

But while temporarily mitigating the contradictions between production and consumption, war at the same time lays the basis for a new sharpening of these contradictions and a new explosion, for a new crisis. War contributes to the growth, in a number of countries, of the productive capacities of capitalism, a growth based on the growing "wartime demand." At the same time war means the further impoverishment of the working people in capitalist countries, that is the curtailment of consumer demand. The law of relative and absolute impoverishment of the working class under capitalism is active also in war time, and even in a sharper form. The end of the war and the sharp curtailment of the "military demand" bring capitalist production with its increased productive capacities face to face with the curtailed purchasing power of the masses, and disclose a great sharpen-

ing of the contradiction between production and consumption.

HOW THE LAW OF UNEVEN DEVELOPMENT AFFECTED THE U.S.A.

The law of uneven development of capitalism operates in war time with special force. If the economy of certain countries, under the pressure of war, has suffered a decline and was thrown back by several years, or even several decades, there was the contrary phenomenon in other countries, situated at great distances from the front, such as the U.S.A., Canada, where the war caused a rise of production and a growth of productive capacity. The economic development of the U.S.A. during the war was laying the basis directly for the further sharpening of the contradiction between production and consumption, between the curtailed purchasing power of the masses and the productive capacities which have increased on the yeast of "war time demand."

American monopoly capital has resorted to convulsive efforts to prevent the further decline of production, to extricate itself from the sharpest contradictions of the American economy by means of the increased exploitation of the working class and the laboring people of the U.S.A., through lowering their living standards, through militarization and the increase of military expenditures, through the increased exploitation of the working people of other capitalist countries.

HOW
ME
CO
A v
ploita
U.S.A.
Amer
hand,
work
hand.
taxes)
in 194
sal su
pared
in 194
in 19
mono
about
passed
striking
of pro
time
condi
produ
war t
nopol
tack u
worki
out th
ers ar
indus
1943
paid
other
ment
a low
the e
than
wages
high

HOW AMERICAN CAPITALISM MEETS SHARPENED CONTRADICTIONS

A vivid index of the growing exploitation of the working class of the U.S.A. is the increase of profits of American monopolies on the one hand, and the decline of wages of workers and employees on the other hand. During the war, profits (before taxes) reached their maximum level in 1944 when they grew to the colossal sum of 25.7 billion dollars compared with approximately 9.3 billion in 1940. After some slight fluctuation in 1945-46 the profits of American monopolists in 1947 amounted to about 30 billion dollars, *i.e.*, they surpassed the level reached in 1944. The striking fact here is that the increase of profits as compared with the war time maximum took place under conditions of a general decline of production in comparison with the war time level. The American monopolists have opened up a wide attack upon the living standards of the working class. It may suffice to point out that while the number of workers and employees in manufacturing industries fell in 1946 to 80.7% of the 1943 total, the total amount of wages paid out to them fell to 67.3%. In other words, not only has unemployment increased, but there was also a lowering of the average wage of the employed workers. Even greater than this was the decline in *real* wages as a result of inflation and higher prices.

The plunder of the working people of the U.S.A. proceeds not only along the line of increased unemployment, declining earnings and higher prices, but also by means of putting on the screws of the tax burden, squeezing from the pockets of workers and working people enormous sums for the inflated military budget, for subsidies and other "aid" for the manipulators in the munitions industry.

NEW WAR ORDERS BASIS OF CHECKING FURTHER DECLINE

The enormous military expenditures of the U.S.A. during the war were the basis for the high war-time level of the economy. At the moment of the ending of the war, such expenditures had lost their basis, and the military budget was being curtailed. Had it been reduced to the pre-war level, *i.e.*, had the demobilization of American industry, its "re-conversion" been complete, then the decline in production during 1944-46 would have assumed even more stupendous dimensions. However, the ruling clique of monopolists has directed the ship of state of the U.S.A. along the course of preparing a new war. This determined the enormous size of the military budget of the postwar period. In 1947-48 the military budget of the U.S.A. amounted to 11 billion dollars, which is 11 times the pre-war sum allotted to military expenditures. For 1948-49 the planned budget for military ex-

penditures is 15.2 billion, or 15 times as much as was spent before the war. In addition, the U.S.A. budget contains a number of items which also represent hidden expenses for military aims. The authors of the pamphlet *The Militarization of America* have calculated that the items for armed forces and related organizations amounted in 1947 to about 54% of the Federal budget, while in 1948 this figure rose to 66.3%.

Thus, the monopolists of the United States have stopped the decline of the military budget at a critical point and have maintained it on a very high level.

But what does a large military budget mean? It means the maintenance of large armed forces and large military orders. It means the maintenance of large-scale war industry. This factor has made it possible for the American monopolists to apply to a certain extent the brakes on the downward movement of industrial production.

FEROCIOUS DRIVE FOR FOREIGN MARKETS

In searching for a way out of the most acute contradictions of the American economy the monopolists of the U.S.A. have entered upon the most ferocious struggle for foreign markets. This struggle takes place at a time when the major competitors of the U.S.A. for foreign markets—Germany and Japan, — are out of the running, when European countries, including England, are weak-

ened by the war, at a time when the U.S.A. itself has grown stronger economically and militarily. All this has made it possible for the U.S.A. for a time to grab with comparative ease the most important positions on the foreign markets, including those of Europe.

During the war the U.S.A. used its position of being the "Arsenal of Democracy," as Wall Street dealers politely called it, to penetrate new markets for the sale of goods. A very important part was played in this by lend-lease. In 1944 U.S.A. exports, including lend-lease, reached the high total of 14.1 billion dollars against 3.1 billion dollars in 1939 (in current prices). The end of the war, the discontinuance of shipments under lend-lease, brought about a decline in exports in 1946 to 9.5 billion dollars. This decline would have been even greater had not the bosses of monopoly capital, driven by fear, developed a furious struggle for new markets for their goods and for the investment of capital. It was precisely that year that witnessed the appearance of the expansionist "Truman Doctrine" and the "Marshall Plan." As a result of this the monopolists of the U.S.A. have succeeded not only in stopping the decline in foreign trade, but have achieved an increase. In 1947 exports from the U.S.A. amounted to 15 billion dollars, a figure in excess of even the maximum wartime figure of 1944.

The share of the U.S.A. in total world exports, which in 1938 was

only
30.5
In s
Brit
exp
tota
mai
The
afte
wen
Thu
text
and
port
text
yarc
only
1947
exp
ship
Eng
squ
wer
the
port
Ger
ferr
befo
am
1938
fir
met
tons
ing
othe
the
mar
mar
1947
tons
1938

only 13.5% of the total, increased to 30.5% in 1946 and to 32.6% in 1947. In spite of the enormous efforts of the British monopolists to push their exports up, England's share in the total of world exports in 1947 remained on the level of 1938 (10.3%). The major advantage in world trade after Germany and Japan fell out, went to the monopolists of the U.S.A. Thus, the major exporters of cotton textiles before the war were England and Japan. In 1937-38 England exported 1654 million square yards of textiles, Japan—2412 million square yards, while the U.S.A. exported only 278 million square yards. In 1947, the U.S.A. became the major exporter of cotton textiles when it shipped 1470 million square yards. England's exports fell to 631 million square yards, while Japan's exports were 394 million square yards. Nearly the same picture is presented by exports in the field of ferrous metals. Germany was the major exporter of ferrous metals to European countries before the war, and these exports amounted to 1,273 thousand tons in 1938. In 1947 the U.S.A. advanced to first place in the export of ferrous metals to Europe (1,766 thousand tons) replacing Germany and squeezing out to a considerable degree other exporters. In the same way the U.S.A. pushed out of the export market other exporters of coal, primarily Germany and England. In 1947 the U.S.A. exported 80 million tons of coal against 12 million in 1938; England, 6 million tons against

37 million in 1938; and Germany, 11 million tons against 30 million tons in 1938.³

Such growth of American exports is not usual. It reflects the attempts of the American monopolist bourgeoisie to extricate itself from the most acute contradiction of the American economy at the expense of the working people of other lands, by means of exporting abroad its surplus production.

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE MARSHALL PLAN

One of the major weapons for this export is the "Marshall Plan." For the countries of Europe the "Marshall Plan" is an economic decree, it is a means of forcing the purchase of those goods which cannot be disposed of on the American market. For the American monopolists the "Marshall Plan" is a means of government financing of their foreign trade, a means of government-guaranteed export of American over-production to other countries.

Comrade Molotov, in his report on the 31st Anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution, said:

Everyone is familiar with the stir raised in Europe over the "Marshall Plan." This plan is advertised as the factor of salvation for the post-war recovery of European economy. To listen to certain British or French statesmen one would gather that without American credits under the "Marshall Plan" the economic recovery of the countries

³ *Vneshnyaya Torgovlia* (Foreign Trade), No. 5, p. 17, No. 17, pp. 8 and 16, for 1948.

of Europe is impossible. And yet the American dollars which this year streamed into the pockets of European capitalists, according to the credit plan of the U.S.A., have not produced any real revival of industry in the countries of capitalist Europe. They cannot bring about such a revival, because American credits are not being given to restore and expand the industry of European countries which compete with the United States of America, but in order to provide a broader market for American goods in Europe and to place these countries in economic and political dependence on the capitalist monopolies which dominate the U.S. and on their aggressive plans, in disregard of the interests of the European peoples themselves.

American export in the postwar period has resulted in the flooding of the market of the country which becomes the recipient of American "aid" with stale American goods, the closing down of local industrial establishments, the growth of unemployment.

The penetration of Americans interferes with the restoration of the economy of European and other countries which have not recovered from the after-effects of the war, and it pulls them backward.

