

political

affairs

MARCH 1950 • 25 CENTS

Reprint
DARTMOUTH COLLEGE
MAR 23 1950
LIBRARY

EUGENE DENNIS
ROBERT THOMPSON
GUS HALL
CLAUDIA JONES
ANDER BITTELMAN
PETTIS PEARLY
GILBERT GREEN
WILLIAM WINSTONE
NAT HANE

- [1] Lenin, Stalin and the Mid-Century
- [7] Two Paths for American Labor
- [18] The Coal Miners Lead the Way
- [32] International Women's Day
- [46] The Developing Economic Crisis
- [58] The Civil Rights Mobilization
- [68] Capitalism's Crisis—and Mr. Browder's
- [82] Where the Main Blow Must Be Struck
- [86] An Imperialist Agent's Three Years
in Moscow (*Book Review*)

IMPORTANT NEW TITLES

THE C.I.O. TODAY <i>by George Morris</i>	\$.10
HELL-BOMB OR PEACE? <i>by Joseph Clark</i>	.02
THE COAL MINERS AND YOU <i>by Elmer Felhaber</i>	.03
WORKING CLASS UNITY FOR PEACE <i>by M. Suslov and Others</i>	.25
THE NEGRO PEOPLE AND THE SOVIET UNION <i>by Paul Robeson</i>	.02
F.E.P.C.: HOW IT WAS BETRAYED—HOW IT CAN BE SAVED <i>by Rob F. Hall</i>	.03
THE COMMUNIST TRIAL <i>by George Marion</i>	.50
TITO'S PLOT AGAINST EUROPE <i>by Derek Kartun</i>	.75
THE CITIZEN WRITER: ESSAYS IN DEFENSE OF AMERICAN CULTURE <i>by Albert Maltz</i>	.25

Coming

AFRICA FIGHTS FOR FREEDOM <i>by Alphaeus Hunton</i>	.05
COLD WAR IN THE CLASSROOM <i>by Samuel Sillen</i>	.10

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.

200

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

Lenin, Stalin and the Mid-Century

By Eugene Dennis

STALIN'S 70TH BIRTHDAY and the 26th anniversary of Lenin's death coincide with the half-way mark in the 20th century. Most historians already acknowledge that these two world giants, the teachers and leaders of the international working class, of Communism, have decisively shaped the course of the whole century and social progress.

The opening of the year 1950 is therefore a fitting time to draw up—even if only in the briefest manner—the balance sheet between two paths, two social systems, two world outlooks: the capitalist, on the one hand, and, on the other, the social system and world outlook symbolized by the names *Lenin* and *Stalin*.

On the capitalist side of the ledger appear a number of major entries, made in the past 50 years. At the turn of the century, U.S. capitalism, and with it world capitalism, attained the summit of its development. Having reached the peaks of its ascendant

stage, capitalism in its final monopoly stage—imperialism—started on the path of decline and decay.

By 1914 and the outbreak of the First World War which it engendered, world capitalism was sick beyond hope of permanent recovery; and with the victory of the great proletarian revolution in 1917—it had entered the period of its general crisis. It also suffered a number of serious economic crises, beginning with the panic of 1901 and climaxed by the Great Economic Crisis of 1929-33 which wracked, not only the United States, but the whole capitalist world.

The brutality, rapaciousness, parasitism and fatal sickness of monopoly capitalism in the period following World War I manifested themselves, above all, in barbarous fascism, which in 1933 seized power in Germany. Thus was underscored, once again, the analysis of Lenin that "... politically imperialism is

in general a striving toward violence and reaction." The imperialist Munich policy and "anti-Comintern" rape of Manchuria, Ethiopia, Spain and Czechoslovakia were inevitably followed by the devastation and mass slaughter of World War II.

In the postwar period, Wall Street—heading the camp of imperialism—unable to live without oppression and conquest, seeks to imitate the Hitlerites and to dominate the world. For the last five years, under the smokescreen of "containing Communism," it has intervened and warred against the peoples of Greece, China, Indonesia, Palestine. It has restored, under U.S. control, the cartels and war potential of Western Germany and Japan. It has undermined the national independence and well-being of France and Italy, and strengthened its predatory grip on Latin America, Africa and the Near East.

As 1950 opens, a new economic crisis is maturing in the capitalist world generally, and particularly in the United States—the stronghold of world imperialism. While retarded up till now by huge expenditures for armaments, the Marshall Plan, and the North Atlantic Pact, this new crisis draws nearer and threatens to have more devastating consequences than any of its predecessors. Its development is accompanied by the colossal, extensive and adventurist preparations of Wall Street for a third world war, and thus, too, by the growth of pro-fascist reaction in

our country and its satellite states.

Capitalism, especially in the period of its ascent, enabled mankind to raise considerably the productive forces and to make notable advances in the fields of science, industrial organization and culture. But, as is most dramatically illustrated by the atom bomb, the capitalist system is now capable only of utilizing these achievements for purposes of reaction, destruction and aggressive war.

* * *

On the other side of the ledger, history records the entries made by the camp of peace, national liberation and Socialism—headed by the U.S.S.R.

Here the great event of the turn of the 20th century was the formation of the Bolshevik Party—the party of Lenin and Stalin. Sprung from the historic split with Menshevism, with opportunist- and revisionist-corroded Social-Democracy, which as early as then subordinated the interests of the working class to those of the bourgeoisie—this party of a new type is at once a monument to its founders, and the invincible and enduring instrument for the continuation of their work.

True to the principles of revolutionary Marxism, Lenin and Stalin developed further this universally valid, working-class social science in accord with the new conditions prevailing in the epoch of imperialist wars and proletarian revolutions, and in the period of the victorious

establish
Bolshev
the Oct
Socialis
model
inspired
ful Ma
working
The
volution
national
the wo
of czar
and lar
democr
dictator
rule of
the exp
After
Stalin's
sheviks
pleted
feating
plots
Titoite
nites a
they b
dustry
They
well-b
to new
equali
nation
viet fa
on the
teachi
They
class c
racy in
carried
vances

establishment of Socialism. The Bolshevik Party organized and led the October Revolution, which made Socialism a glorious reality. This model party set an example for and inspired the development of powerful Marxist-Leninist parties of the working class in other countries.

The Great October Socialist Revolution put an end to capitalist and national oppression in one-sixth of the world. It replaced the tyranny of czarism and Russian capitalism and landlordism with working-class democracy, establishing through the dictatorship of the proletariat the rule of the many over the few, of the exploited over the exploiters.

After Lenin's death, and under Stalin's brilliant leadership, the Bolsheviks and the Soviet state completed the victory of Socialism. Defeating all treasonous opposition and plots of the predecessors of the Titoites—the Trotskyites, Bukharinists and other imperialist agents—they built up a Socialist heavy industry and collective agriculture. They raised the living standards, well-being and culture of the people to new heights. They established the equality and friendship of the many nations and peoples within the Soviet family and multi-national state on the basis of the Lenin-Stalin teachings on the national question. They consolidated the new working-class democracy—the highest democracy in the annals of mankind—and carried forward the enormous advances of the Soviet people through

the adoption of the Stalin Constitution.

In the most severe test, the world's first Socialist state—guided by Stalin's unequalled military strategy and national-liberation policies—played the decisive role in the world coalition of states and peoples' resistance movements which defeated the Axis powers in World War II.

Since the end of the Second World War, as a result of the liberating role of the Soviet Union and its glorious Red Army, the oppressed masses of a series of countries in Eastern Europe have entered on this side of the ledger their achievement of People's Democracies, which, as a new form of the dictatorship of the proletariat, have opened up in those countries new paths of transition to Socialism.

Second in historic importance only to the October Socialist Revolution and as a result of that great revolution and the victories of Socialism is the entry recording the liberation of the 450,000,000 Chinese people from centuries of feudal and imperialist oppression; and the establishment, under the leadership of the great Chinese Communist Party, of the new People's Republic of China.

In contrast to imperialism's way of life through reaction and war, on this side of the ledger there is no record—indeed no possibility—of aggression and war incitement, of national enslavement, social regression and obscurantism. In contrast to

monopoly capital's economy of misery for the many amidst plenty for the few, on this side of the ledger there is no record of economic crisis, no entry of millions of unemployed, no threat or possibility of impending depression or economic decline.

On this side of the ledger the people can see that already in the first half of the 20th century Socialism has proved capable of improving upon, and surpassing, the scientific, industrial and cultural achievements of capitalism in its hey-day. And they can see that Stalin symbolizes man's potential power, the power of the working class to lead the nation and to master nature, and to plan and achieve limitless new benefits for his fellow man, for the cause of peace and progress.

Adding up the entries on this side of the ledger we behold the historic phenomenon that 800,000,000 of the world's people now live in states led by Marxist parties, by parties devoted to the principles of Lenin and Stalin—which rule in behalf of the working class and in the interests of the vast majority. This vast camp of peace, democracy and Socialism—headed by the U.S.S.R. and its great leader, Stalin—extends also to hundreds of millions of people in the capitalist and colonial countries whose struggle for peace, social progress and national liberation is led by their own vanguard Communist Party.

The second half of the 20th century dawns on a world in which this

new anti-imperialist camp is powerful enough to prevent another world war, or at the very least can guarantee that should such a war be launched by the war-makers against the will of all the world's peoples it would bring this war to an end in the interests of all peoples, in the interests of a world freed at last from imperialist capitalism, from wars, colonial enslavement, national oppression and fascism.

* * *

This, in sketchy outline, is how things stand between the two paths, the two social systems, the two world outlooks, at the end of the first half of our century. What are the prospects for the next 50 years?

One view of the future was put forward by President Truman. Bypassing the urgent needs of the people in 1950, he holds forth the promise of an income of \$12,000 for the average family at the end of the century—50 years hence. But with this he foresees more "cold war," more power to the American trusts, and he even dreams of re-enslaving the peoples liberated by Socialism and People's Democracy. To Hoover, Taft and Eisenhower, even Truman's "Fair Deal" appears as a "radical utopia." But with or without the \$12,000 average income 50 years from now, the Trumanites and the G.O.P. look forward to an eternity of "free enterprise," that is, to the survival of full sway for monopoly capitalism.

its incre
state of
recurri
sion an
murder
We
view of
of othe
in the c
the Sov
transiti
ministr
whatev
transiti
pleted
cies, a
other c
As f
dently
people
ocratic
and at
in the
now c
all "ex
ican c
are co
strugg
will a
tiers o
end of
them
cialism
Wh
year 2
or pa
work
toward
—dep
effect
Com

its increased power and a permanent state of "cold war" punctuated by recurring crises, imperialist aggression and outbreaks of colossal mass murder.

We Communists take a different view of the future. We and millions of other working people know that in the course of the new half century the Soviet Union will complete the transition from Socialism to Communism, already begun; and that, whatever the difficulties may be, the transition to Socialism will be completed by the new People's Democracies, as well as by a number of other countries.

As for our own country, we confidently foresee that the American people will achieve great social democratic advances in struggle against and at the expense of the monopolists in the course of the new half century now opening up. Rejecting any and all "exceptionalist" notions of American capitalism "in permanence," we are confident that the coming great struggles of the American workers will advance among them the frontiers of class consciousness, and the end of the 20th century should find them marching on the path of Socialism.

Where our country stands in the year 2,000 A.D., and the relative ease or pain with which the American working class and people advance toward their inevitable Socialist goal—depends, to a great extent, on how effectively labor and all progressives, Communists and non-Communists,

work and fight for peace *now*. Today peace—and the struggle for peace—favors and promotes social progress, and is the enemy of pro-fascist reaction. The more lasting the peace, the better for the American people and the worse for the trusts, for their Wall Street enemies.

Peace serves the interests of all peoples everywhere. But for *our* people peace will be decisive in determining how hard or how easy, how long or how short, will be the road of social progress. Unjust, imperialist war is costly and exacts its toll of all peoples, but another world war—a Wall Street-instigated war—would be worse for the American people than for any other. It would be disastrous and catastrophic for our people, no less than Hitler's war was for the German people.

Great opportunities for achieving lasting peace exist now and will expand in the future. They exist because of the great and growing might of the Soviet Union, the People's Democracies, the new German Democratic Republic and liberated China. They exist, too, because of the organized and conscious efforts of hundreds of millions of people in the West, led by their Communist Parties, to impose peace on the warmongers. They exist because the U.S.S.R., under Stalin's leadership, pursues a resolute peace policy and strives to realize the realistic possibilities, the Leninist-Stalinist concept, of the peaceful co-existence of Socialist and capitalist states. They exist

because, as Stalin emphasizes, the peoples are war-weary and yearn for peace. They exist because the mutual interests of the American and Soviet peoples necessitate and favor cooperation and friendship, the realization of the proposal of Stalin for an American-Soviet Pact of Peace.

The mid-century year challenges all thoughtful and forward-looking Americans, above all the workers and all anti-imperialists, to seize upon, shape, and utilize fully these new opportunities for achieving lasting peace. This challenge places a special historic responsibility on the American working class, and above all on its vanguard Communist Party. The Bolshevik Party of Lenin and Stalin has demonstrated, in the almost 50 years since the ideological and organizational crystallization of Bolshevism, what a working class with a mind and will of its own, guided by the beacon-light of Marxist science, can accomplish. It has proved that through the instrument of such a Party, millions of men and women can become masters of their destiny, the conscious architects of a better world for all—the world of Socialism.

We American Communists look on the future not as a chapter to be read, but as one to be written. Our Party is determined to do all in its power to help assure that the hand of those who would write on it the disaster of a third world war—the monopolists and their Titoite, Social-Demo-

cratic and reformist agents—shall be stayed by the united action of millions of our fellow-Americans, acting in unison with countless legions of partisans of peace in all countries.

Inspired by the wisdom and the indestructible achievements of the Party of Lenin and Stalin, we guard the unity of our Communist Party and the purity of its principles, the unity of our Marxist-Leninist theory and practice, the strengthening of the Party and its ties with the masses, as the most precious possession of the American working class.

Drawing upon the best in America's democratic and revolutionary traditions and the rich and glorious experiences of the international labor and Communist movements, we will bend every effort to promote united labor action and the broadest front of peace to advance the welfare and security of the American people, Negro and white. We will go forward relying upon the militancy and creative initiative of the working class and its great allies: the Negro people, the progressive intellectuals and working farmers. Undaunted by persecutions and momentary setbacks, we will build an ever more effective, steeled and influential Communist Party to guide America by the compass of Marxism-Leninism forward to new struggles and new victories in the people's fight to prevent fascism and World War III, and to ensure peace, democracy and Socialism for our people and our nation.

(ON A
OF TH

By Ro

THE G
the wo
diplom
govern
them,
their p
tance t
at this

This
jected
to the
Worki
ation (
after i
1864.

The
der the
This t
war pr
Americ
world
of the
fully
ican in
ing the
powerf
instru
with t
of the
entire
and the
"libera
realize

Two Paths For American Labor

(ON THE OCCASION OF THE 67TH ANNIVERSARY
OF THE DEATH OF KARL MARX)

By Robert Thompson

THE GREAT Marxist principle that the working class should "watch the diplomatic acts of their respective governments" in order to "counteract them, if necessary, by all means in their power," is of supreme importance to the American working class at this time.

This guiding thought was projected by Karl Marx in the Address to the Working Class issued by the Workingmen's International Association (the First International) shortly after it was founded in London in 1864.

The whole world lives today under the threat of a third world war. This threat comes from the brazen war preparations which characterize American imperialism's drive for world domination. The top leadership of the C.I.O. and A. F. of L. have fully allied themselves with American imperialism and are transforming the national centers of these two powerful trade-union bodies into key instruments of its policies. In fact, with the support of all the agencies of the government and the press, the entire top trade-union bureaucracy and the Social-Democrats and A.D.A. "liberals" are bending every effort to realize in the U.S. what Lenin called

the possibility of "something like an alliance . . . between the workers of a given nation and their imperialists against the other nations."

Under these conditions growing forces of the American trade-union movement must develop a frontal challenge to the disastrous course along which Murray, Carey, Green, Dubinsky and Co. are attempting to lead labor. In order to be formidable, such a frontal challenge must involve the bold moving along the path of working-class internationalism in the struggle for peace by sections of the American trade-union movement. The path of working-class internationalism in this period is the path of open alignment with the world camp of democracy and Socialism headed by the Soviet Union and symbolized by the World Federation of Trade Unions. The absence of such a frontal challenge aids Wall Street's labor lieutenants in their efforts to spread chauvinist nationalism and to lead the trade-union movement along the path of becoming the accomplice of Wall Street in its war aims and the prisoner of Wall Street in its drive for fascist reaction and monopoly profits at home.

There is, of course, a vast body of

American trade unionists who not only have not decided as between the path of working-class internationalism and chauvinist nationalism, but who are as yet not at all conscious of the necessity of arriving at any such decision. This, however, should not give rise to the illusion that there exists a third, a middle, course steering somewhere between the working-class internationalism of this period and the warmongering chauvinist nationalism of Wall Street.

NEW FEATURES OF LABOR REFORMISM

There have been times, such as during the 1920's in the period of relative stabilization of capitalism, when labor reformism found its *chief* expression in class-collaboration schemes with the employers on the domestic front and on economic issues. Almost as a matter of course during such periods, the labor lieutenants of Big Business (Gompers, Green, Woll, Murray, Lewis, Tighe, etc., etc.) gave general support to Wall Street's foreign policies (hostility to the Soviet Union, barring of ties with the trade-union movement of the Soviet Union and of Europe, disruption of the labor movement in Latin America, etc.). American imperialism during these periods had not placed on the order of the day the realization of its insane adventurist objective of world domination. It was operating under the banner of the Monroe Doctrine and pseudo-

isolationism. Its labor lieutenants, following dutifully in its wake, devoted themselves largely to keeping American labor isolated from world labor and immobilized in relation to issues of foreign policy.

A quite different situation exists in this period. Today, American imperialism has placed its drive for world domination on the order of the day. It has replaced the Monroe Doctrine with the militarist North Atlantic Pact and pseudo-isolationism with the banner of Anglo-Saxon world supremacy. In this period, labor reformism finds its *chief* expression in collaboration with monopoly capital and the State Department in furthering Wall Street's war preparations both in the sphere of foreign policy and in the internal political life of the country. Almost as a matter of course, following from its support of American imperialism's grandiose objective of world domination, Wall Street's labor lieutenants during this period are shackling labor with class-collaboration policies on the domestic front and on economic issues. The membership of the trade unions are tasting the bitter fruits of this policy in the increasingly "militant" discouragement by the top leadership of the C.I.O. and A. F. of L. of an aggressive wage strategy, the steady abandonment of the struggle for Negro rights, the failure to develop resistance against speed-up, etc., etc. A new feature of labor reformism in this period, therefore, is the fact that its starting point, decisive character-

istic an
ration
and ex
imper

A se
formis
tion to
ism. In
its chi
Wall
isolate
movem
day, th
pressic
leader
union
vening
the af
every
Wall
been u
becom
ternati
told:

Lab
a gap
the U
Europ
bitterl
may
tory i
frequ
that a
exten
Out
the fa
good
Doors
open
Amer
accept

istic and *chief* expression is collaboration with the aggressive pro-war and expansionist drive of American imperialism.

A second new feature of labor reformism is the form of its opposition to working-class internationalism. In the past this opposition found its chief expression in the efforts of Wall Street's labor lieutenants to isolate the American trade-union movement from European labor. Today, this opposition finds its *chief* expression in efforts of these labor misleaders to utilize the American trade-union movement as a base for intervening on behalf of Wall Street in the affairs of the working class in every Marshall Plan country. These Wall Street labor lieutenants have been told that American labor must become "an active participant in international affairs." They have been told:

Labor is peculiarly qualified to bridge a gap that has been growing between the United States and Europe. A new Europe is being born. . . . They are bitterly suspicious of all those who may be undisclosed agents of predatory interests. They fear the threat so frequently voiced in Soviet propaganda that an American imperialism may be extending its power into Europe. . . .

Out of this arises the importance of the fact that American labor carries good credentials to Western Europe. Doors tightly closed to all others may open at its knock. Words from American labor promise to find quick acceptance" (address of Supreme Court

Justice William O. Douglas to the 1948 C.I.O. Convention).

There is internationalism and "internationalism." These orders from the State Department and Wall Street determine the content of the peculiar "internationalism" of the corrupt gang of State Department errand boys in the leadership of the C.I.O. and the A. F. of L. This State Department "internationalism" has led, from a division of labor in which the national C.I.O. undertook to enter the W.F.T.U. for the purpose of disruption from within, and the A. F. of L. undertook to organize and rehabilitate the Right-wing Socialist and Roman Catholic forces outside the W.F.T.U., to a unity of the A. F. of L. and C.I.O. leadership in a joint endeavor to launch a labor adjunct of the North Atlantic Pact. From general support of the Truman Doctrine, Marshall Plan and North Atlantic Pact it has led to transforming the C.I.O. and A. F. of L. national centers into key instruments of the State Department in its efforts to spread slanders against the Soviet Union and the People's Democracies and to split and weaken the working class and patriotic forces of national resistance to American imperialism in the countries of Europe, Asia, Africa, and Latin America. A second new feature of labor reformism in this period is, therefore, the abandonment of pseudo-isolationism and the adoption of an aggressive State Department "internationalism"

which attempts to dictate a policy of surrendering to American imperialism the labor movement of other countries.

CAREY'S TREACHERY AND LABOR'S POLICY

A good dog always runs ahead of its master.

"In the last war we joined with the Communists to fight the fascists. In another war we will join with the fascists to defeat the Communists" (from the speech of James Carey, Secretary-Treasurer of the C.I.O., before an assembly of bankers, manufacturers and professional organizers of pro-fascist movements held in New York, January 29-30, for the purpose of launching a National "Anti-Communist" Front and crusade).

Carey is an ambitious young clerical-fascist. He doesn't want to be "just another" Wall Street labor lieutenant performing the menial (even though high-paid) service of sowing Social-Democratic and reformist confusion and poison in labor's ranks. He is bucking hard for the post of "labor top sergeant" in what he hopes will soon be a fully State-operated labor set-up in a fascist America. He doesn't think that Wall Street and the State Department will select for such a post an old-line, traditional-type labor bureaucrat who merely goes along with, and runs interference in labor's ranks for, Big Business. He feels that the time has come when Wall Street and Washington must have a new brand of "labor"

leader who will not only run interference for U.S. imperialism's program of war and fascism, but will carry the ball—the brand of "labor" leader that will *openly proclaim* its war program and pro-fascist objectives and *openly* undertake to black-jack labor into support for them.

In the person of Jim (join the fascists) Carey and his performance at this American Legion, N.A.M. and State Department-run conference to organize a fascist front, American labor is confronted with a major attempt by Big Business and Washington to force upon it a new brand of openly pro-fascist "labor" leadership.

The ability of Carey to anticipate Wall Street's wishes is matched only by his long record of unique inability accurately to gauge the mood and temper of the American working class. That is why the workers in his own union, the U.E.R.&M.W., kicked him out of all positions of leadership in 1941. That is why, for the past nine years, Murray has had to keep him suspended like a chandelier without a base in the post of C.I.O. National Secretary-Treasurer.