THE CATASTROPHIC EFFECTS ON CHINESE ECONOMY

As a vivid example of the results of American "aid" let us point to the economy of Kuomintang China. After the war American monopolists grabbed the basic positions on the

Chinese market. The share of the U.S.A. in the total of 1947 imports to China was 52%. The flooding of China with American goods has brought on catastrophic results for the economy of China — it has brought about the decline of production within China, the shutting down of local factories and plants, the growth of unemployment. According to data issued by the All-China Industrial Association in the provinces of Szechwan, Honan, Kurechow, Shensi, Kansu, Tsinghai, Ninghsia, from the days of Japan's surrender till October 1, 1946, 445 of a total of 589 industrial establishments have been shut down, taking away jobs from over 600,000 workers. A similar picture was to be seen also in other Kuomintang provinces. Thus, in Hankow by October, 1946, there was a shut-down of 90% of Chinese tobacco and 75% of Chinese cotton textile factories. In Canton, from February to August, 1946, 76 cigarette factories were closed out of a total of 99. Canton was flooded with American cigarettes with the "Truman" trademark, which were being flown in on American planes and ships and were, as a rule, not subject to any customs duties. Under the pressure of American competition Chinese production was being curtailed. The production of tea in China in 1947 was only 66,000 tons or only 18% of the average annual production for 1933-37; the export of tung oil is only one-half of pre-war; cotton production fell by 35%; out-

put of electric power, by 52%. In 1946 coal production in China was only 45% of pre-war; antimony—3%; wolfram—22%; lead—15%.⁴

The same picture of curtailed local production, closed working establishments, and growing unemployment, may be observed in European countries which have experienced the "beneficent" influence of the "Marshall Plan." As is well known, American monopolists are at present making themselves at home in the Italian market. The result of this has been that Italian industrial production, which by September 1947 had risen to 73% of 1938, fell by September 1948 to 65%. By January 1948 the number of unemployed had risen to 2 million. During 1948 this number continued to grow, reaching the figure of 3 million by September 1948. A resolution on the economic situation in Italy, adopted by the National Council of the Italian Communist Party, stated:

In the economic and social field an acute crisis is developing. . . . The present crisis is characterized primarily by curtailment of production, unabating unemployment, an alarming increase of the deficit in the government's budget, an unfavorable trade balance, an increase in the number of bankruptcies and unpaid promissory notes. . . .

Tremendous difficulties are being experienced by the Belgian economy. The Swiss newspaper, *Neue Zürich*

Zeitung, in its issue of September 8 (1948) states that for several months now the Belgian economy is in the grip of a crisis. Thus, the coal industry of Belgium, under the pressure of American coal exports, has been forced to curtail production. Coal digging in Belgium is only 74% of pre-war output. Two-thirds of the mines are operating at a loss because of reduced production of coal. The coal markets of Europe and Africa have been taken over by the American monopolists. The total number of unemployed in Belgium is growing, totalling 150,000 in August.

"THEORIES" REGARDING EUROPEAN ECONOMY

Academician Varga and his adherents do not see the relationship of the economy in various capitalist countries.

L. Mendelsohn exclaims: "What can there be in common, for instance, between the postwar economic problems of England and Japan? Or between the economic status of the U.S.A., where there is a rapid ripening of the prerequisites of the next crisis of *overproduction*, and the economy of the countries of the European continent which are suffering acutely from *underproduction*?"⁵

The decline in the level of production in the capitalist countries of Europe, the thing which L. Mendelsohn calls "European underproduction," represents a vivid expression of

⁴ *Ibid.*, No. 6, 1948, pp. 16-17.

⁵ Appendix to *World Economy and World Politics*, No. 5, 1947, p. 2.

the contradictions of the capitalist economic system, and is closely connected with the economic expansion of American capitalism and the impoverishment of the working people of Western Europe. This phenomenon is now recognized even by the editor of the British magazine, *The Economist*, Barbara Ward, who writes in her recently published book under the characteristic title of *The West at Bay*. She states pointblank that the capitalist countries of Western Europe "are at present in a stage of serious economic decline." Of course, Barbara Ward cannot properly explain the causes of this economic collapse which predominates in the capitalist countries of Europe. Unfortunately this is also impossible for some of our own economists, as for example Mendelsohn, who are unable to tie together all the loose ends in their analysis of world capitalist economy. European "underproduction" appears to them as in no way connected with American overproduction. In reality, however, these phenomena are most closely connected. European "underproduction" is at present not only, and not so much, a result of the war; the economic decline in European capitalist countries, this "European underproduction" is only the other side of the coin and the result of American overproduction.

The line of thinking of Academician Varga presents the entire picture of the postwar economic situation in capitalist countries in an incorrect light. This viewpoint blurs

the deepest contradictions of capitalism after the war and makes it impossible to evaluate scientifically the contemporary situation of the capitalist world.

Academician Varga and his adherents assure everybody that the American economy is experiencing a "postwar rise" or a "postwar boom." L. Mendelsohn even gives a description of this "boom." He writes:

... The demand is high for both means of production and goods for consumption, prices and profits are rising rapidly; this stimulates the accumulation of reserves of goods, which in its turn still further swells demand. . . , etc.⁶

In this there is only one correct statement, namely, that prices for goods and profits of American monopolists are rising after the war. But this fact could in no way contribute to the increase in the demand for goods; on the contrary, it narrows the purchasing power of the masses. Quite clearly, American capitalism could not attain a flourishing state or achieve a postwar upswing. American production of the postwar period not only failed to disclose any upswing, but, on the contrary, declined in comparison with the 1943 level. Five years have gone by since 1943 and three years since the end of the war, and yet industrial production in the U.S.A. both in 1947 and 1948 stands at about the same level of about 80% of 1943. Certain

⁶ *World Economy and World Politics*, No. 11, 1947, p. 58.

branches of industry are at even lower levels. Thus, in 1947 the chemical industry produced only 65% of the 1943 total; the products of the machine-building industry amount to 62%, while production of machine tools was only 22.6% of the maximum wartime level reached in 1942. Thus, in these and many other branches of industry there is now a tremendous chronic situation where basic capital is not utilized to full capacity.

The attack, at present developed by the monopolists on the standard of living of the working class of the U.S.A., the decline in earnings, the increase in unemployment, inflation, all lead to the decline of the purchasing power of the people.

Com. Molotov in his report on the 31st anniversary of the October Socialist Revolution pointed out that the earnings of American workers lag sharply behind the increase in prices, which signifies a considerable worsening in the condition of the working class. According to official data, the number of fully unemployed in the U.S.A. is only slightly over 2 million persons which underestimates the real figure of fully unemployed by at least two-thirds. The

number of partially unemployed, those who do not work a full week, even according to official figures, has already reached 8 million. Naturally, all this cannot fail to bring about a decline in the purchasing power of the working class, a narrowing of the internal market. This is beginning to show up in the figures for retail trade. Thus, the latest news from the U.S.A. tells of the decline in turnover of department stores throughout the country in November of 1948 in comparison with November of 1947.

On the other hand, the external expansion of American capital leads in the long run to the narrowing of foreign markets for the U.S.A. The "Marshall Plan" is an invention of the dealers of Wall Street, who were confronted after the war by countries ruined by the war. The "purchasing power" of these countries is being supported for a time by American credits. This is clearly evident from the unfavorable trade balance of these countries. The relation between imports and exports in 1946 and 1947 is presented in the following table (in millions of American dollars):⁷

⁷ *Vnesbnyaya Torgovlia*, No. 5, 1948, p. 33.

Countries	1946		1947	
	Import	Export	Import	Export
England	5,230	3,877	7,202	4,582
France	2,566	852	2,911	1,788
Italy	994	287	1,900	778
Belgium-Luxembourg	1,199	677	1,933	1,405
Holland	817	306	1,606	702
China	746	152	756	219
U.S.A.	4,818	9,502	5,739	14,475

This table shows the clearly expressed unfavorable trade balance of the European capitalist countries and the favorable balance of the U.S.A. attained by means of credit-trading. But the financial enslavement of the European countries signifies that it will be necessary for them to pay up their loans and interest on these loans. And this inevitably brings to the fore the question of increasing more than ever exports from European countries and of their cutting down their imports. In other words, this very trade based on credit leads inevitably to a sharpening of the struggle for markets, to the narrowing of the export market for the U.S.A.

The penetration of American capital into other countries inevitably means the greater exploitation of the working people of those countries, the lowering of their standard of living, the reduction of the purchasing power of the population. Present-day "Marshallized" Italy may serve as a vivid example. Parallel to the enormous increase of unemployment in that country, there is taking place a sharp reduction in the earnings of employed workers. The norms of bread distribution are very low. Prices for bread and macaroni, sold by coupons only, were raised by 50% beginning August 1, 1948, while prices of other items of food rose by 40%. Rents have increased by 250-1000% over 1945. As a result of all this the purchasing power of the Italian people, which even before the

war was considered the lowest in Europe, was decreased by another 50%. As pointed out by the newspaper *Momento*, the living standard of the Italian people at present "does not exceed the living standard of the people of India." Such are the results of "Marshallization."

To this must be added the fact that the working people of the European capitalist countries are increasingly beginning to feel the weight of the tax burden connected with the increase in military budgets and the necessity of payments on loans and interest to the U.S.A. In his report to the XIV Party Congress, Comrade Stalin, noting that Europe had then fallen into financial bondage to the U.S.A., pointed out that payments on loans and interest to the U.S.A. bring with them an increase of the tax burden for the population of European countries, worsening conditions for the working people. The enslavement of Europe by American capital and the worsening in this connection of the working people of the European countries is taking place on an even larger scale after World War II than it did after World War I.

U.S.A. DECLINE IN FOREIGN TRADE IN 1948

All this is already reflected in the condition of the world market at the present time. World exports after the war reached their highest point by the middle of 1947, following which they began to contract. It is significant that U.S.A. exports for the first

nine
9.41
with
same
14%
Clau
"is
ance
wor
dem
whic
rest
cred
of t
supp
brin
the
clin
whic
wor
T
slav
capi
tries
quer
can
arou
ples
free
stru
the
peri
an
a n
crisi

STA

T
the
well

nine months of 1948 amounted to 9,413 million dollars, as compared with 10,941 million dollars for the same period of 1947, a decline of 14%. This reduction, notes Henri Claude in the weekly journal *Action*, "is witness to the growing disturbance of the equilibrium between world supply on the one hand and demand for goods on the other, which the Americans have tried to restore in vain by means of providing credits for Europe. The disturbance of the equilibrium between world supply and demand must inevitably bring about, in the countries under the imperialist system, a sharp decline in industrial activity, a decline which will signify the beginning of a world economic crisis."

The "Marshallization" and enslavement by American monopoly capital of European and other countries also has definite political consequences. The penetration of American capital into other countries arouses the indignation of their peoples, activates their struggle for their freedom and independence. This struggle, as it develops, brings about the narrowing of the sphere of imperialist exploitation and represents an important factor in accelerating a new and still deeper economic crisis in capitalist countries.

STALIN ON WAR PRODUCTION

Thus, there remains the factor of the "military demand." But, as is well known, it is not possible to in-

crease endlessly the military budget, the army and the production of war goods under peace-time conditions. Comrade Stalin in his report to the 18th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, in noting the importance of military preparations for the economy of capitalist countries, pointed out that such preparations can delay somewhat the setting in of the crisis in the aggressive countries, but not avert it.

For, what does placing the economy of a country on a war footing mean? It means giving industry a one-sided, war direction; developing to the utmost the production of goods necessary for war and not for consumption by the population; restricting to the utmost the production and especially the sale of articles of general consumption — and consequently, reducing consumption by the population and confronting the country with an economic crisis.*

Thus, a survey of the postwar economic situation in the U.S.A. shows very clearly the inglorious failure of all sorts of attempts to picture the economic development of the U.S.A. in the postwar years as a peculiar sort of new "prosperity," to embellish American capitalism, to picture it as free of anarchy of production, crises, unemployment. The postwar economic development of the U.S.A. proves once again the Marxist proposition that the development of capitalism can proceed only along the path of crises and catastrophes.

* Joseph Stalin, *Leninism: Selected Writings*, International Publishers, p. 437—Ed.

Comrade Molotov in his report on the 31st Anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution said:

There are capitalist countries where much wealth and human experience have been accumulated, where there are natural resources and much else. But

the obsolescent capitalist system itself, with its private ownership and anarchy of production, and the social and political antagonisms and crises which rend it, doom these countries to instability and catastrophic slumps, to periodical shocks and revolutionary upheavals.

"The American social system, despite all its present seeming strength, is a blood brother to the decaying capitalist system of Europe and Asia, and it is subject to the same basic laws of economic and political development that have flung the old world capitalism into its present ruinous plight. Our country, too, is involved in the deepening general crisis of capitalism. American workers, therefore, must necessarily start to study our capitalism through and through and, in the light of Marxist-Leninist science, begin to orientate upon the socialist perspective that is becoming so obviously needed in the rest of the world."

William Z. Foster, *American Trade Unionism*, p. 349.

[Pu
tions,
the M
with
can-A
unani
Natio
nist P

[Ta
menta
the I
Amon
ple, t

RESO

THE
of the
States
of Ar
with
requir
by our
lem.
ing o
presse
in lin
icy, w
the fo
I. T

The Mexican-Americans—Their Plight and Struggles

[Published below are two resolutions, dealing with the Conditions of the Mexican-American People and with Party Work Among the Mexican-American People, which were unanimously adopted at the 14th National Convention of the Communist Party, U.S.A., August 3, 1948.

[To provide a basis for the implementation of the first task listed in the Resolution on Party Work Among the Mexican-American People, the Editors of Political Affairs

also present below, as the preliminary to other projected articles, an extensive study of the history of struggle, traditions and the present economic, social, and political status of the Mexican people in the Southwest. This survey was compiled from material prepared by the Mexican-American Commission of the Communist Party in Los Angeles County, and by Comrades Arthur Bary and Pat Bell of Colorado.—Editor.]

RESOLUTION ON PARTY WORK AMONG THE MEXICAN-AMERICAN PEOPLE

THE SPECIAL historical development of the Mexican people in the United States as a conquered people, victim of American imperialist expansion, with close ties to Latin America, requires a new and special approach by our Party to the Mexican problem. In order to assist in the building of the Party among this oppressed section of the working class, in line with our concentration policy, we undertake to carry through the following tasks:

1. That the Party undertake dis-

cussions of the position of the Mexican people in the Southwest, with the object of arriving at a scientific formulation of this question.

2. That the National Committee take steps to see that pertinent current literature be made available in the Spanish language, and that material be produced dealing with the Mexican-American question, as well as with Mexico and the Latin-American countries in the Spanish and English languages.

3. That the National Committee

make the necessary arrangements for the holding of schools in the Southwest for the training of Mexican cadres.

4. That the Party undertake a struggle for the \$1.00 minimum wage for all migratory workers, including Mexican nationals, and the extension of social security and unemployment insurance to agricultural workers.

5. That the Party pledge full support to the developing movement of Amigos de Wallace and the newspaper *Liberacion*.

6. That the National Committee shall assist in the coordination of effective work among the Mexican people.

7. That anti-Mexican ideology in

every walk of life: cultural, political, economic and social, must be vigorously combated as an expression of national chauvinism and part of the imperialist drive against the Latin-American people for their subjection and oppression.

8. That we conduct a struggle in all trade unions to integrate and promote into leadership Mexican-American trade unionists, and for a program of struggle against discrimination in hiring and upgrading.

9. That we increase our activities in the struggle for civil rights, including the fight against police brutality, deportations, and all other violations of the Bill of Rights.

RESOLUTION ON THE CONDITION OF THE MEXICAN-AMERICAN PEOPLE

THE COMMUNIST PARTY condemns the ruthless economic, political and social suppression of the Mexican-American people in the Southwest. The plight of the Mexican-American people, whose subjugation by foreign powers dates back several hundred years before the American conquest of this area, which constituted two-thirds of the Republic of Mexico, can be compared in some respects to the oppression suffered by the Negro people in the South.

The four to five million Mexican-

American people, as the largest national group in the Southwest, are also the most exploited. They comprise large sections of the basic industrial workers of the Southwest and Southern California, in some areas the majority, and comprise the majority of agricultural workers.

The inferior status—economic, political and social—that their conquerors have brutally forced upon the Mexican people, is shown in the fact that 90 per cent live in sub-standard homes, and their infant mortality rate

is one-third higher than the rest of the population. Their tuberculosis rate exceeds all other sections of the population put together, and the average wage paid to the Mexican-American worker is below 40 cents an hour.

"No Mexicans Served" signs are common in towns throughout the Southwest. Recently Mexican-American workers living in Texas who wanted to leave to go to higher wage states were prevented from leaving by the peon-minded bosses of Texas, through use of the State Rangers. Police brutality, which includes wanton murder, such as the Salcido case in Los Angeles, is becoming a storm-trooper pattern. Discrimination in housing, health and education is their common lot.

There is a noticeable increase in attacks upon the Mexican people and their rights. There is an increase in anti-Mexican stereotype and caricature over the radio, in movies and in songs, portraying the Mexican people as lazy, shiftless and generally inferior, the most recent example of this being the song, "Mariana."

These intensified attacks upon the civil rights, living standards, culture and general well-being of the Mexican people is part of the increased drive of Wall Street for imperialist domination of the world, especially Latin America. American imperialism considers Latin America as its special domain of exploitation and moves as rapidly as possible to ac-

complish this subjugation, as witness events in Brazil, Chile and other Latin-American countries.

By this race-superiority propaganda and activity American imperialism hopes to poison the minds of the rest of the American people and thus prepare them for use in completely subjugating the Latin-Americans as an inferior people.

The Communist Party pledges itself to undertake an unceasing struggle against all forms of anti-Mexican race-superiority propaganda, for an end to discrimination in employment and for full social and political equality. We pledge ourselves to fight for the election of Mexican candidates to local, state and national office, to demand the political representation they are entitled to and the unqualified right to vote.

We support the Mexican people in their demands for the right fully to use their own language, Spanish, and the freedom to exercise and develop their culture. We further pledge to fight for all Mexican-American veterans to get the full use of G.I. benefits; to undertake a struggle for the extension of Social Security benefits to agricultural workers; and to demand that adequate federal, state and local appropriations be made to launch a real health and housing program in the Mexican communities and for decent wages and working conditions and special housing and educational facilities for migratory workers.

THE PLIGHT AND STRUGGLES OF THE MEXICAN-AMERICANS

The problems of the Mexican people, who constitute the largest national minority in the Southwest and who include the largest group of non-citizens in the United States, have deep social and economic roots that reach back to the time of the Mexican-American War in 1846 and '47. A reactionary, slave-owner dominated United States at that time plotted and carried out an aggressive war against the reactionary, *hacendado*-controlled regime of Santa Ana. In the process, the Mexicans of the entire Southwestern area became a conquered people, subjected to disenfranchisement, expropriation, discrimination and intimidation—conditions which have survived in but slightly changed form down to the present day.

The three million or more Spanish-speaking Americans* living in the Southwest are not just a minority group in the same sense that the Italians or Irish or Poles constitute a minority in this country. Rather, they are characterized by a peculiar historic circumstance, shared only by the Indians and to some degree by the Louisiana French, of being long-established residents taken over, conquered outright, by military forces of the United States. Their background, history, culture, and eco-

nomie contributions are part and parcel of the background, history, culture and economic development of the states of the Southwest, which at one time constituted two-thirds of the area of the Republic of Mexico—namely, California, Arizona, Nevada, New Mexico, Utah, Texas, and Colorado.