Carey has now gone too far. It is not just that he does not speak the sentiment of the membership of C.I.O., A. F. of L. and independent unions—the all-important fact of the moment is that he has flown in the face of the *prevailing dominant* mood and sentiment of the bulk of organized labor. Carey has chosen to make his debut as a self-professed, open, "labor" advocate of fascism at a time

when such great sections of the labor movement as the mine workers, auto workers, maritime workers, rubber workers, etc., are engaged in or are immediately confronted with unprecedentedly sharp strike struggles; a time when a new upsurge of militancy is setting in motion growing sections of the Negro workers; a time when the highly important predominantly Jewish sectors of the trade-union movement are reflecting the growing concern of the Jewish people over the revival of Nazism. Because of this, organized labor is confronted, not only with a grave challenge, but with an historic opportunity—the opportunity of ridding its ranks of a most dangerous, rabid, “best friend” of pro-war, pro-fascist Big Business, the opportunity of nipping in the bud the emergence of a new Robert Ley (head of the Nazi Labor Front under Hitler) brand of American “labor” leadership.

The President of the Furriers' Union, Ben Gold, has given brilliant and scathing expression to the sentiment of every honest trade unionist from Boston to San Francisco by decorating Jim (join the fascists) Carey with a Hitler Iron Cross. It is in this spirit that every class-conscious worker, every progressive, above all every Communist, must move into action. In every shop, in every local, in every council of the C.I.O., A. F. of L., brotherhoods and independent unions, the cry must be raised:

Denounce Carey's join-the-fascists speech!

Demand a halt to efforts of the Legion, the N.A.M., and the State Department to organize a national pro-fascist anti-labor front!

Demand the ouster of Carey, and of Lewis G. Hines, Legislative Director of the A. F. of L., from all positions of labor leadership, for their participation in this anti-labor conference!

Drive Wall Street's rabid “best friend” Carey from the labor movement!

* * *

The participation of Carey, and of Lewis Hines, Legislative Director of the A. F. of L., in this national conference to organize a pro-fascist crusade, is a brazen attempt to transform organized labor into an instrument of its own destruction. Along with Carey's “join the fascists” speech, it constitutes perhaps the most flagrant act of treachery every perpetrated against the American working class by so-called labor leaders.

How does it happen that the great 12-million strong trade-union movement of this country can be officially represented by top “labor leaders” in a conference led by the N.A.M. and the State Department to organize an anti-working class, pro-fascist “stop Communism” crusade? What has led to a situation where a top official of the C.I.O., four years after the end of a war in which the Soviet Union played the decisive role in saving the working people of America and the world from fascism, dares

openly to proclaim a policy of uniting with fascism to destroy Socialism? The speech of Carey at this pro-fascist conference, together with the participation of Lewis Hines, has posed these questions in the sharpest possible form before the whole labor movement.

Only a small part of the answer to these questions is to be found in the reactionary ambitions and pro-fascist leanings of individual "labor" officials. The basic answer is to be found in *the relationship* between the flagrant acts of treachery to organized labor by "labor" officials such as Carey and Hines, and the main policy orientation of the national leadership of the C.I.O. and the A. F. of L. The truth is that the traitorous acts of Carey and Hines are but shameful milestones along the disastrous road which the C.I.O. and A. F. of L. top leadership are attempting to lead labor. The *chief task* of the Communists, and of all class-conscious workers, is to establish this truth in the consciousness of the mass of the American working class; to arouse and direct the indignation of the mass membership of the trade unions in such a way as to bring this membership into open, conscious collision with the main policy orientation of the top C.I.O. and A. F. of L. national leadership.

What is this main policy orientation?

In his infamous "join the fascists" speech, Carey openly set forth a policy of building up and uniting

with fascist forces on a world scale, in Germany, Japan, Greece, Spain, France, Italy, etc. *The heart of this policy, however, is unity with the forces of fascism in the United States*, where monopoly capital not only poses a grave fascist danger to the American people, but is also the chief source of strength and the guiding center for fascist developments on a world scale. The policy enunciated by Carey and which also guided the participation of Hines in this pro-fascist conference, is a policy of *total surrender* to Wall Street—it involves not only an effort to make organized labor a full participant in the criminal war plans and fascist objectives of American imperialism, but also leads to a full surrender of its class interests on the economic field.

Carey deserves to be attacked as the crudest and most brazen exponent of this policy in the C.I.O. It can hardly be said that he is its architect. That "honor" belongs to more weighty forces in Wall Street's "Kitchen cabinet" of "labor" officials. It belongs, for example, to Phil Murray, who in his classic statement: "We have no classes in this country . . ." (June 1948 issue of *American Magazine*) established in full the grounds for placing labor's leadership in the hands of the N.A.M.

Murray, Green and Co. have made their choice. Their path, the path down which they are attempting to lead American labor, is the path of a brand of national chauvinism more

ambitious, more all-embracing, more savagely reactionary than that of Hitler-Germany. This path was outlined at the close of the war by an authentic spokesman of American monopoly capitalism in the following terms:

If anyone complains that the dilemma implies or drives us to a type of imperialism which must end as all others have ended, though its purpose be different, let them make the most of it, for this time we have no other choice, and we will not have that one much longer unless we make it now. We must ask the world that surrounds us not merely to accept our power, but to accept our purpose of peace and freedom for our own sake as well as its own, and use it to that end. . . .

Let us first offer the utmost capacity of our economic power for reconstruction to every people who will undertake to abolish all national military expenditures and disarm down to the level of the local constabulary. Let us, secondly, demand the unlimited right of continuous inspection and control of every industrial operation and process or every public policy which may have the most remote relationship to armament and warfare. And finally, let us make, keep and improve our atomic bombs for this imperative purpose; let us suspend them in principle over every place in the world where we have any reason to suspect evasion or conspiracy against this purpose; and let us drop them in fact, promptly and without compunction wherever it is defied (Speech of Virgil Jordan to Union League Club of Philadelphia, Lincoln's Birthday, 1946).

This is the master's voice in all of its brazen authority. It is the voice of the owners of the coal mines, the steel mills and the auto plants of this country. It is the voice which has staked out the path pursued by the top leadership of both the A. F. of L. and the C.I.O. in the entire postwar period.

The great bulk of American trade-union members recognize this voice as the voice of the class enemy when it speaks to them on questions of wages, working conditions and union contracts. They display tremendous militancy in great strike struggles on this front. Yet, on the life-and-death issues of foreign policy and national politics, they succumb to policies of class collaboration and class peace. They approach the imperialist ruling class of this country as a Mr. Hyde on economic questions and a Dr. Jekyll on matters of foreign policy and politics. This is the chief weakness of the American working class, the chief source of strength of the labor misleaders. Murray, Green and Co. are now in the process of extending their support of Wall Street's foreign policy into complete subordination of labor's economic interests to the building of a war economy. They are now attempting to present American monopoly capital to the American working class as a Dr. Jekyll on the economic as well as on the foreign-political fronts.

It is not possible to approach Murray, Green and Co. as confused or

mistaken people. They are confirmed agents of a pro-war, pro-fascist ruling class, conscious enemies of the interests of the American working class. Their path is Wall Street's path of rampant Anglo-Saxon chauvinist nationalism. It is a path which aims at a special kind of enslavement of American labor—the kind in which the American working class in its slavery supplies the chains for binding the working people of the world. It is a path which, followed to its end, will inevitably lead to a far worse fate for the American working class than that which befell the working people of Germany.

This is the soil that breeds such flagrant acts of treachery to organized labor as Carey's "join the fascists" speech and the participation of Carey and Hines in an N.A.M. and State Department-led conference to organize a pro-fascist crusade. This is the relationship between individual acts of betrayal and a policy of betrayal. This is the truth which must be driven home throughout labor's ranks by Communists and all class-conscious workers.

WORKING-CLASS INTERNATIONALISM—THE ONLY PATH FORWARD FOR AMERICAN LABOR

The perspective before the American working class, arising out of the maturing economic crisis and the sharpening anti-labor offensive of Wall Street and Washington, is one

of expanding struggle on many fronts: wage, unemployed, trade-union protection, etc., etc. The fullest participation in, and unfoldment of, these struggles on the basis of a policy which emphasizes the United Front in action from below is the starting point and cornerstone of the struggle which must be waged for working-class internationalism in the American labor movement. This must be seen and understood. Something else, however, must also be seen and understood, that is, that participation in such struggles is *only* the cornerstone and starting point of the fight for working-class internationalism—not the be-all and end-all of that fight.

Working-class internationalism on the part of a working class whose capitalist class is organizing the capitalist world for a counter-revolutionary crusade against Socialism and democracy is a high form of, an acid test of, class-consciousness.

Class-consciousness, as distinct from trade-union consciousness, is not a spontaneous outgrowth of the class struggle. It is a product of the fusion of the experience of the class struggle and the conscious education and propaganda of the advanced, primarily the Marxist vanguard sector of the working class. In Lenin's words:

The history of all countries shows that the working class, exclusively by its own effort, is able to develop only trade-union consciousness. . . . Class

political
to the
is, on
gle.

In th
class i
vanced
actions
other
worker
workin
people
guard
their
of Am

It is
ican l
larly
rally
count
imper
world
is an
comba
overco
tional
top I
A. F.
a gen
defen
the
peace
cialist
worki

To
two
fascis
by th
States

* v.
53, 90

political consciousness can be brought to the workers *only from without*, that is, only outside of the economic struggle. . . .*

In this period the cause of working-class internationalism must be advanced both by propaganda and by *actions*, *i.e.*, demonstrations and other actions which bring American workers into direct support of the working class abroad and colonial peoples in their struggles to safeguard the national independence of their countries from the onslaught of American imperialist expansion.

It is the supreme task of the American labor movement, and particularly of its Communist vanguard, to rally the forces of peace in our own country, which is the citadel of world imperialism and the source of the world threat of war and fascism. It is an integral part of this task to combat boldly, and in the long run overcome, the betrayal of international solidarity engineered by the top leadership of the C.I.O. and A. F. of L. It is impossible to unfold a genuine and conscious struggle in defense of the economic interests of the American working class for peace and for progress toward Socialism, save under the slogan of working-class internationalism.

Today the world is divided into two camps—the pro-war and pro-fascist camp of imperialism headed by the ruling class of the United States, and the anti-imperialist camp

of peace, democracy and Socialism headed by the Soviet Union. The camp of imperialism offers a future of economic crisis, mass unemployment, fascist reaction and a third world war. The camp of Socialism is conducting a resolute struggle for a lasting peace and for the blocking of a new upsurge of the threat of fascism. This being the case, there can be no working-class internationalism save that which supports the camp of peace, democracy and Socialism in the struggle against the camp of imperialism, fascism and war. Because of this, the historical dividing line in this period between the forces of war and fascism on the one hand, and peace and democracy on the other, has become their attitude toward the Soviet Union.

The supreme responsibility falling on the shoulders of American Communists and other class-conscious forces in the American labor movement is that of bringing into being an organized force fighting to align the American trade-union movement with the world camp of peace, democracy and Socialism and against the chauvinist nationalism of Murray, Green and Co. Let those who will, crow over the fact that such a force will, in its beginnings, be a minority force—an opposition force—in the trade-union movement as a whole. This force will carry with it the future and the salvation of the whole of the working people of America and as such, if resolutely fought for and developed, will be-

* V. I. Lenin, *Selected Works*, Volume II, pp. 53, 98.

come the dominant trend and force of tomorrow.

The guiding principle for the development and growth of such a force was highlighted by the great founder of scientific socialism, Karl Marx, in his pointed question: "If the emancipation of the working classes requires their fraternal concurrence, how are they to fulfill that great mission with a foreign policy in pursuit of criminal designs, playing upon national prejudices, and squandering in piratical wars the people's blood and treasure?" In the spirit of the teaching of the great continuator of the work of Marx and Lenin and the leader of the world camp of Socialism and peace, Stalin, the meaning of this principle for this period was set forth by the Resolution on Working-Class Unity adopted at the recent meeting of the Communist Information Bureau: "Never before in the history of the international working-class movement has the unity of the working class, both within individual countries and on a world scale, been of such decisive significance as at the present time."

The application of that principle to the situation confronting the American working class today requires:

1. The elevation of issues such as outlawing of the Atom and Hydrogen Bomb; curtailment of the enormous U.S. military budget; recognition of the Chinese People's Republic; the halting of the rearming and

renazification of Western Germany, the rebuilding of a militarist Japan, and intervention in Indo-China, to their rightful place of cardinal importance as issues before the American working class, and the development of broad United Front movements around them.

2. Widespread and effective agitation and propaganda exposing the devastating effects of the Marshall Plan and the developing war economy on the living standards and rights of labor, and exposing the relationship between the top trade-union bureaucracy's support of State Department policy and its abandonment of the defense of the economic interests of the working class.

3. The widest popularization of the policies and role of the Soviet Union, the People's Democracies and the liberation movement in the colonies. The development of a more aggressive struggle against Titoist slanders and tendencies in labor and progressive ranks.

4. The utilization of all possibilities for the development of *actions* which bring the weight of particular sections of American labor, however small, into *active* support of the labor and peace forces of other countries and the development of more concrete forms of support to the national-liberation struggles of the Negro people in the United States.

Out of this line of action must emerge a movement for the resumption of ties between trade unions of this country and the W.F.T.U. The

W.F.
worl
gle
imp
and
cran
Car
the
carr
Am
est
of t
the
of o
ican
gro
reg
T
afil
W.F.
han
Gre
que
cert
ican
pro
tra
jun
whi
the
lea
Gre
the
Asi
wit

W.F.T.U. is a great bulwark of workers the world over in their struggle against capitalist exploitation and imperialist enslavement and for peace and social progress. It is a great force cramping the ability of the Murray-Carey, Green-Dubinsky leadership of the C.I.O. and the A. F. of L. to carry through their betrayal of the American working class. The sharpest blow struck against the interests of the American working class in the postwar period was the breaking of organizational ties between American labor and the W.F.T.U. The ground lost by this blow must be regained.

The question of American labor's affiliations to, and relations with, the W.F.T.U. must not be left in the hands of the Murrays, Careys and Greens. This supremely important question must become a central concern of the rank and file of American labor, of the leadership of every progressive-led union, of every honest trade unionist. The new labor adjunct of the North Atlantic Pact which has been set up on orders of the State Department and under the leadership of Murray, Carey and Green must meet, not only with the scorn of the workers of Europe, Asia, Africa and Latin America, but with a direct and active opposition

from a growing section of the American trade-union movement.

The American working class has not been won for the objectives of American imperialism. In their decisive majority the American working class wants peace. It wants democracy. It wants a better life. These healthy mass working-class sentiments for peace and social progress must be organized and given clear expression in time—before Murray, Green and Co. succeed in betraying it into the path of chauvinist nationalism followed by the German working class under Hitler.

Key in this period to giving effective organization and clear expression to these healthy working-class sentiments and instincts is the unfolding of a struggle to align American labor with the W.F.T.U., with the world camp of peace and Socialism headed by the Soviet Union. This is the path of working-class internationalism, the path of real American patriotism. This is the Marxist principle which in this period affords the American working class the key to preventing the destruction of its movement and catastrophe for its country. It is the path of unfoldment of struggle for the class unity of the American workers.

The Coal Miners Lead the Way

By Gus Hall

TWO FACTORS that greatly influence and determine the course of the class struggle in postwar America are, first, the cold war and the continued drive for imperialist conquest of the world by Wall Street, and, secondly, the developing economic crisis. No issues confronting labor and the people can be properly assessed without full consideration of these two factors.

WALL STREET'S WAR UPON THE WORKERS

An integral part of Wall Street's drive for world domination and an inevitable result of the developing economic crisis is the war against the American working class, its economic organizations, the trade unions, and its vanguard political party, the Communist Party.

The reactionary imperialist rulers of America consider this phase of the war preparations as urgent and equally important as the making of planes, tanks A- and H-bombs.

The offensive against the standard of living, the democratic rights and the organizations of the people—and above all against the organizations

of the working class—is waged increasingly by means of violence as the way to put over policies that are unpopular, that are against the interests of the workers. It is the only way to force the workers and the people generally, not only to accept the unpopular preparations for imperialist war, but also to pay for them. With each successive stage of the cold war and preparations for war, there has been a corresponding stepping-up of the attack on the people at home.

This war at home takes the form of direct attacks by the lynchers in the South and the hoodlums in Peekskill. It involves court actions, as in the "trial" of the Communist leaders in New York, and the "contempt" charges as in Denver and California against those who refuse to be stool-pigeons; the rulings of Federal Judges Keech and Goldsborough against the unions. It takes the form of splitting the trade unions as witness the C.I.O. Executive Board's action, under the domination of Murray and Reuther and the admitted co-worker of the fascists, James Carey, in expelling unions that do not fully conform to the policies of

support
cludes
the
Mund
such a
presse
on the
up, cu
wages
nage
on unc
ments
relief
form
and a
destro
lish th
dition
In t
people
ruling
on th
the g
cratic
Cor
of wo
the d
the b
class
econ
capit
ing b
This
ery o
plove
prices
ing v
part-
work
Th

supporting imperialist wars. It includes Congressional action such as the Taft-Hartley Law and the Mundt Bill and Executive Orders, such as the "loyalty" oaths. It is expressed in the intensified exploitation on the job: inhuman rates of speed-up, cutting of work crews, cutting of wages by setting new piece and tonnage rates; in layoffs; in chiseling on unemployment compensation payments and the cutting of already low relief standards. And it takes the form of breaking union contracts and agreements by open attempts to destroy the trade unions and reestablish the open-shop, sweat-shop conditions of slavery.

In this war against the American people during these last years, the ruling class has more and more called on the open services of the state, of the government with all its bureaucratic and widespread apparatus.

Connected with the drive for a war of world conquest by Wall Street is the developing economic crisis. Like the burden of the war, the ruling class wants to put the burden of this economic disaster, a product of the capitalist system, on the already bending backs of the American workers. This burden is measured by the misery of the growing army of unemployed, by the monopoly-fixed high prices. It is measured in the spreading wage cuts, by the millions of part-time workers, and by the Negro workers who are being laid off first.

This presently developing eco-

nomics crisis has been preceded by a long period of slow decline in production. This decline has been uneven because certain industries have received artificial boosts by war orders. The coal industry has been no exception to the decline. This is clearly indicated by the fact that in 1947 the American miners dug 630 million tons of coal, while in 1948 450 million tons were sufficient for all needs, including export.

The coal corporations are dead-set on returning the miners to the pre-New Deal, non-union conditions of 15 years ago. As late as 1933, the average wage of the coal miners was \$1.50 a day. Because of the slave conditions and the absence of safety regulations, the death rate was such that the coal miner's chance of returning home alive was less than the chance of an American in the armed forces in either of the two world wars.

Since 1935, the coal miners have slowly forced improvements year after year. They have raised their standard of living only because of a long, uphill, bloody, self-sacrificing, militant struggle against the stubborn anti-labor policies of finance capital and the coal corporations.

A "CHRONICALLY SICK" INDUSTRY

Complicating the situation enormously for the militantly struggling miners is the fact that the coal in-

dustry in the United States is a "chronically sick" industry. This state of chronic illness, whose heavy burdens have been placed on the shoulders of the miners, is due to a number of factors: (1) The speculative "overexpansion" of American coal mining resulting from the unplanned character of capitalist production during the period of rapid industrial expansion in the United States. Even in the period 1890 to 1914, the average number of days that coal mines in the United States were operated during any year ranged from 178 to 238. This "overexpansion" (in terms of the peacetime needs of the capitalist market) was further intensified during the First and Second World Wars, at the end of which the market demand for coal dropped sharply. Thus, the coal mines drew into the industry more men than they could steadily employ under capitalist conditions. (2) The cut-throat competitive character of the industry, which continues side by side with increasing monopoly concentration of ownership and control, especially of the larger mines. (3) The growing mechanization of coal mining, especially of the larger, monopoly-controlled mines. For many years, due to the extremely low wages paid the miners, mining methods and techniques were maintained at an extremely primitive level; it was immensely more profitable for the coal barons to wear out miners in 10 or 20 years of intensive exploitation at low wages than to install expensive new machinery and

equipment.

Large-scale mechanization of coal mining is a relatively new development in America. Now it is being pushed forward in all parts of the whole industry. This will continue to sharpen the problems already facing the coal miners. This process of mechanization has paralleled the struggle of the miners for higher wages and better conditions. As late as 1933, when the miners were unorganized and worked for less than \$2.00 per day, the coal corporations did not push for new machinery. They had the same position on mechanization as do the imperialist slave masters in the colonies, who acquire large profits without mechanization because of the slave-labor conditions. But as the miners won higher wages, the corporations began to put in new machinery to displace miners. (4) The use, on a growing scale, of substitute fuels (gas, and particularly oil) for transportation (the merchant marine, trucking, etc.), heating and lighting, etc. (5) Increased competition on a world scale among the imperialist powers.

As a result of all this, and of the developing economic crisis, as well as of a cold-war policy that restricts foreign trade, the miners were able in 1949 to supply the total coal needs of the country, including export, in 129 days, or about 2½ days per week.

Even if they secure complete victory in the present strike, therefore, the miners face serious problems of a long-term character. The pension

plan,
sand
a 99
ing d
these
nent
Th
with
The
dema
tion
in w
porat
very
work
call f
diti
healt
Lil
the c
ernm
anti-
woul
try i
mine
Unti
be p
speci
Fede
In
ist
capit
enth
living
Soci
cond
geoi
have
hesit
sons
A

plan, which will retire a few thousand miners over 60 years of age, and a 95-cent per day wage increase raising daily wages to \$15, will not solve these problems basically or permanently.

The miners, therefore, are faced with the need to win further goals. The situation in the coal industry demands the immediate consideration of a 30-hour week with no cut in weekly earnings. The coal corporations, with their huge profits, can very well afford, and the hazardous working conditions of the miners call for, longer vacations plus an additional minimum of a two-week health leave with pay each year.

Like the majority of Americans, the coal miners need a people's government of the anti-monopoly and anti-war coalition that could and would nationalize the mining industry in a way that would benefit the miners and the American people. Until some of these measures can be put into effect, the miners need special consideration for relief by the Federal and state governments.

In the early days of the new Socialist Soviet Republics, the American capitalist press for many years very enthusiastically compared the Soviet living standards with ours. As the Socialist state has matured and living conditions have improved, the bourgeois propagandists more and more have generalized their attack and hesitate to make specific comparisons.

A comparison of the conditions of

the coal miners is a clear example of why they are in no position to make such comparisons. Not only the coal miners in the Soviet Union, but the miners in the People's Democracies are on the road to new high standards of life.

Like all Soviet citizens, Soviet miners have long forgotten what unemployment is like. The planned nature of the Soviet economy, founded on collective, Socialist ownership of the means of production, assures a continued and growing demand for coal and other fuels. The closing of mines for want of markets is impossible in the U.S.S.R., and so the coal industry is constantly adding more workers and other personnel. Coal is needed in constantly growing quantities for swiftly expanding Soviet metallurgical and machinery plants, power stations, railways, as well as for heating homes, etc. During the first half of 1949, a total of 37 new mechanized collieries were opened by the Soviet coal industry.