The Mexican problem has an important international aspect. It is the internal manifestation of an American imperialist attitude toward all of Latin America. Although the United States was not yet developed to the stage of imperialism, an aggressive, expansionist policy had already been adopted in the interests of the Southern slave-owners, who wished to arrest the wide abolitionist movement that had swept the newly-liberated Hispanic-American countries. American armies penetrated as far as Vera Cruz and Mexico City, forcing Mexico to cede most of her territory.

With the raising of the American flag over the Southwest in 1848, the Mexican people were reduced to an inferior status. A mold of inferiority was cast, into which all later arrivals were forced to fit. The large landed estates were taken from their owners, and false claims of newcomers validated by the courts. The Spanish language was replaced by English as the official tongue, and

* Estimates vary from this figure to as high as five million.

equal civil rights were abolished in practice. Submergence of Mexican culture and influence became a systematic program.

The whole history of the Southwest has been one of discrimination. From the Spanish colonial days, the Indians were treated as inferiors and forced to pay tribute to the Spanish crown, particularly in New Mexico. In the days of the missions, the Indians under the *encomienda* system became serfs of the landowners, were sold with the land, and remained without social equality. The missions themselves turned the tribal peoples into skilled artisans, farmers, laborers, and cowboys, acting as procurer of labor for the feudal landlords as well as long-term pacifier of the Indians, who could not be conquered by arms alone.

This treatment was extended to the Mexicans by the Anglo-Americans when they came into the territory. Like the Indians, they were used as a source of cheap labor and were relegated to virtually the same position of inferiority. While the condition of the toiling masses, both Indian and Mexican, was pitiful enough before the Gold Rush days of '49, under the impact of rapid "Anglo" settlement (long spared the people of New Mexico because of the relative poverty of the region), it became intolerable. There was open season on the Indians, who could be shot for any minor infraction of the "white code"—and were frequently shot on sight.

"Social homicides" and kidnapping of children for sale to the ranchers was a common practice. Mexicans were sold outright on the Barbary Coast of San Francisco in the 1850's. At this time, the practice of lynching Mexicans was becoming a favorite outdoor sport in Northern California, and was far from unknown in Texas. The swift victory over Mexico, the easy conquest of the territory, and the greed for controlling the land, mines, etc., facilitated ruling-class propaganda among Americans of a contempt for things Mexican.

Mexicans had their mining claims jumped, and could find no legal protection. The first session of the California legislature, in 1850, adopted a Foreign Miners' Tax Law, the purpose being to drive "foreigners" (Chinese, Mexicans, etc., although the Mexicans were technically citizens by virtue of the treaty with Mexico) from the mines. Immediately, a systematic campaign to oust Mexicans from their claims was launched. In the same year, a mob of 2,000 American miners descended on the Mexican mining camp in Sonora, California, and "firing at every Mexican in sight" proceeded to raze the town. The rioting lasted a week, with scores of murders and lynchings.

Present-day police brutality against the Mexican people has its historic roots in the armed repression of the Mexican and Indian peoples of this period. For example, in 1856 Deputy

Constable Jenkins killed a Mexican prisoner in the Los Angeles jail. Incensed, the Mexican citizens gathered and shot the deputy. To restore order the "Citizens' Committee" (vigilantes) had to appeal to El Monte for aid. The following year, amidst the lawlessness of the "inter-regnum period," four Mexicans were lynched in the vicinity of Los Angeles; in the city itself, 11 were lynched. In 1867, two were lynched on Spring Street. Actually the annals of 1850 to 1890 are studded with references to lynchings of Mexicans, the last of which was reported in 1892, in Santa Ana—still the center of reaction and anti-Mexican feeling in Orange County.

While the wealthy Mexican landowners usually came to an "understanding" with the American forces, often helping them militarily and welcoming them into their families in order to retain as much of their land as possible, some landowners and the poor in general, both Mexican and Indian elements of the working class, thought differently. They supported in California the brilliant guerrilla campaign of Joaquin Murrieta, giving him food, shelter and protection throughout the state. The Indian leader, Estanislao, or Stanislaus, freed whole regions of the Great Valley from white control, but was repeatedly forced to retreat into the wild canyons of the high Sierra Nevadas. In New Mexico, there were several uprisings against American rule; the Navajos and Apaches

went on the warpath for years; and unrest was felt in other areas as well. Governor Bent of New Mexico was killed in a revolt against American authority, and the conspirators were hanged in the Taos Square.

As more Anglo-Americans entered the territory, the conquest was consolidated. Progressively, the equality of the Spanish language, the right to equal justice in the courts, and early political concessions (participation in local governments, state legislatures, etc.) were taken away. By the 1900's, the Mexican immigrants who poured across the border, in response to thousands of handbills and posters distributed by railroad and agricultural interests, found their plight quite different from the rosy picture painted by the leaflets, which promised high wages and resplendent opportunities. The demand for cheap labor was so great in the Imperial Valley of California, the cotton-raising regions of Arizona, and the sugar-beet fields of Colorado and California, that the railroads offered free transportation into the country, until freight and broken-down passenger trains loaded with hundreds of Mexicans from Central Mexico became a familiar sight in all the railroad centers of the Southwest.

In 1930, due largely to the economic crisis and governmental restrictions, the rate of legal immigration from Mexico dropped from a six-year average of 58,000 per annum to approximately 16,000. Enforcement of the Deportation Law, effec-

tive
ent
W
Unit
dant
work
big i
immi
depo
000
"repa
thing
noctu
tion
1931,
75,000
Score
Texa
crisis,
no ch
patria
relief

THE
ME

The
west
num
indig
the
threat
subje
econ
be co
Negro

a) In

In
Auth
of the

tive July 1, 1927, nearly halted illegal entries.

When the economic crisis in the United States created an over-abundant supply of cheap labor, Mexican workers became "surplus"; the same big interests which once encouraged immigration now loudly demanded deportation. From 1928 to 1933, 160,000 either left California or were "repatriated"—a term covering everything from voluntary departure to nocturnal kidnapping by immigration authorities. Beginning with 1931, repatriation was in excess of 75,000 from Los Angeles alone. Scores of thousands more left from Texas and Arizona. During the crisis, Mexican families on relief had no choice: either they agreed to "repatriation" or they were cut off from relief rolls.

THE CONDITIONS OF THE MEXICAN-AMERICANS

The Mexican people of the Southwest U.S.A., because of their vast numbers and the fact that they are *indigenous to the basic economy of the area*, constitute an economic threat to the ruling class, and are subjected to a form of social and economic oppression which can only be compared to that suffered by the Negro people in the deep South.

a) Income:

In 1939, the Federal Housing Authority estimated that 45 percent of the Mexicans in the United States

earned less than \$550 a year, and 75 percent less than \$950 a year. For a comparison with the rest of the population, the statistics for Denver, Colorado, are revealing: in 1941, the average annual wage for all workers was \$1,420, for Negroes \$720, and for Mexicans \$690. Carey McWilliams found that a Mexican family of 5.6 members working in the beet fields of Colorado, Montana, Wyoming, or Nebraska, the domain of the Great Western Sugar Company monopoly, earns an average of \$259 per year from their labors!

b) Health:

The disastrous effects of the brutal oppression imposed upon the Mexican people can be seen in the death rate from tuberculosis, the scourge of exploited peoples.

According to the Public Health Department of Texas, in 1944 there were over 31 "Anglo" deaths from t.b. for each hundred thousand of the population in Texas, 95 Negro deaths, and 209 Mexican. The pre-war rate for Mexicans in California was 12½ times greater than that of the rest of the population.

Infant mortality rates are also an index of the level of health. In San Antonio, Texas, there were about the same number of live births for both sections of the population in the five years from 1940-44 (21,556 Anglo, 21,436 Mexican). However, in that same period there were about *three times* as many infant deaths among the Mexican people as among the

Anglos: 781 Anglo, 2,295 Mexican.* These Texas figures are typical of the entire area, and no one familiar with the living conditions of the Mexican people can doubt that most of these infant deaths are directly traceable to a lack of decent food, sanitary facilities, and medical care.

c) *Housing:*

The Mexican people in the Southwest are for the most part segregated into slum areas that are running sores on the face of the community. These areas are characterized by unpaved streets and an absence of sewer lines, and are hemmed in by restrictive covenants. The houses are nothing more than shacks. These areas are usually separated from the rest of the town by a river, railroad track, or both. In the Los Angeles City Housing Survey of 1939, more than half of the Mexicans interviewed were found to be living in overcrowded, sub-standard homes in slum areas. With slightly more than three rooms per family, they were more overcrowded than any other group. In the San Antonio Housing Survey of 1937, ninety percent of the Mexican homes were found to be below standard. A housing survey of Denver made by the University of Denver in 1940 shows that "nine out of even ten of Denver's Spanish-speaking population live in houses that are sub-standard." The condi-

tions in the rural areas are equally appalling. From sample studies made of the living conditions of 70,000 sugar-beet workers in Colorado, Montana, Wyoming, most of whom are Mexican, a government specialist worked out the following conclusions: 60,000 live in houses that have no sanitary sewage disposal; 67,000 have no garbage-disposal facilities; 10,000 use ditch water for drinking; 33,000 have no bathing facilities. The housing includes converted railroad cars, chicken sheds, barns and tent camps.*

d) *Education:*

... the 1930 Census revealed that only 52 percent of the Mexican population 5 to 20 years of age was attending school in contrast to 70 percent for the total population of the United States.

Of course, this index of educational opportunity is crude, but it takes on particular significance when augmented by statements such as the following:

"Many communities have not cared whether or not the children of beet laborers attend school, and have made no pretense of enforcing the school attendance laws with regard to them. . . . Mexican sugar-beet workers are isolated from other groups in the community, their children are not permitted to become assimilated into the American culture in the traditional fashion."**

* Isabel Gonzales, *Step-Children of a Nation*, American Committee for the Protection of the Foreign Born.

** "A Demographic Analysis of First and Second Generation Mexican Population of the United States: 1930," *Southwestern Social Science Quarterly*, September 1943.

* Pauline Kibbe, *Latin-Americans in Texas*, University of New Mexico Press, Albuquerque, 1946.

That the practice of discouraging Mexican children from attending school is not confined to the beet-fields can be seen from the Texas figures: In Bexar County, Texas, for example, only 53 percent (37,246) of the Spanish-speaking children of school age were in school.

It is hardly surprising that less than one per cent of the large Mexican population of Colorado ever reaches college.

e) *Effects of National Chauvinism:*

The drive of American imperialism to dominate the world finds its counterpart in *increased national chauvinism at home.*

One of the chief weapons used by the bourgeoisie in the attempt to keep the Mexican people in a status of inferiority is the propagation of ideas of racial superiority, of contempt for all things not "American." This growing wave of chauvinism is manifested in the

... increase in anti-Mexican stereotype and caricature over the radio, in movies and in songs, portraying the Mexican people as lazy, shiftless and generally inferior, the most recent example of this is the song "Manana." (From the Party Convention Resolution on the Conditions of the Mexican-American People.)

The propagation of this ideology results in sanctioned beatings and killings by the police. In his foreword to the Civil Rights Congress

pamphlet *Justice for Salcido*, Carey McWilliams says:

Formerly the social suppression of the Mexican people was maintained in this state by periodic lynchings: the first person lynched in California was a Mexican and the last lynching of a Mexican in Southern California occurred in Santa Ana, in 1890, when one Francisco Torres was lynched from a telegraph pole. In this case, however, the application of force through lynchings was abandoned years ago as being too crude and, also, too dangerous a device. The new method substituted for lynchings involves what is known as "police brutality," killings, beatings and other acts of violence protected from community censure and condemnation by the dogma that police officers can do no wrong and that the "arm of the law" must be upheld at any cost.

The youth have been particular victims of these brutal attacks: 13-year-old Eugene Montenegro, killed by a Los Angeles deputy sheriff in July 1946; a 16-year-old honor student, Adolfo Miranda, killed by the police of Phoenix, Arizona, in the summer of 1947; Augustin Salcido, 17 years old, killed by the police of Los Angeles, March 10, 1948; and Charles White, decorated World War II veteran of La Junta, Colorado, killed in a restaurant while demanding his right to be served. These tragic cases are but a few of the incidents in a countless series of beatings and shootings.

f) *Deportations:*

Another weapon used against the

Mexican people is the constant threat of deportation. While this is primarily used against the more recent arrivals, it acts as a means of terrorizing the whole community. As Isabel Gonzales indicates:

. . . the threat of deportation has served as a very effective weapon to keep the Mexican people as a whole in bondage, because as soon as a leader arises among them, deportation proceedings are immediately used to remove him from such leadership—witness the case of Humberto Silex [former regional director of the Mine, Mill, and Smelter Workers' Union and leader of the Mexican-American people in the Southwest—Ed.] whose defense your Committee (American Committee for the Protection of the Foreign Born) has already taken up. The case of Refugio Martinez, of Chicago, a leader of the United Packinghouse Workers of America, is another example.

The extent to which this weapon is used can be seen from the following figures. In the fiscal year ending

July 1948, of the 217,000 people deported by the U.S. Immigration Department, 207,000 were Mexican! The practice of "overlooking" the illegal importation of large numbers of Mexicans during the harvesting seasons, with subsequent deportation when the season is over, has been very profitable to the capitalist farmers, as witness John Nance Garner of Texas, testifying before a Senate Committee in 1928:

The seasonal Mexicans in our territory do a kind of labor that no others are willing to do. . . . I can mention two counties down there on the border that have increased in taxing value in the past two decades from \$3,000,000 to \$88,000,000. That increase would not have been brought about if we had had an immigration quota to apply to Mexico.*

[*The traditions and present status of the struggles of the Mexican-American people will be dealt with in the concluding section.—Editor.*]

* Charles P. Loomis, *Informal Groupings in a Spanish-American Village*, U. S. Department of Agriculture.

by Dr

THE
LU

THE
Marin
than
neighb
tempt
ion ar
native
that t
repres
history
eviden
more
ing to
nothin
maneu
Rico
vantag
nor, n
leader
any st
ing th

THE
MALuis
the ma* Pres
Cuba.

The Situation in Puerto Rico

by Dr. Juan Marinello*

THE INAUGURATION OF LUIS MUNOZ MARIN

THE INAUGURATION of Luis Muñoz Marín has exposed with more clarity than ever, the true situation in our neighboring island. Through the attempts to confuse continental opinion and the efforts to convince the native population and foreigners that the exaltation of Muñoz Marín represents a liberating step in the history of Puerto Rico, it is clearly evident that the costly ceremony—more than a million dollars, according to those who know—has been nothing more than an imperialist maneuver on a large scale. Puerto Rico has neither gained a real advantage by having a native Governor, nor has the exaltation of the leader of the Popular Party meant any step in the direction of liberating that unfortunate island.

THE REAL POSITION OF MARIN'S PARTY

Luis Muñoz Marín is president of the majority political party of Puerto

Rico. The undeniable support of numerous insular masses, as well as the skillful demagogy of its leader, has frequently misled some American observers as to the real character of the Popular Democratic Party. The task achieved in the months which followed its first electoral victory led to the assumption that this party was essentially good and of a caliber that could serve the Puerto Rican nation. We have carefully analyzed the question. It is interesting, because if the party of Muñoz Marín does not have the indispensable qualities to advance Puerto Rico toward a free and prosperous life, the presence of its leader in the *Fortaleza** will not help but rather hinder the liberation of his people.

The heart of the question is this: to define if the Popular Party is, in its basic orientation, a liberating, anti-imperialist force; or if, on the other hand, it is a basically colonialist entity and, therefore, incapable of achieving stable benefits and opening a firm path toward political and economic redemption of Puerto

* President of the Popular Socialist Party of Cuba.

* *Fortaleza*—Puerto Rican Governor's palace. (Translator's note.)

Rico. A reliable analysis of the question forces us to answer in the negative.

The party of Muñoz Marín, according to the well-worded definition of the Puerto Rican Communist Party, has as the basis of its activities, the following premises:

1. The political relationship between the government of Puerto Rico and of the United States is completely undesirable.

2. But the economic relation between Puerto Rico and the United States is not.

3. Therefore, it is necessary to change the political relationship without destroying the economic relation.

Several statements of Muñoz Marín illustrate clearly this false thesis. On one occasion he expressed himself: "The political status is, in the peculiar case of Puerto Rico, a political problem. It is a political problem of the greatest importance. It is worth taking all steps to solve. But it is not, as in other places, an economic problem. Furthermore, to solve the political status, if it is not done properly, can result in the creation of a new economic problem, aggravating that which already exists." And another time he said, "Independence or statehood, whenever one or the other is established, is going to cost the people of Puerto Rico many millions of dollars."

To give a concrete explanation of his assertion, Muñoz Marín continu-

ally refers to what, according to him, is the privileged position of the Puerto Rican economy; in that the products of the island do not have to pay United States custom duties: "The millions that will have to be paid out to U.S. customs," he says, "will be the same millions that will not be available for schools, health, roads, old age pensions, wages, employment opportunities, industrialization. . . ." And persisting in his argument, he claims: "The local market of Puerto Rico ends in San Francisco, California." And making his hypothesis sound like a principle, he goes so far as to claim: "The best possible economic position for a small country is to have free access for its products in the greatest and richest market of the world, that market being protected against the competition of other countries."

In the first place, it is absurd to maintain that an economic reality can be understood separate and distinct from a political situation. If things were as Muñoz Marín paints them, the independentist ideal would have only a sentimental value, which would make it respectable, but neither urgent nor timely. Fortunately, each day makes it clearer that Puerto Rico needs its independence precisely in order to solve its grievous economic situation.

If the economic reality of Puerto Rico were even supportable, the arguments of Muñoz Marín might have some value. But facts, as al-

ways,
What
perat
from
puts t
cisco?
bread,
The
people
worst
hemis
direct
an exh
Puerto
in its
gogic
sults o
Marín
parent
not ne
cation
later, r
is also
the ba
centur
ganize
interes
ests o
Theref
certain
enjoy
on the
part o
would
truth
But r
groups
pense
ard of
really

ways, are more powerful than words. What do the underfed, wretched, desperate people of Puerto Rico get from this startling privilege which puts their local market in San Francisco? Too much market for so little bread, we might say.

The undisputable truth is that the people of Puerto Rico suffer the worst economic situation of the hemisphere because they are most directly and completely oppressed by an exhaustive colonial structure. The Puerto Rican problem has to be seen in its actual roots, without demagogic subterfuges. The practical results of the economy which Muñoz Marín applauds and defends are apparent in its actual effects. But it is not necessary to stop at the ramifications; although, as we shall see later, the leader of the Popular Party is also incorrect in this. The root, the basic point, is that for half a century, Yankee imperialism has organized an economy favorable to its interests and contrary to the interests of the Puerto Rican people. Therefore the sugar corporations and certain groups connected with them enjoy exceptional benefits. If we look on those entities and groups as a part of the Puerto Rican reality, it would appear that there is some truth in what Muñoz Marín says. But there is not, because those groups live and prosper at the expense of causing the lowest standard of living for the masses who really inhabit the country.

We said that Muñoz Marín is also incorrect in the ramifications. We want to express that the much praised free trade between Puerto Rico and the United States is a fallacy. Basically the rationalizations in this respect are linked with colonial submission. There is some of that sad pride which the serfs felt when they carried the litter of a great lord. Mr. Muñoz Marín, he says, is proud that his people can do business without tariff restrictions "in the greatest and most prosperous market of the world." It is a market, without a doubt, but for those who control it, not for those who suffer it, for the United States, not for Puerto Rico. This is so certain, that if we ask a New York sugar magnate among those who buy sugar from the island if he is satisfied with the existing freedom, he would say yes. It is obvious that a *jibaro* from *Guanica** would not say the same.