Soviet miners enjoy the finest and most comprehensive system of social insurance found anywhere, and they get these benefits and protections without any cost to themselves. The miners in the U.S.S.R. receive sick benefits that also cover illness or care of a sick member of their families. Their social insurance plan covers disability and old-age pensions. The same plan provides maternity-leave benefits to working mothers. Social insurance funds are also used to provide miners with facilities for rest

and treatment at health resorts and vacations with pay. The Soviet Government has instituted a system of annual bonuses to miners for long and faultless service, the size of the bonuses ranging from 10-30 percent of the given miner's annual wage, depending upon the length of his service.

Soviet miners enjoy a position of honor and respect. Great attention is paid to housing, living conditions and cultural services for miners. During 1948 and the first half of 1949, the Ministry of Coal made available to miners a total of 26,372,800 square feet of living space. The building of private homes is warmly encouraged; the Soviet state grants all workers, including miners, long-term credits for such construction and provides them with free plots of land. Miners that are eligible to retire (at the age of 50), are given many special privileges, including free deeds for life-long use of their apartments. These pensioners thus become honored elder citizens upon completing their productive careers in the mines.

It is not surprising that Big Business draws a tighter and tighter iron curtain over the facts to prevent coal miners in the United States from drawing the correct conclusion that Socialism is the only way out of an existence marked by poverty, back-breaking toil, hazard to life, layoffs and chronic unemployment and the "democratic right" to dig coal at the point of a bayonet.

THE GREAT SIGNIFICANCE OF THE MINERS' STRUGGLE

The 1949-50 strike of the 400,000 coal miners has a number of features which are unprecedented among the recent struggles of the American working class:

1. It is one of the longest industry-wide struggles on record. The strike has been on the basis either of "no work" or "3 days per week" for more than nine months.

2. More than any other strike for economic demands in recent times, the miners' struggle has developed strong elements of a political character, and has now emerged into the very center of the political picture of the nation. The actions of the Truman Administration, the constant threat of the use of Taft-Hartley injunctions, the barrage of anti-coal-miner speeches by Republicans in the Senate and House and the numerous court actions in the coal-mining states against the miners have forced the miners and large sections of labor generally to take a new look into the role of the state as an instrument in the hands of the employers. One need only step into any coal town to feel the new, politically charged atmosphere.

3. The miners' struggle has become the center and the vehicle for the broadest rank-and-file movement for united labor action since the organizing drives of 1936-37. The belated action of Philip Murray in giving half a million dollars to the miners

for relief, the action of the C.I.O. Executive Board, the statements of William Green and others, are only a token, forced recognition of the mood for action and of the wide support for the coal miners in all sections of the rank and file of the American labor movement.

4. For the younger mine workers this is the first experience, and for the older miners the first experience since the early 'thirties, with mass picketing, with the test of holding out against widespread hunger, with a battle against organized attempts to split their union and with the threat of an open shop—all this under conditions of a combined attack by the coal corporations, by the most powerful financial groups in the country, by the Federal Government and by the governmental bodies in the states and counties.

5. In past strikes, the miners were inclined to leave the negotiations and settlement to John L. Lewis and the negotiating committees, and very often took their annual vacations during the strikes. In the present strike, to meet the new challenge in this new situation, the miners are on hand in the largest numbers, participating in mass picketing and other strike activities, as well as finding many new methods for exercising their influence on the leadership of their union.

6. The coal miners are the only section of the American working class who have felt the whip of the Taft-Hartley slave law now for the

third time. They have the distinction of being alone in offering mass resistance to this slave act. For the first time since its passage, the Taft-Hartley Law has been challenged, not by idle talk, but by the united action of the miners.

7. The coal miners are writing a new chapter in American labor history by continuing to strike in spite of the actions of the Federal Courts and after the leadership of the union has complied with the court order and ordered the miners back to work.

AIMS AND STRATEGY OF THE COAL BARONS

Nine months ago, the monopoly interests set out to reduce the fighting ability of the mine workers' union and, if possible, to destroy it. In the initial stages of this fight, the coal barons hid their real aims behind public statements that they were resisting only John L. Lewis' demands for higher wages and pensions. The injunctions asked for by Robert N. Denham, General Counsel for the N.L.R.B., and granted by Judge Keech, give away the actual aim of the monopolies. Judge Keech declared it illegal for the miners to ask for (1) a union shop; (2) the right to work only when the miners are "willing and able" to work; (3) the distribution of welfare funds only to members of their union. With one sweep of his pen, Judge Keech threw out most of the important victories of the miners won as a result of generations of sacrifice

and struggle. But this not the full story. The Federal Court ruled out these conditions that have been in existence in the past agreements, and then told the miners: now go and negotiate with the corporations for the rest of the agreement.

The financiers especially want to destroy the union that has established the precedent of the miners' pension plan. The urge of the employers to single out the miners for attack was further increased by the stubborn resistance of the U.M.W.A. to the Truman-administered, Republican-sponsored Taft-Hartley slave act.

Further, the employers chose the miners as the break-through point in their attack on all trade unions because they estimated that the miners would be one of the weakest links in the labor movement. They sensed the isolation of the miners from the rest of the labor movement. They gambled with the misery and suffering of the miners, their wives and children; they gambled on the reserve stockpiles of coal throughout the country.

The pattern of the employers is becoming obvious from what is happening in this "chronically sick" industry, with its relatively large army of permanently unemployed and its condition of constant economic crisis. The employers have picked this industry to set the pattern for a lower wage and greater speedup and as the guinea-pig example of how to place the burden of the coming crisis on the backs of the workers.

The corporations also hoped that the use of the Taft-Hartley Law on two previous occasions and the robbing of the miners' treasury of nearly \$2 million by court actions had further softened the miners for the kill, and had rendered them suitable as the point of break-through in the union-smashing drive.

The coal corporations knew they could not force the miners to their knees with a blitzkrieg. They therefore adopted the long-range perspective of preparing the miners for the final action of Taft-Hartley injunctions, the open shop, back-to-work movements and union splitting, by a process of slow starvation. Modern America has not seen or experienced such starvation conditions as exist in the coal fields today. It is estimated that each miner's family now has a grocery bill in the company- and privately-owned stores averaging from \$450 to \$700. In most places, even this avenue of credit as a means of keeping alive is now closed. In the coal fields of Kentucky and West Virginia, one sees a repetition of the ironic depression-day situation of coal diggers forced to go into the mountains for firewood to keep their children from freezing. The miners are drawing indelible political impressions from the contradiction of seeing their children starve while the government is destroying 40 million bushels of potatoes and sending to the miners only enough to make newspaper headlines.

CHARACTER AND COURSE OF
THE STRUGGLE

This long protracted struggle has developed a new militancy in the ranks of the miners as well as in the ranks of large sections of labor generally. The picketing is organized, conducted and led largely by younger miners. This new section of the coal miners, made up largely of veterans of the last world war, has brought into play new militant methods, such as flying squads or mass roving pickets on wheels, and many other forms of mass action that the coal fields have not seen for a long time. In many sections of the coal fields, these pickets have not only forced the closing of mines, but have developed actions and methods of control that forced the stores to continue credit at the rate of \$2.00 per miner's family per day.

The present struggle has brought forward the greatest numbers of Negro coal miners into active participation and into the leadership of the strike. The rank-and-file unity of Negro and white has thus been further strengthened in the U.M.W.A., a union that can proudly boast that it was the first labor organization to organize inter-racial locals in the deep South.

For the first time in 15 years, the miners' wives and daughters have taken their post on the picket line. This has revived the past glorious traditions of the heroic role of women in the numerous coal strikes

in the United States. The legend of Mother Jones is haunting the coal bosses again.

The course of the nine months' struggle of the miners can be roughly divided into three stages. In the first stage, the miners went on a two-month strike. This took place during the same period as the strikes of the steelworkers and many other sections of the working class. Long before the miners' and steelworkers' contracts expired last summer, the trusts had openly indicated their stubborn determination to use the contract negotiations as an occasion for cutting the workers' living standard. This was a clear warning to all of labor. It was the handwriting on the wall that labor could win new contracts and concessions only by a united struggle. There were a number of actions that indicated a growing rank-and-file sentiment for such a struggle. John L. Lewis made his proposal for a joint \$2,500,000 strike fund; but this was summarily rejected by Philip Murray and William Green.

The Murray-Reuther leadership of the C.I.O. was evidently more interested in maneuvering to split labor's ranks than in joining a united labor struggle for new contracts. This determination of Murray and Reuther to split the C.I.O. by expelling its most militant and progressive affiliates gave considerable further encouragement to the profit-hungry, power-drunk employers. The lords of industry adopted Hitler's

strategy of divide and conquer. They adopted in their union-busting drive the tactic of picking off the unions one at a time. Murray called the steel strike off and signed the present contract with no wage increases and the pension plan for which the steelworkers now are paying at the rate of \$5 and \$6 per month deducted from their pay envelopes.

These actions left the coal miners high and dry in isolation from the rest of labor. The monopoly financial interests, and especially the Mellon-Morgan combination that had just signed with the steelworkers, proceeded to pinpoint their full-scale attack on the coal miners as well as on the United Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers, just expelled from the C.I.O.

The trade-union movement did not come to the aid of the miners. This forced the miners to retreat and resulted in the tactic of a 3-day work week in place of a full strike. While it can be said that the leadership, and specifically John L. Lewis, possibly ordered the retreat prematurely, because of an underestimation of the readiness of the miners to fight and because of a wrong approach to the handling of the big question of large stockpiles of coal and other such problems arising in a "chronically sick" industry, the trade-union movement must in the first place see its own responsibility for the retreat in its failure to rally to the defense of the miners.

The second stage was thus the long

siege, a test of holding power of working 3 days a week. During this long period, the coal stockpiles dwindled, but so did the miners' food supply and means of livelihood. The 3-day-a-week tactic was not fully effective because the employers found a weak spot. They put to work as many additional crews as possible, adding new crews in the big mines and opening up some of the smaller mines that had been closed. Although the miners were working 3 days a week, more coal was dug because there were more miners working.

The slow starvation and feeling of isolation from the rest of the labor movement seriously affected the fighting spirit and the morale of large sections of the miners. A feeling of hopelessness began to spread in the coal fields.

January of this year opened the third stage of this struggle. The forces of the state moved into action. The courts in every state where coal is dug started to grind out cases. The Republicans and Dixiecrats, with the help of Democrats like Senator Lucas of Illinois, started their frenzied oratory against the miners. The press and radio joined in the call for the Taft-Hartley axe to fall on the miners' necks. President Truman, playing his usual, demagogic role, pretended to resist the use of the Taft-Hartley Law while he continuously encouraged the coal corporations by his statements that he was not "allergic to using the Taft-Hart-

ley Law," until the corporations had created the proper conditions for it. Simultaneously during the attack, under the initiative of Communist and Left and progressive forces, the working class began to rally in support of the miners. The U.E. in Pittsburgh and Erie, Pennsylvania; the Communists and other progressives in the steel locals of Steubenville, Youngstown, McDonald, Warren, Lorain, Canton, Yorkville and Cleveland, Ohio; and the forces of the U.E. in Mansfield and Dayton, Ohio, as well as sections of the rubber workers' union, led the way. Similar developments took place in the large industrial sections of Gary, Indiana, and South Chicago, and in the progressive unions of both the C.I.O. and the A. F. of L. in New York and other Eastern seaboard industrial centers.