For free trade between two countries to be fruitful, it has to be based—as history and current events have amply shown—on a plane of equality. If Puerto Rico could to some extent negotiate with the United States, we might admit some advantage. But when a stronger entity imposes a relation of mother-country to a colony, the pretended equality is nothing more than opening a path to aggravating the servitude of the subjected country. We have today

* *Jibaro*—typical Puerto Rican peasant.—Tr.; *Guanica*—typical small town in the sugar regions of Puerto Rico.—Tr.

an impressive proof: What else but this false equality does the United States want for all of Latin America, through the Clayton Plan? When a great power has to dispose quickly of its industrial surpluses it resorts to these deceitful proceedings. What is of importance to it, above everything else, is that the lands of a colonial economy should be "part of the motherland," zones dominated by its economic force, without competitors or rivals. And the great power embraces like a bear, the kind that kills with affection. What the government of the United States is trying to do with the Latin-American nations is similar to what it has done in the case of Puerto Rico. If Puerto Rico had not undergone, in fifty years of Yankee colonialism, an uninterrupted trail of oppressions, vexations, and miseries, there would be at least room to study the thesis of the Popular Party. It is the facts that destroy the unscientific position of the party of Muñoz Marín.

The decision of imperialism to make of Latin America a great free market subject to its convenience, is not a secret thing, nor even disguised. It was none other than Mr. William L. Clayton, speaking last June 15 at the Economic Institute of the United States Chamber of Commerce, who said: "The productive capacity of the United States in the industrial field is equal to the rest of the world combined. We need to import from all parts of the world

every kind of raw materials to feed our vast productive machine. In metals and minerals, we only have enough coal and one or two more of these items. Our rapid growth and prosperous population needs a variety of articles. Much of our basic industrial and agricultural activity works so effectively that enormous surpluses compel us to find markets abroad. We have much to gain and nothing to lose in a great development of exchange of products and services in all the world, a result which can only appear with the return of multi-lateral commerce and without discrimination." These words of Mr. Clayton are the best support for the opinions and purposes of Muñoz Marín and his party.

THE CORRECT POSITION

Only a Marxist evaluation of the case of Puerto Rico offers a just solution. The island of Hostos¹ saw the liberating process which expressed itself in Lares,² interrupted with the establishment of the Yankee Military Government.³ The thesis of Baldorioty,⁴ as Cesar Andreu⁵ has pointed

¹ Eugenio Maria de Hostos—19th century Puerto Rican revolutionary writer and philosopher.—Tr.

² Grito de Lares—name given to Betances' revolt, which began in the village of Lares, Puerto Rico.—Tr.

³ Yankee military government—set up when U.S. took Puerto Rico from Spain after the Spanish-American war in 1898.—Tr.

⁴ Roman Baldorioty de Castro—Reformist politician, educator, and leader of the Autonomist party.—Tr.

⁵ Cesar Andreu—President of Puerto Rican Communist Party.—Tr.

out, replaced the clear and correct liberating concept of Betances.⁶ For half a century the island has suffered a domination directed not only toward exploiting its riches but also toward molding the minds of the people to its advantage. The immediate and apparent improvement, brought about by the great increase in sugar production, fooled a good part of the population of the island, and the material improvement of the principal cities was for many an indication of a stable, general, and progressive prosperity.

The retreat, the confusion, the vacillating way in which the Puerto Rican masses have moved throughout the colonial period must not be viewed as the reactionary critics see them—a reflection on the racial or personal characteristics, but rather as the inevitable effects of one of the most deceiving and cruel dominations. Any country of the world whatever, subjected to equal pressures, would have suffered identical confusions. That explains why the Popular Party obtained a good many votes in the last elections, although fewer than in previous ones.

The imperialist representatives have known how to use the class contradictions in Puerto Rico and have found suitable means for directing the struggles of the working class

and the people away from the path of liberation of the island. Outside of insignificant exceptions, the Puerto Rican proprietors and businessmen have been and are for the continuation of the colonial set-up and, divided into various political factions, are expending their energies and skills toward the end of impressing on the minds of the people that the dependence of the island on the government of Washington is an unchangeable reality and that through it they can achieve as much or more than American countries, with an independent personality, obtain. Muñoz Marín is today the most notorious servant of this faction of rich Puerto Ricans who think, for the development of their businesses, not in terms of a healthy and growing island, but rather in terms of the occasional crumbs which imperialist corporations throw them.

The question, therefore, becomes much clearer. If Muñoz Marín is the head of a colonialist party, if he represents the common interest of the sugar corporations and of the native bourgeoisie, controlled by imperialism, his promotion to the Governorship of the island can only signify the extension of the political and economic agony of Puerto Rico. Because of this indisputable anti-Puerto Rican policy, we denounce and fight the policy of the Popular Democratic Party and its cunning and dulling leader.

⁶Dr. Ramon Betances—Physician who organized an unsuccessful revolt against Spanish rule in September 1868.—Tr.

The solution of the case of Puerto Rico cannot be, however, the achievement of a nominal and romantic independence, ignoring the economic needs of the island. It is necessary to understand the task in all its aspects, as a case of national liberation, that is to say full self-determination to control insular affairs, to solve for the good of the masses and of the nation all the questions which Puerto Rico confronts as a people. Therefore the assertion of the Communist Party of Puerto Rico is correct and adequate: "The struggle for political independence is the only real solution for the economic liberation of Puerto Rico." This thesis is impeccable: without independence, without the breaking of the colonial link with the government of Washington, imperialism will maintain its umbilical cord and by this means it will carry out on the island, through its servants, all its oppressive and exploitative policies. But the breaking of this relation, the conquest of this independence, has to be a conscious and united drive of all the national factors of the island toward an indispensable economic transformation and liberation of the island. This struggle requires a sincere and firm struggle against imperialism, and therefore the parties identified with imperialism, such as that of Muñoz Marín, are not competent to carry this struggle to its conclusion.

THE VICTORY OF MUÑOZ MARÍN, AN ACCOMPLISHMENT OF IMPERIALISM

We have recognized that the party of Muñoz Marín, in the days following its great previous victory—1944—obtained some benefits for the people, especially for the peasants. Only recently, on the eve of the elections, did it begin to distribute some land again, which is clear proof of the demagogic and political intention. But if, due to these factors, the Popular Party still enjoys important support, it is necessary to admit that only with the sympathy and enormous resources of imperialism can the election of its leader be explained.

One of the oldest concerns of imperialism in Puerto Rico has been to interfere, through legal means, with the development of popular movements against its operation. When things came to an appreciable protest, they have not hesitated to use force; but in general they have preferred to fabricate, with the help of native allies, legislation favorable to their desires of status quo and profit. This slow process of democratic denial has completely identified itself with the election of Luis Muñoz Marín.

The electoral districts in which Muñoz Marín won were controlled by a scandalously undemocratic electoral system. They maintained a di-

vision
more
rise in Pu
Cuba,
votes
large
party,
was,
this s
memb
nate
The
anoth
vents
reflect
rents
mend
partic
law, f
officia
ister
cast i
addit
and s
regist
insur
with
50,135
nation
Puert
popu
000.
incre
of th
rialist
it is
to ac
conti
Islan

vision of electoral districts set up more than thirty years ago, giving rise to the phenomenon, repeatedly in Puerto Rico, and well known in Cuba, that many candidates with few votes are elected, while others with a large vote are defeated. The majority party, the Popular Democratic Party, was, as always, highly favored with this system, maintained by the same members of the P.D.P. who dominated the Congress.

There still exists in Puerto Rico another major obstacle which prevents the elections from accurately reflecting the different political currents of the island; namely, the tremendous difficulties of registering parties. According to the electoral law, for a political party to be placed officially on the ballot, it must register 10 per cent of the total votes cast in the previous election and, in addition, each petitioner must sign and swear before a judge a separate registration form. These barriers are insurmountable. While in Cuba, with almost 5 million inhabitants, 50,135 signatures are required for the national registration of a party, in Puerto Rico, with about half the population, the requirement is 59,000. And the proportion, of course, increases after each election. A proof of the malice with which the imperialists proceed is the fact that, when it is worth their while, they refer to advantages of legislation on the continent and apply them to the Island; nevertheless, they forget that,

with regard to elections, no State in the Union requires as much, proportionately, as does Puerto Rico, for a party to get on the ballot.

If one takes into account that the requirement of swearing before judges is expensive and difficult, and that the judges are, for obvious reasons, inclined to favor the dominant interests, one will have an exact idea of the insurmountable obstacles in the path of the parties faithful to national interests.

When we take into account this accumulation of difficulties to achieve a real expression of popular will, the result of the last elections in Puerto Rico assumes particular significance. While the party of Muñoz Marín dropped from 64 per cent of the voters in 1944 to 61 per cent now; while the Socialist Party, sold out to unpopular interests, dropped from 12 per cent in the past election to 9 per cent now, the Puerto Rican Independentist Party, led by Concepción de Gracia, achieved the support of 10 per cent of the electorate. Whoever is familiar with the force of the official machine—manipulated by Piñero in favor of Muñoz Marín—the clever laws and the inexhaustible economic resources of imperialism, will have to admit that in the last elections in Puerto Rico there is a definite sign of a favorable change. The people are beginning to see clearly that the Popular Party—despite the relative benefits it gave the masses in the past—is funda-

mentally incapable of solving the basic question of the Island, of undertaking a policy which will make the country master of its sovereignty and its economy.

THE NATIVE GOVERNOR,
SIMPLY A DELEGATE OF
THE PRESIDENT OF
THE UNITED STATES

The powerful propaganda, paid for by Washington, has proclaimed to the four corners of the earth that the election of Muñoz Marín, native Governor, implies a considerable advance toward liberation of the Island. It is not difficult to prove the fallacy of this assertion. We see, with the facts before us, how the political command of Puerto Rico continues in the hands of the rulers in Washington.

The functions of the Governor of Puerto Rico are regulated, as is known, by what is called the Organic Act of Puerto Rico. In its Article 12, the Act defines those functions. In its text are expressed things as clear and restrictive as these: "He will be responsible for the faithful execution of the laws of Puerto Rico and of the States applicable to Puerto Rico. . . ." What this means is that the Governor of Puerto Rico *as the agent of the United States government* has to enforce those measures which, emanating from the government of Washington, are ordered to be applied to the Island.

The same article adds that the Governor can put the Island or part of it under Martial Law until he can communicate with the President and know his decision in the matter. That is to say, that in something as essential as public order, the Governor is nothing more than an assistant of the President of the United States.

But there are things of even greater importance in the Organic Act. According to it, the Governor has to report on his Administration annually, or whenever he is asked, to the department of the Washington government which the President designates. It further adds that "he will carry out those other duties and functions which in the fulfillment of the law, the President will delegate to him." And already we see that the law is ultimately in the hands of the President. It is undisputable that the Governor has the status of a delegate of the President of the United States.

But we see what his powers are reduced to, in spite of all the cackling in these days of pompous festivity. Administratively the governor will be assisted by an Executive Council. The members of this consultative entity (Art. 13 of the Organic Act) will have the duties which the Governor assigns them, but with the approval of the President; the reports which the Governor's Council gives will always be transmitted to the President of the United States. As is seen, the Governor is well watched

in his administrative sphere. But this is not the worst. What is more serious, without doubt, is the impossibility of his disposing of official funds. This is up to the Auditor (Art. 20) who, appointed by the President, can control the Governor without the least bit of difficulty.

The Auditor "will examine, adjust, decide, audit and liquidate all accounts and claims relating to taxes or income of the Government of Puerto Rico from any source whatever, and municipal funds proceeding from the floating of bonds; and will examine, audit and liquidate, in accordance with the law and regulations, all expenditures of funds and of property belonging to the Government and to the Municipalities or their dependencies, or which are in a state of bankruptcy. It will carry out the same functions with respect to all branches of the government." It is further provided that the Auditor's jurisdiction over accounts will be exclusive and that his decisions will be final. This is to say that the new native Governor is a prisoner subject to exclusive jurisdiction and to final decisions on no less a matter than the disposition of public monies, and by a functionary appointed by the President of the United States.

Much has been said about the power of Puerto Rico, in the new situation, to make its own laws. We recommend, to end all doubts, the reading of article 34 of the Organic Act. The legislative power does not

exist. With imperial arrogance the Act says that "all laws decreed by the Legislative Assembly of Puerto Rico will be communicated to the Congress of the United States . . . which reserves the right and authority to annul them." The limitation is double. Note: "If the President of the United States approves the bill, he will sign it and it will become law. If he does not approve it, he will return it to the Governor, indicating his disapproval and it will not be law." Can one speak of a new situation, of self-government, when a people can only pass laws which please its oppressor?

But Puerto Rico not only does not make its own laws, but neither does it control its own courts. The incorrectly named Supreme Court — it would be more accurate if this meant the supremacy of Washington—is appointed by the President, with the advice and consent of the Senate of the United States. The judge of the district of Puerto Rico, as the Auditor, are likewise presidential appointments. Can one maintain that justice—which should spring from the heart of the country and serve the country—is in Puerto Rico a national and native thing?

The submission of the native governor reaches the most scandalous extremes. Above him is a typically imperialist personage, a powerful functionary called the Coordinator of Federal Agencies who, according to the law, "will coordinate the ad-

ministration of civil federal functions and activities in Puerto Rico." Said Coordinator, who is really a supervisor of all public functions, "will confer with the Governor," but "will inform the President," according to Article 49 of the Organic Act. His reimbursements, paid by the Puerto Rican people, are on a level with those of the Governor. His function is superior and less restricted, since by the law he is responsible to the President and not to the Governor.

THE ONLY PATH

The election of Muñoz Marín is, therefore, an imperialist accomplishment, a Government grateful to Washington and an effective instrument for the purposes of imperialism. Looking at the base of things, it cannot be otherwise. Is it possible to imagine that when the Government of Truman is doing everything possible to make of the Americas a continent in its service, that it will permit and encourage, in an island which is in its hands, a government that is to any extent a liberating force? To admit this would be as much as failing to understand the heart and purposes of United States imperialism. The people do not want war, but imperialism wants it. And can one imagine for one moment that those who want war, which is the submission of the masses and the ignoring of their rights, can work for their freedom and betterment? Mu-

ñoz Marín is the continuation of the policy of another native, of Jesus Piñero,* who, while he calls the Independentist movement fifth columnist and subversive (*El Imparcial*, Nov. 12, 1948), he invites Yankee corporations to invest in Puerto Rico (Bulletin of the Office of Puerto Rico, August 1948) "because salaries on the island are about one-third lower than those that prevail on the continent." Muñoz Marín wants to maintain, in the service of Yankee enterprise, that advantage; his first decision was to lower the security of the sugar workers to ridiculous amounts.

All this indicates that the solution of the Puerto Rican problem has to come from the action of the masses without compromises with imperialism. Because of this, the unity of the working class is of primary importance, constituting an indestructible nucleus in every struggle for national liberation. In Puerto Rico, as in Cuba, the oppressors have known how to utilize class traitors, divisionists of every kind, in order to weaken this most militant and powerful bastion. The setbacks fomented and maintained by imperialism in the very ranks of the working class have been used with some success; but one would have to be blind not to discover a growing class consciousness and more clarity on the immediate and long-range objectives of the im-

* Jesus Piñero—first native Governor of the Island; appointed by President Truman in the fall of 1946, and inaugurated September 3, 1946.—T.

perial
ences
in the
of the
the B
Wit
unity,
class
munis
of tin
center
the Isl
to sol
imper
class
private
ple, i
and th
tive bo
of the
ty sho
carry
role.
I be
tasks
nist P
tions c
to Rico
questi
The tr
and sh
ceeded
Puerto
people
they e
the ca
trable,
the C

* Bor
Island.—

perialists. The more recent experiences of the Island and developments in the Americas and in other parts of the world are rapidly penetrating the *Borinquen** working masses.

With the growth of proletarian unity, goes the strengthening of its class party, the Puerto Rican Communist Party, which in a short period of time must become an orienting center of the liberation movement of the Island. It is the task of this Party to solidify the indispensable anti-imperialist alliance of the working class with the peasants, public and private employees, professional people, intellectuals, the middle class and the progressive sectors of the native bourgeoisie. The recent advances of the Puerto Rican Communist Party shows that it will know how to carry out so difficult and historic a role.

I believe that one of the primary tasks of the Puerto Rican Communist Party, as of the groups and sections clearly for the freedom of Puerto Rico, is to clarify daily the national question in clear and precise terms. The truth is that the maneuvering and skillful demagogues have succeeded in confusing not only the Puerto Ricans but also many honest people on the Continent. Sometimes they even go so far as to allege that the case of Puerto Rico is impenetrable, singular, and mysterious. In the Cuban magazine, *Bohemia*,

Muñoz Marín, through Jorge Manach, his guest of honor, attempts one of those confusions with a very pseudo-intellectual framework. He insists on the absurd premise that there is a contradiction between political independence and economic prosperity, and writes a rambling thesis in which Puerto Rico is, in his imagination, at the head of political concepts of our time: the leader of the Popular Democratic Party wants to take from the people "the complex that their own destiny is inaccessible, when in the world, colonialism is already disappearing because of these very compromises that are being made, and the nationalities want to assimilate themselves into large blocks of culture and common interests. . . ." It is very difficult to find a better model of demagogic double-talk.

According to the leader of the P. D. P., colonialism is disappearing. And he says this in the days of the murderous fight in Indonesia and the Viet-Nam, and at a time when imperialism hovers wherever they might colonize what they do not already possess. Of course, the names — with which Muñoz Marín plays so maliciously—are not the most important things. It would not seem strange now, if Muñoz Marín in *La Fortaleza*, with the Auditor on one side and the Coordinator on the other, were to decide to frighten the colonial phantom and call Puerto Rico a "Free State," or decree that it should

* *Borinquen*—original Indian name of the Island.—Tr.

be part of "a great national bloc of culture and common interests" with headquarters in Washington. In this way Muñoz Marín would neither cease to be subordinate to the aims of the President of the United States, aims which cannot favor the development of the freedom and economy of the Island, nor could he impede the community of "common culture and interests" which permits the imperialists to enrich themselves with the culture and prosperity which they extract from the colony.

It must be made very clear that what is important is that Puerto Rico should have real freedom to assure its progressive economic development and that this cannot come while its government is determined and sustained by imperialism, whatever the name and the form given to that government. Colonialism, which is political and economic subjugation—which Puerto Rico suffers—does not cease to exist because Muñoz Marín says it has disappeared and been superseded. It will cease to exist when, through the united and liberating action of the masses, Puerto Rico asserts its national rights in the favor of its people. And with regard to fusing the Island in a great bloc of culture and common interests, it is quite clear that that is precisely what the rulers in Washington so fiercely resist through instruments such as Muñoz Marín and his party. To destroy insular culture, to prohibit the use of its own language,

to starve the people, to destroy their energies, to dissipate their resistance, is not to look toward the integration of a bloc of common interests, but rather to work for half a century to make the subjected Island, increasingly each day, vassal and victim of the interests of the great dominating bloc.

INTER-AMERICAN SOLIDARITY

One of the objectives of imperialism has been to keep Puerto Rico isolated from the knowledge and assistance of the peoples of the hemisphere. If from our lands we have seldom looked toward San Juan, from San Juan they have even more rarely looked toward our lands. And now it is clearer than ever that without interfering with the struggle for freedom of each people united action against the common enemies is indispensable.