These forces not only mobilized their own membership but helped to move the rest of labor in support of the miners. This movement is taking the form of mass campaigns, pressure on Washington for the immediate repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act, and the removal of the corporation attorney Denham and protests against the use of injunctions. The trade-union movement and many nationality groups began, although slowly at first, to raise and send relief to the miners.

The increased attacks by the organs of state power and the growing support from the ranks of labor had their immediate effect on the miners.

They began to lose their feeling of isolation. They began to end their tactic of 3 days a week. Over 100,000 miners were in total strike when the President of the United States felt that the situation was "ripe" to use the Taft-Hartley Law. This was a signal for the rest of the miners to go all out into the fight.

LABOR SOLIDARITY AND POLITICAL LESSONS

The miners' struggle has now become the center for the broadest rank-and-file movement of labor solidarity in many years. The majority of the locals in the Right-led steel and auto unions, the majority of the locals of the Railroad Brotherhoods, the locals of the Machinists Union, great numbers of central bodies, both A. F. of L. and C.I.O., have joined the U.E., Mine, Mill and Smelter and other Left- and progressive-led unions in protests to Washington and in sending relief to the miners. The response to food collections at factory gates, union halls and centers of progressive organization of the national groups, and the donations of money and food by locals and by shop departments, are unprecedented in the history of American working-class struggles. A new and glorious page in working-class solidarity is being written.

Also, it must be noted that for the first time since the general strikes in the 'thirties, the idea of sympathy strikes is growing in the large industrial centers, especially those in

close contact with the miners. A number of locals, such as U.E.-Westinghouse in Pittsburgh and U.A.W. Local 45 in Cleveland, have passed resolutions urging such action by the trade-union leadership. The fact is that the majority of organized labor has expressed its solidarity in one form or another.

"The working class learns from its own experience," said Lenin. Not only have the coal miners learned from their nine months' experience, but large sections of the working class have also learned from it, especially the basic industrial workers who often live and work in the same communities, such as the steelworkers. These workers are drawing political lessons, particularly in the following direction:

1. Labor solidarity. The idea of directly helping striking workers in other industries is a new thought for whole sections of young workers who have come into industry during the last 10-15 years. This type of labor solidarity has been so little practiced in recent years that even older workers have had to re-learn its importance. The miners' struggle has helped to reestablish this idea of class unity on the level of economic struggles in the ranks of important sections of the working class.

2. The miners' struggle and the open and direct use of the apparatus of the state on the side of the mine operators has forced many workers to re-examine and draw some general conclusions on the role of the

capitalist state. The actions of Truman, Denham and Judge Keech in the coal crisis affirms Engels' statement that the bourgeois state "is nothing but the organized, integrated power of the 'have' classes, the landowners and capitalists, directed against the exploited classes, the peasants and workers."

3. The miners' long struggle has helped labor to dispel many of its illusions about the promises of President Truman. The Right-wing labor leaders are finding it more and more difficult to call "injunction Harry" the "greatest president since Lincoln" while he brazenly issues injunctions against the coal miners. President Truman's maneuver of waiting for the opportune moment, and blaming the Taft-Hartley Law on the Republicans, while he freely uses it himself, is regarded by the miners as a cheap wardheeler's election stunt.

4. There is a new concern over and understanding of the viciousness of the Taft-Hartley Act. Growing sections of the trade-union movement are now more determined than ever to fight for its repeal in this session of Congress.

5. There is a growing realization and appreciation of the important initiating and mobilizing role of the Communist Party in the working-class movement. This is clearly indicated by the almost complete absence of Red-baiting in the coal fields and the warm response to *The Worker* and the *Daily Worker*.

The above lessons can be summed up as follows: As a result of the miners' struggle there is taking place a growing trade-union consciousness and, in a more limited way, class-consciousness, in the ranks of important sections of the American working class.

More than any other section of the American working class, the coal miners have been forced to strike to defend and improve their conditions. The miners have learned to rely on their own rank-and-file strength. This self-reliance has developed, not only because the miners have faced a stubborn foe in the coal barons, but also because they have very often had to modify the advice of their own union leaders.

While giving full support to John L. Lewis' leadership, the miners are very critical of a number of weaknesses. The leadership has continued its old policy of not taking the members into its confidence by involving them in the formulation of policies.

The U.M.W.A. leadership does not extend its generally correct and militant economic demands to the political field. Consistency demands that in their struggle to defend their living standards and their union, and to secure an improved contract, the miners join with all other militant workers in challenging the reactionary and war-inciting Big Business forces and the Truman-bipartisan foreign policy. Lack of consistency in this respect was reflected by the participation of the U.M.W.A. lead-

ership in the Wall Street-dominated London conference of certain reformist and Social-Democratic trade-union leaders who had broken with the first real World Federation of Trade Unions on the issue of support to the Marshall Plan.

The failure to fight for the political interests of the miners in keeping with the struggle for their economic demands is a reflection of the thinking of a leadership that still sees the solution of the miners' problems as being within the framework of the dying capitalist system—a system dominated by the Wall Street Economic Royalists and their political stooges, Taft and Truman, who are threatening to wipe out human existence itself in their drive for world domination.

The miners are splendid fighters against the T-H bomb, and they can be just as effective fighters against the Hell-bomb threat to peace and all humanity. In this fight they must exercise the same type of initiative and self-activity as they are displaying in the present strike.

The broad rank-and-file working-class united front in support of the coal miners points to many lessons.

The workers were not influenced by the ideological barrage against the miners and their union. Broad masses sensed that here was an issue that affected the pocket-book of every worker in the country. The attack on the miners was an attack on the whole working class.

The support started on the elementary, practical level of collecting and sending relief to the miners, but in a matter of a few weeks this movement took on more and more the character, not only of a united struggle against the coal corporations, but of militant resistance to the open strike-breaking role of the capitalist state machinery.

This movement started largely as the result of the initiative of the Communists and the Left and progressive forces in the rank and file. Trade-union bureaucracy put up a resistance, but was unable to stem the tide.

This movement of support developed along a multitude of forms and methods, depending on the level of understanding of the workers of the particular union or shop. The actions developed from the sending of telegrams to the miners and to Washington, to demands for one-day protest stoppages in support to the miners.

The delegations of U.M.W. local officers and rank-and-file miners that toured and spoke in many of the industrial centers were very effective in mobilizing help for the miners and also in raising the political issues involved in the struggle to higher levels.

The tasks before the labor movement in this regard were set forth in the appeal for solidarity with the miners issued on February 15 by the National Committee of our Party, under the signatures of Eugene Den-

nis, General Secretary, and John Williamson, Labor Secretary, of which the following are important excerpts:

As a result of President Truman's use of the T-H bomb, the miners' struggle against the coal operators and Wall Street's government has entered a new phase.

The President has joined with the operators, the G.O.P. and the Dixiecrats to defeat the miners' demands and smash their union. There is no room for doubt about where Truman stands.

The miners have also made their position clear. They are more determined than ever to defend their union and secure their demands through united and organized trade union struggle.

The President has belied his campaign talk about repealing the Taft-Hartley Act. He encourages the operators to hold out against negotiating a new contract that would grant the miners' just demands. He has used the Taft-Hartley Act to secure two injunctions, which threaten the very existence of the U.M.W.A. . . .

This blitz against the coal miners is an attempt to turn back the clock of American labor history, and wipe out all the gains won through labor struggle since the pre-New Deal days. . . .

As long as the Taft-Hartley injunction can be applied against the United Mine Workers Union and its half-million members, no union is

safe. All trade unions, and the 15 million organized workers, are within range of the T-H bomb.

The forces behind this big anti-labor push are the big trusts, the bipartisan Congress, the Truman Administration and the monopoly-controlled press. Those who say "no" to the coal miners are also saying "no" to all who propose American-Soviet negotiations for outlawing atomic weapons.

Those who are using the T-H bomb against the miners are also going ahead with preparations to use the Hell-bomb against all mankind.

Those who seek to destroy the U.M.W.A. and the labor movement under cover of the Taft-Hartley Act also seek to destroy the Bill of Rights under cover of the Smith Act, the Foley Square frameup verdict and the pending Mundt-Ferguson bills—which are ostensibly directed "only" toward outlawing the Communist Party and its leaders.

Those who talk about "repealing" Taft-Hartley, while they use it to slug the miners, also talk about "passing" F.E.P.C. while they encourage the mounting K.K.K. violence against the Negro people.

Now, more than ever, the miners and their union deserve all-out support of all workers and progressives. . . .

The militancy and courage of the coal miners have brought forth a warm response from the workers in all industries and areas. A big and growing movement has not yet achieved its full potentialities. . . .

The National Committee of the Communist Party renews its appeal to all workers, and all trade-union leaders, to defend themselves and their unions by rallying all-out support to the miners who are in the front line of battle today.

Extend and broaden your pledges of solidarity to the miners!

Call for one-day work stoppages in protest against the injunctions!

Support the call for an all-union emergency conference, issued by I.F.L.W.U. president Ben Gold to C.I.O. president Philip Murray!

Make government-held food surpluses (food, eggs, etc.) available to the starving miners! Organize and send relief direct to the miners.

Hold emergency trade-union conferences in every city!

Set miners' solidarity days in all industries and industrial areas!

Make the coal operators grant the miners' demands!

Every shop and department demand Truman oust Denham!

Repeal the Taft-Hartley Act—NOW!

International Women's Day and the Struggle for Peace

By Claudia Jones

ON INTERNATIONAL WOMEN'S DAY this year, millions of women in the world-wide camp of peace headed by the mighty land of Socialism will muster their united forces to make March 8, 1950, a day of demonstrative struggle for peace, freedom and women's rights.

In our own land, there will be over fifty celebrations. On New York's Lower East Side, original site of this historic American-born day of struggle for equal rights for women, and in major industrial states, such as Illinois, Ohio, Michigan, Pennsylvania, California, Massachusetts, and Connecticut, broad united-front meetings of women for peace will be held. "Save the Peace!" "Halt Production of the A-Bomb!" "Negotiate with the Soviet Union to Outlaw Atomic Weapons!"—these are the slogans of women in the U.S.A. on International Women's Day.

THE STRUGGLE FOR PEACE

The special significance of this holiday this year, its particular meaning for labor, progressives, and Com-

munist, and for American working women generally, is to be found in the widespread condemnation, among numerous sections of the American people, of Truman's cold-blooded order to produce the hydrogen bomb and to inaugurate a suicidal atomic and hydrogen weapon race.

Not to the liking of the imperialist ideologists of the "American Century" is the growing indication by millions of American women of their opposition to war, their ardent desire for peace, their rejection of the Truman-bipartisan war policy.

As in the Protestant women's groups, many women's organizations are opposed to the North Atlantic war pact, which spells misery for the masses of American women and their families. This development coincides with the policy stand of progressive women's organizations that have been outspoken in demands for peaceful negotiations of differences with the Soviet Union, for the outlawing of atomic weapons, for ending the cold war.

Typical of the shocked reaction to Truman's order for H-bomb production was the statement of the Women's International League for Peace

and Fr
tary o
clear. H
that th
tiation
viet U
statem
down
nation
tion a
Aches
tion o
U.N.
well a
the pe
The
positio
bomb
ganiz
the s
front
many
Bosto
Peace
ballot
perma
en's c
for P
that c
wome
frater
class
signe
of th
Wom
addre
ballot
for
have
Chica
men

and Freedom demanding that Secretary of State Dean Acheson "make clear by action as well as by words that the United States desires negotiations and agreement" with the Soviet Union. This is necessary, the statement added, to avoid "bringing down upon this nation the condemnation of the world." This organization also expressed its opposition to Acheson's suggestion for the resumption of diplomatic relations between U.N. members and Franco-Spain, as well as to the proposed extension of the peace-time draft law.