The strategy of imperialism varies but always leads to the same conclusion. In the Dutch West Indies, they are now trying a farcical Colonial Constitution which would have appeared excellent to our autonomists in Puerto Rico they put a native Governor on the scene; but the real instruments of oppression are kept intact and the channels for future aggressions are kept ready. The pressure of the people forces them to use a variety of ruses, and what the imperialists defend are neither the

form
polit
over
In
facts
very
but a
feel
their
blood
prob
cial a
tion,
ing t
Mexi
the n

forms nor the names, but rather the political and economic domination over the peoples.

In view of this situation, which affects all of us, our sister Island must very clearly see its path to salvation; but all the American countries must feel that the case of Puerto Rico is their own problem, as a painful and bloody part of the whole American problem. There are some very special aspects of the Puerto Rican question, but on the whole they are waging the same battle as in Cuba, as in Mexico, and as in Brazil. Through the native Governor, the Auditor, and

the new Coordinator, runs the same purpose which characterizes the Embassies of the United States and its thousand open and concealed agencies from Nuevo Laredo to Patagonia. Puerto Rico must fight its battle; but all of democratic, popular, and progressive America—without excluding the people of the United States—must support the cause of Puerto Rican liberation as their own. . . .

Text from *Fundamentos* (Havana), March 1949. Translated by Leonard D. Harris.

From the Treasury of Marxism

ON THE STRUGGLE FOR THE SHORTER WORKING DAY

by Karl Marx

[*The First of May, historic day of working-class struggle and manifestation of unity and militancy, originated in Chicago in 1886 in the glorious. Haymarket struggle for the eight-hour day. Today, after decades of bitter struggle during which the barons of capital continually resorted to systematic force and violence and to frame-up "justice," the eight-hour day has been won by the decisive section of the American working class. This victory—which is not yet enjoyed by all American workers, however—has been more than compensated by the capitalists in the form of intense and brutal speed-up, Taylorism, etc. Hence the growing realization by American workers—voiced most boldly and clearly by the Left-progressive forces in the unions—that the thirty-hour week must be a pressing immediate demand. The struggle for the thirty-hour week without reduction in pay assumes added significance as the economic crisis develops. It can and should become a key issue for uniting the rank and file of the whole labor movement in the struggle against speed-up, unemployment, the war program of the Administration,*

and ultimately against the capitalist system of exploitation itself.

[*The excerpt from Marx which follows provides the theoretical basis of the struggle for the shorter working day.—Editor.*]

THE CAPITALIST has bought the labor-power at its day-rate. To him its use-value belongs during one working day. He has thus acquired the right to make the labor work for him during one day. But what is a working day?

At all events, less than a natural day. By how much? The capitalist has his own views of this *ultima Thule*, the necessary limit of the working day. As capitalist, he is only capital personified. His soul is the soul of capital. But capital has one single life impulse, the tendency to create value and surplus-value, to make its constant factor, the means of production, absorb the greatest possible amount of surplus-labor.

Capital is dead labor, that, vampire-like, only lives by sucking living labor, and lives the more, the more labor it sucks. The time during which the laborer works, is the time during which the capitalist consumes the

labor-power he has purchased of him.

If the laborer consumes his disposable time for himself, he robs the capitalist.

The capitalist then takes his stand on the law of the exchange of commodities. He, like all other buyers, seeks to get the greatest possible benefit out of the use-value of his commodity. Suddenly the voice of the laborer, which had been stifled in the storm and stress of the process of production, rises:

The commodity that I have sold to you differs from the crowd of other commodities, in that its use creates value, and a value greater than its own. That is why you bought it. That which on your side appears a spontaneous expansion of capital, is on mine extra expenditure of labor-power. You and I know on the market only one law, that of the exchange of commodities. And the consumption of the commodity belongs not to the seller who parts with it, but to the buyer, who acquires it. To you, therefore, belongs the use of my daily labor-power. But by means of the price that you pay for it each day, I must be able to reproduce it daily, and to sell it again. Apart from natural exhaustion through age, etc., I must be able on the morrow to work with the same normal amount of force, health and freshness as today. You preach to me constantly the gospel of "saving" and "abstinence." Good! I will, like a sensible saving owner, husband my sole wealth, labor-power, and abstain from all fool-

ish waste of it. I will each day spend, set in motion, put into action only as much of it as is compatible with its normal duration and healthy development. By an unlimited extension of the working day, you may in one day use up a quantity of labor-power greater than I can restore in three. What you gain in labor I lose in substance. The use of my labor-power and the spoliation of it are quite different things. If the average time that (doing a reasonable amount of work) an average laborer can live, is 30 years, the value of my labor-power, which you pay me from day to day is $\frac{1}{365} \times 30$ or $\frac{1}{10950}$ of its total value. But if you consume it in ten years, you pay me daily $\frac{1}{10950}$ instead of $\frac{1}{3650}$ of its total value, *i.e.*, only $\frac{1}{3}$ of its daily value, and you rob me, therefore, every day of $\frac{2}{3}$ of the value of my commodity. You pay me for one day's labor-power, whilst you use that of 3 days. That is against our contract and the law of exchanges. I demand, therefore, a working day of normal length, and I demand it without any appeal to your heart, for in money matters sentiment is out of place. You may be a model citizen, perhaps a member of the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, and in the odor of sanctity to boot; but the thing that you represent face to face with me has no heart in its breast. That which seems to throb there is my own heart-beating. I demand the normal working day because I, like every other seller,

demand the value of my commodity. . . .

Hence is it that in the history of capitalist production, the determination of what is a working day presents itself as the result of a struggle, a struggle between collective capital, *i.e.*, the class of capitalists, and collective labor, *i.e.*, the working class.

In the United States of North America, every independent movement of the workers was paralyzed so long as slavery disfigured a part of the Republic. Labor cannot emancipate itself in the white skin where in the black it is branded. But out of the death of slavery a new life at once arose. The first fruit of the Civil War was the eight hours' agitation, that ran with the seven-leagued boots of the locomotive from the Atlantic to the Pacific, from New England to California. The General Congress

of Labor at Baltimore (August 16th, 1866) declared: "The first and great necessity of the present, to free the labor of this country from capitalistic slavery, is the passing of a law by which eight hours shall be the normal working day in all States of the American Union. We are resolved to put forth all our strength until this glorious result is attained." At the same time, the Congress of the International Working Men's Association at Geneva, on the proposition of the London General Council, resolved that "the limitation of the working day is a preliminary condition without which all further attempts at improvement and emancipation must prove abortive. . . . the Congress proposes eight hours as the legal limit of the working day."

[*Capital*, Kerr Edition, Volume I, pp. 257-259, 329.]

ANNOUNCEMENT

The next issue of Political Affairs (June) will be devoted in its entirety to the struggle for Negro rights and national liberation, and against white chauvinism in the context of its significance for the present day. The issue will include a series of articles of a wide range dealing with economic, political and social aspects of this struggle. Our readers are urged to take extra measures to ensure a very considerable expansion in the circulation of this special issue.

TIMELY PAMPHLETS ON VITAL EVENTS

- THE NORTH ATLANTIC PACT—FOR PEACE OR WAR? \$.03
by Abraham Chapman
- WHO PAYS FOR THE COLD WAR? .05
by George Blake
- LABOR'S OWN WILLIAM Z. FOSTER \$.05
by Elizabeth Gurley Flynn
- WHERE IS THE C.I.O. GOING? .10
by George Morris
- FIGHTING WORDS—TWENTY-FIVE YEARS OF THE
"DAILY WORKER" paper: \$1.50; cloth: \$2.50
- THE FEDERAL JURY IS STACKED AGAINST YOU .05
by Marion Bachrach
- THIRTY-ONE YEARS OF THE U.S.S.R. .10
by V. M. Molotov
- WHAT NEXT IN FRANCE? .05
by Maurice Thorez
- SPOTLIGHT ON GERMANY .15
by Paul Richards
- THE "SAVE OUR COUNTRY" RACKET .25
by John L. Spivak

NEW CENTURY PUBLISHERS

832 Broadway, New York 3, N. Y.

Marxist Book Selection for June —

Handbook of Philosophy

Edited by HOWARD SELSAM

This new International volume, translated and adapted from the *Short Philosophical Dictionary*, first published in the U.S.S.R. in 1939, and revised in many subsequent editions since then, sold over two million copies in the Soviet Union.

The *Handbook of Philosophy* is a different kind of dictionary. It is partisan as well as integrated, taking its point of departure from the philosophy of dialectical materialism, and calculated to take the reader ever further into philosophic thought at the same time that it leads him out to progressive action in the real world around us. It is so organically constructed, and contains such cross references that no matter where one begins, one can go from term to term, from concept to concept, until not only is the volume read, but the reader has acquired the foundations of Marxist philosophy.

Among the scientific definitions, ranging in length from a few paragraphs to a few pages, are: Agnosticism — Aristotle — Atheism — Causality — Class (Social) — Cosmos — Darwinism — Deism — Democracy — Dialectics — Dualism — Dogmatism — Engels — Eclecticism — Economic Determinism — Empiricism — Epicurus — Ethics — Fatalism — Formal Logic — Freedom and Necessity — Freudianism — Hegel — Hobbes — Humanism — Idealism — Induction and Deduction — Infinite and Finite — Immanuel Kant — Lenin — Locke — Machism — Marx — Marxism-Leninism — Materialism — Metaphysics — Monism — Naturalism — Negation of the Negation — Pragmatism — Stalin — Theory of Relativity — and scores of others.

Price \$1.50

NEW CENTURY PUBLISHERS
832 Broadway, New York 3, N. Y.

hy

l from
S.S.R.
a, sold

onary.
arture
culated
at the
e real
ntains
e can
t only
ations

rom a
ottle -
ism -
matism
ricism
m and
ism -
hite -
Marx-
Natu-
ulin -

\$1.50