These and other expressions of opposition to the Administration's H-bomb policy by notable women's organizations and leaders merge with the significant grass-roots united-front peace activities developing in many communities. For example, in Boston, as a result of a "Save the Peace—Outlaw the A-Bomb" peace ballot circulated last November, a permanent, broad united-front women's organization, "Minute Women for Peace," has been established. In that city, within ten days, over 6,000 women from church, trade-union, fraternal, Negro, civic and middle-class-led women's organizations signed peace ballots urging outlawing of the A-Bomb. In Philadelphia, a Women's Committee For Peace has addressed to President Truman a ballot to "Outlaw the H-Bomb—Vote for Peace." Similar developments have taken place in Pasadena and Chicago. The wide response of women of all political opinions to these

ballots is but an index of the readiness of American women to challenge the monstrous Truman-Acheson doctrine that war is inevitable. Emulation of these development in other cities, particularly among working-class and Negro women, is certainly on the order of the day.

Indicative of the determination of women, not only to register their peace sentiments, but to fight for peace, is the coalescing on a community basis, following such ballotings, of women's peace committees. The orientation of these committees is to convene women's peace conferences, in alliance with the general peace movement now developing.

The widespread peace sentiments, particularly of the women and the youth in their millions, must be organized and given direction and effective, militant expression. This is necessary, since the monopolist rulers are doing everything possible to deceive the people and to paralyze their will to fight for peace. Particularly insidious agents of the war-makers are the Social-Democratic and reformist labor leaders, the reactionary Roman Catholic hierarchy, and the American agents of the fascist Tito gang of imperialist spies, whose main task is to confuse, split and undermine the peace camp.

Hence, a fundamental condition for rallying the masses of American women into the peace camp is to free them from the influence of the agents of imperialism and to arouse their sense of internationalism with

millions upon millions of their sisters the world over; to protest the repressive and death-dealing measures carried through against the countless women victims by Wall Street's puppets in Marshallized Italy, in fascist Greece and Spain; to link them in solidarity with the anti-imperialist women united 80 million strong in 59 lands in the Women's International Democratic Federation, who are in the front ranks of the struggle for peace and democracy.

In these lands, anti-fascist women collect millions of signatures for the outlawing of the A-bomb, against the Marshall Plan and Atlantic war pact, for world disarmament, etc. In the German Democratic Republic, five million signatures were collected by women for outlawing the A-bomb. In Italy, the Union of Italian Women collected more than 2 million such signatures for presentation to the De Gasperi government. In France, women conducted demonstrations when bodies of dead French soldiers were returned to their shores as a result of the Marshall-Plan-financed war of their own government against the heroic Viet-Nameese. In Africa, women barricaded the roads with their bodies to prevent their men from being carted away as prisoners in a militant strike struggle charged with slogans of anti-colonialism and peace. And who can measure the capitalist fear of emulation by American Negro and white women of these peace struggles, particularly of the women of China (as reflected in the All-

Asian Women's Conference held last December in Peking), whose feudal bonds were severed forever as a result of the major victory of the Chinese people's revolution?

These and other significant anti-imperialist advances, achieved in united-front struggle, should serve to inspire the growing struggles of American women and heighten their consciousness of the need for militant united-front campaigns around the burning demands of the day, against monopoly oppression, against war and fascism.

REACTION'S IDEOLOGICAL AND POLITICAL ATTACKS AGAINST WOMEN

American monopoly capital can offer the masses of American women, who compose more than one-half of our country's population, a program only of war and fascism. Typical of the ideology governing this war perspective was the article in the recent mid-century issue of *Life* magazine entitled "Fifty Years of American Women." That "contribution" did not hold out the promise to American women along the demagogic 2000 A.D. line of Truman's State of the Union annual message, but brazenly offered the fascist triple-K (*Kinder-Küche-Kirche*) pattern of war and a "war psychology" for American women!

The author, Winthrop Sargeant, drawing upon the decadent, Nazi-adopted "theorist," Oswald Spengler, propounded his cheap philosophy on

the ex
sexes
each
domin
playin
propo
femin
With
in. T
ticket
frump
the n
reflect
pation
Femin
until
warti
ance.

Th
shoul
vulgar
this a
"theo
men'
tion,
peace
omeg
tacks
war
ment
Su
velop
izes
work
class
the
prof
terin
enin
N

the expensive Luce paper

. . . that only in wartime do the sexes achieve a normal relationship to each other. The male assumes his dominant heroic role, and the female, playing up to the male, assumes her proper and normal function of being feminine, glamorous and inspiring. With the arrival of peace a decline sets in. The male becomes primarily a meal ticket and the female becomes a sexless frump, transferring her interest from the male to various unproductive intellectual pursuits or to neurotic occupations, such as bridge or politics. Feminine civilization thus goes to pot until a new challenge in the form of wartime psychology restores the balance.

The real intent of such ideology should be obvious from its barbarous, vulgar, fascist essence. The aim of this and other numerous anti-woman "theories" is to hamper and curb women's progressive social participation, particularly in the struggle for peace. This has been the alpha and omega of bourgeois ideological attacks upon women since the post-war betrayal of our nation's commitments to its wartime allies.

Such ideology accompanies the developing economic crisis and penalizes especially the Negro women, the working women and the working class generally, but also women on the farms, in the offices and in the professions, who are increasingly entering the struggle to resist the worsening of their economic status.

Not always discerned by the labor-

progressive forces, however, is the nature of this ideological attack, which increasingly is masked as attacks on woman's femininity, her womanliness, her pursuit of personal and family happiness. Big capital accelerates its reactionary ideological offensive against the people with forcible opposition to women's social participation for peace and for her pressing economic and social demands.

None of these attacks, however, has been as rabid as the recent "foreign agent" charge falsely levelled by the Department of Justice against the Congress of American Women on the basis of that organization's former affiliation with the Women's International Democratic Federation.

Only the most naive, of course, are startled at the attack against this progressive women's organization, whose policies, domestic and international, were always identified with the progressive camp. The C.A.W. leadership, in its press statement, answered the continuing attack of the Justice Department, which demands "retroactive compliance" with the undemocratic Kellar-McCormack Act, despite the organization's disaffiliation from the W.I.D.F. (under protest). The statement pointed out that this organization has been harassed from its very birth precisely because of its advanced policy stand and activities for peace, child welfare and education, Negro-white unity and equal rights for women. Incumbent on labor-progres-

sives is the expression of full support for the struggles of women against these and other attacks and for the National Bread and Butter Conference on Child Care to be held in Chicago on April 15-16. The call for this conference indicates a broad, united-front sponsorship that includes C.A.W. leaders and demands use of government surpluses and the diversion of war funds to feed the nation's needy children.

ECONOMIC CONDITIONS OF WOMEN WORKERS

Any true assessment of women's present status in the United States must begin with an evaluation of the effects of the growing economic crisis upon the working women, farm women, workers' wives, Negro women, women of various national origins, etc. The ruthless Taft-Hartley-employer drive to depress the workers' wage standards and abolish labor's right to strike and bargain collectively, as well as the wholesale ouster of Negro workers from many industries, was presaged by the post-war systematic displacement of women from basic industry. While women constituted 36.1 percent of all workers in 1945, this figure was reduced to 27.6 percent by 1947. Despite this, there still remains a sizable force of 17½ million women workers in industry, approximately three million of whom are organized in the trade unions, the vast majority being still unorganized.

The sparse economic data available

show that the burdens of the crisis are increasingly being placed on the backs of women workers, who receive unequal wages, are victims of speed-up and face a sharp challenge to their very right to work. Older women workers are increasingly being penalized in the growing layoffs. Close to 30 percent of the estimated 6 million unemployed are women workers.

Side by side with this reactionary offensive against their living standards, women workers have increasing economic responsibilities. More than half of these women, as revealed in a survey by the Women's Bureau of the U.S. Department of Labor, are economic heads of families. The continued expulsion of women from industry, the growing unemployment of men and youth, as well as the high, monopoly-fixed prices of food and consumer goods generally, are impoverishing the American family and taking a heavy toll on the people's health.

Impoverishment has hit the farm women to an alarming degree. Almost 70 percent of all farm families earned less than \$2000 in 1948, when the growing agricultural crisis was only in its first stage.

Women workers still find a large gap between their wages and those of men doing the same work, while wages of Negro women are particularly depressed below the minimum wage necessary to sustain life.

There are increasing trends toward limited curricula for women students

and limited opportunities for women in the professions. Employment trends also show increasing penalization of married women workers who constitute more than half of all working women.

The attempt by employers to foment divisions between men and women workers—to create a “sex antagonism”—is an increasing feature of the offensive to depress the wages of women and the working class in general. Male workers are being told that the dismissal of married women and the “return of women to the kitchen” will lead to an end of unemployment among the male workers. But this whole campaign against “double earning” and for a “return of women to the kitchen” is nothing but a cloak for the reactionary, Taft-Hartley offensive against wages, working conditions and social security benefits, with a view to a wide-scale dumping of workers, male as well as female.

It must be frankly stated that there has been lethargy on the part of progressives in the labor movement in answering and combatting this insolent demagoguery. It should be pointed out that the German finance capitalists also used this demagogic line prior to the rise of Hitler. By perpetuating the lying slogan that “woman’s place is in the home,” monopoly capital seeks to conceal the real source of the problems of all workers.

Consequently this is a question of attacks, not only against the masses

of women, but against the working class as a whole. When we deal with the situation of women workers, we do so, not only to protect the most exploited section of the working class, but in order to rally labor-progressives and our own Party for work among the masses of women workers, to lead them into the emerging anti-fascist, anti-war coalition.

TRADE UNIONS AND WOMEN WORKERS

There is every evidence that working women’s militancy is increasing, as evidenced last year in strikes in such industries as electrical, communications, packinghouse and in strikes of teachers and white-collar workers. Have labor-progressives grasped the significance of the vital need for a trade-union program based on concrete knowledge of the conditions of the woman worker, an understanding of reaction’s attacks on her, economically, politically, socially?

Some Left-progressive unionists are beginning to tackle this problem as a decisive one. In New York District No. 4 of U.E., splendid initiative was shown by the official establishment of a Women’s Committee. Men and women unionists participate jointly to formulate a program and to combat the growing unemployment trends, especially the ouster of married women and their replacement, at lower wages, by young girls from high schools—a trend that affects the wages of all workers. In this union, also, conferences have

been held on the problems of the women workers. Similarly, in Illinois, an Armour packinghouse local held a women's conference with the aim of enhancing the participation of Negro and white women workers; as the result of its educational work and struggle, it succeeded in extending the leave for pregnancy from the previous three-month limit to one year.

But these instances are exceptions and not the rule, and it would be incorrect if we failed to state that attitudes of male supremacy among Left-progressives in unions and elsewhere have contributed to the gross lack of awareness of the need to struggle for women's demands in the shops and departments. This bourgeois ideology is reflected in the acceptance of the bourgeois attitude of "normal toleration" of women in industry as a "temporary" phenomenon. This dangerous, tenacious ideology must be fought, on the basis of recognition that the dynamics of capitalist society itself means the tearing of women away from the home into industry as a permanent part of the exploited labor force. Marx and Engels, the founders of scientific socialism, more than one-hundred years ago exposed the pious hypocrisy of the troubadours of capitalism who composed hymns about the "glorious future" of the family relationship under capitalism; they noted the fact, which many progressives too readily forget, that "by the action of modern industry, all family

ties among the proletarians are torn asunder. . . . The bourgeoisie has torn away from the family its sentimental veil, and has reduced the family relation to a mere money relation" (*Manifesto of the Communist Party*).

The absence of a special vehicle to deal with the problems of women workers in the unions has undoubtedly contributed to dealing with these problems, not as a union question, but solely as a woman's question. It is of course, both. But it must be tackled as a special union responsibility, with the Communists and progressives boldly in the forefront. In many instances this approach would improve rank-and-file struggles for wage increases, against speed-up and around other concrete demands, and would also win militant unionists for active participation within the emerging rank-and-file movements. In this connection, it is also necessary to examine the just complaints of many women trade unionists, particularly on a shop level, who are concerned over the trend toward fewer elected women officers, and the relegation of women merely to appointive positions, as well as the unnecessary pattern of "all-male organization" union structure on many levels.

This entire question requires that we take into account also the position of the wives of trade unionists.

Indicative of the growing militancy of workers' wives is the role of miners' wives, hundreds of whom, Negro

and white, recently picketed the empty tipples in the mining camps of West Virginia in support of the "no contract, no work" struggle of their fighting husbands, sons and brothers. Similarly, in the longshore trade, during the Local 968 strike in New York, wives of workers, particularly Negro and Italian women, played an outstanding role. Likewise, in Gary and South Chicago, wives of steelworkers issued open letters of support for the miners' struggle at the steel plant gates, collected food, etc.

Reactionary propaganda is not at all loath to exploit the wrong concepts of many workers' wives, who, because of political backwardness stemming from household drudgery, lack of political participation, etc., often adopt the view that it is the union, or the progressive movement, that robs them of their men in relation to their own home responsibilities.

Attention to the organization of wives of working men by labor-progressives and Communists therefore becomes an urgent political necessity. And key to avoiding past errors is the enlisting of women themselves, with the support of the men, at the level of their readiness to struggle.

THE EQUAL RIGHTS AMENDMENT

In the context of these developments and attacks upon women's economic and social status, one must also see the recent passage of the

Equal Rights Amendment in the U.S. Senate by a 63-19 vote. The original amendment, sponsored by the National Women's Party, proceeding from an equalitarian concept of women's legal status in the U.S., would have wiped out all protective legislation won by women with the assistance of the trade unions over the past decades. Objection to the original amendment by labor-progressives and by our Party led to the formation of a coalition of some 43 organizations, including such groups as the Women's Trade Union League, the U.S. Women's Bureau, the American Association of University Women, C.I.O. and A. F. of L. unions, the National Association of Negro Women, etc.

A proper approach to such legislation today must primarily be based on recognizing that it is projected in the atmosphere of the cold war, carrying with it a mandate for drafting of women into the armed forces, for the war economy. Without such recognition, the present Amendment, which now urges no tampering with previously won protective legislative gains for women workers, might serve as an effective catch-all for many unwary supporters of equal rights for women.

Despite this danger, Left-progressives should not fail to utilize the broad debate already taking place to expose women's actual status in law; some 1,000 legal restrictions still operate at women's expense in numerous states, and minimum-wage legisla-

tion does not exist for over 1 million Negro women domestic workers. A demand for legislative hearings and the exposure of the reactionary attacks now prevalent in numerous state legislatures against the legislative gains of women workers are necessary to guarantee that no bill for equal rights for women becomes the law of the land without proper safeguards protecting the special measures meeting the needs of women workers. Perspective of a necessary referendum carrying a 37-state majority necessary to the bill's passage should not obscure the possibility that passage of the legislation in its present form, or minus the protective clause, could serve as a means of bipartisan electoral maneuvers for 1950 and the passage of the Amendment in its original reactionary form.

A RICH HERITAGE OF STRUGGLE

Before 1908 and since, American women have made lasting contributions in the struggle for social progress: against slavery and Negro oppression, for equal rights for women and women's suffrage, against capitalist exploitation, for peace and for Socialism. Special tribute must be paid those heroic women who gave their lives in the struggle for Socialism and freedom: Elsie Smith, Anna Damon, Rose Pastor Stokes, Fanny Sellins, Williana Burroughs and Grace Campbell. In this period of the U.S. monopoly drive to war

and world domination, reaction pays unwilling tribute to the role of Communist women leaders by its deportation delirium. The present-day struggles of progressive and Communist women merge with the traditions and contributions of such great anti-slavery fighters as Harriet Tubman and Sojourner Truth, of such militant women proletarians as the textile workers of 1848, of such women pioneers as Susan B. Anthony and Elizabeth Cady Stanton, of such builders of America's progressive and working-class heritages as Kate Richards O'Hare, Mother Jones, Ella Reeve Bloor, Anita Whitney and Elizabeth Gurley Flynn.

March 8 was designated International Women's Day by the International Socialist Conference in 1910, upon the initiative of Clara Zetkin, the heroic German Communist leader, who later electrified the world with her brave denunciation of the Nazis in Hitler's Reichstag in 1933. Already in 1907, Lenin demanded that the woman question be specifically mentioned in Socialist programs because of the special problems, needs and demands of toiling women. Present at the 1910 conference as a representative of the Russian Social-Democratic Labor Party, Lenin strongly supported and urged adoption of the resolution inaugurating International Women's Day. Thus did the American-initiated March 8 become International Women's Day.

The opportunist degeneration of

the leadership of the Second International inevitably reduced the struggle for the emancipation of women to a paper resolution. Interested only in catching votes, the Socialist parties paid attention to the woman question only during elections.

Lenin and Stalin restored and further developed the revolutionary Marxist position on the woman question. Thus, Stalin declared:

There has not been a single great movement of the oppressed in history in which working women have not played a part. Working women, who are the most oppressed of all the oppressed, have never stood aloof, and could not stand aloof, from the great march of emancipation (*Joseph Stalin; A Political Biography*, p. 65).

Lenin and Stalin taught that the position of working women in capitalist society as "the most oppressed of all the oppressed" makes them more than a reserve, makes them a full-fledged part, of the "regular army" of the proletariat. Stalin wrote:

... The female industrial workers and peasants constitute one of the biggest reserves of the working class. ... Whether this female reserve goes with the working class or against it will determine the fate of the proletarian movement. ... The first task of the proletariat and of its vanguard, the Communist Party, therefore, is to wage a resolute struggle to wrest women, the women workers and peasants, from the influence of the bourgeoisie, politically to educate and to or-

ganize the women workers and peasants under the banner of the proletariat. ... But working women ... are something more than a reserve. They may and should become ... a regular army of the working class ... fighting shoulder to shoulder with the great army of the proletariat. ... (Stalin, *ibid.*)

WOMEN UNDER SOCIALISM

Complete emancipation of women is possible only under Socialism. It was only with the October Socialist Revolution that, for the first time in history, women were fully emancipated and guaranteed their full social equality in every phase of life.

Women in the U.S.S.R. are accorded equal rights with men in all spheres of economic, state, cultural, social and political life (New Soviet Constitution, Article 122.)

But equal rights in the U.S.S.R. are not just formal legal rights, which, under bourgeois democracy, are curtailed, where not denied in reality by the very nature of capitalist exploitation. In the Soviet Union, full enjoyment of equal rights by women is *guaranteed* by the very nature of the Socialist society, in which class divisions and human exploitation are abolished. In bourgeois democracies, equal rights for women constitute at best a programmatic demand to be fought for, and constant struggle is necessary to defend even those rights that are enacted into law.

In the U.S.S.R. equal-rights articles in the law of the land are but codifications of already existing and guaranteed reality. No wonder Soviet women express such supreme confidence in Socialism and such love for the people. Their respect for other nations, their profound sympathy with the oppressed peoples fighting for national liberation, is based on the firm conviction that their Socialist country is the decisive factor and leader in the struggle for peace.

Marxism-Leninism rejects as fallacious all petty-bourgeois equalitarian notions. Equal rights under Socialism do not mean that women do not have special protection and social care necessitated by their special function (child bearing, etc.) and special needs which do not apply to men.

COMRADE FOSTER'S CONTRIBUTION

The Communist Party of the U.S.A. has many positive achievements to record during the last 30 years in the field of struggle for women's rights and in promoting the participation of women in the struggle against war and fascism.

Outstanding was the recent participation of Party women and of the women comrades who are wives of the 12 indicted leaders of our Party in the mass struggle to win the first round in the Foley Square thought-control trial. And in the continuing struggle against the frame-up of our Party leaders we must involve ever

larger masses of women.

Under Comrade Foster's initiative and contributions to the deepening of our theoretical understanding of the woman question, a new political appreciation of our tasks is developing in the Party. Party Commissions on Work Among Women are functioning in the larger districts and in smaller ones. International Women's Day will mark a high point in ideological and political mobilization and in organizational steps to intensify our united-front activities among women, particularly around the peace struggle. As a further contribution to that end, a well-rounded theoretical-ideological outline on the position of Marxism-Leninism on the woman question is being prepared.

Comrade Foster called for theoretical mastery of the woman question as vitally necessary to combat the numerous anti-woman prejudices prevalent in our capitalist society, and the "whole system of male superiority ideas which continue to play such an important part in woman's subjugation." An important guide to the Party's work among women are the following words of Comrade Foster:

The basic purpose of all our theoretical studies is to clarify, deepen and strengthen our practical programs of struggle and work. This is true on the question of women's work, as well as in other branches of our Party's activities. Hence, a sharpening up of our theoretical analysis of, and ideological

struggle against, male supremacy, will help our day-to-day work among women. . . .

Comrade Foster particularly emphasized the ideological pre-conditions for effective struggle on this front:

But such demands and struggles, vital as they may be, are in themselves not enough. They must be reinforced by an energetic struggle against all conceptions of male superiority. But this is just what is lacking. . . . An ideological attack must be made against the whole system of male superiority ideas which continue to play such an important part in woman's subjugation. And such an ideological campaign must be based on sound theoretical work (William Z. Foster, "On Improving the Party's Work Among Women," *Political Affairs*, November 1948).

PARTY TASKS

Following Comrade Foster's article in *Political Affairs*, nine Party Conferences on Work Among Women were held with the active participation of district Party leaders. Two major regional schools to train women cadres were held. An all-day conference on Marxism-Leninism and the Woman Question held at the Jefferson School of Social Science last summer was attended by 600 women and men. These developments evidence a thirst for knowledge of the Marxist-Leninist teachings on the woman question.

But it must be frankly stated that it is necessary to combat all and sundry male supremacist ideas still pervading the labor and progressive movements and our Party. The uprooting of this ideology, which emanates from the ruling class and is sustained by centuries of myths pertaining to the "biological inferiority" of women, requires a sustained struggle. Failure to recognize the special social disabilities of women under capitalism is one of the chief manifestations of male supremacy. These special forms of oppression particularly affect the working women, the farm women and the triply oppressed Negro women; but, in varying degrees, they help to determine the inferior status of women in all classes of society.

Progressive and Communist men must become vanguard fighters against male supremacist ideas and for equal rights for women. Too often we observe in the expression and practice of labor-progressive, and even some Communist, men glib talk about women "as allies" but no commensurate effort to combat male supremacy notions which hamper woman's ability to struggle for peace and security. Too many labor-progressive men, not excluding some Communists, resist the full participation of women, avow bourgeois "equalitarian" notions as regards women, tend to avoid full discussion of the woman question and shunt the problem aside with peremptory decisions. What the promotion of a

sound theoretical understanding of this question would achieve for our Party is shown by the initial results of the cadre training schools and seminars on the woman question, many of whose students have begun seriously to tackle male supremacist notions in relation to the major tasks of the movement and in relation to their own attitudes.

The manifestation of bourgeois feminism in the progressive women's movement and also in our Party is a direct result of the prevalence of male superiority ideas and shows the need for our women comrades to study the Marxist-Leninist teachings on the woman question. According to bourgeois feminism, woman's oppression stems, not from the capitalist system, but from men. Marxism-Leninism, just as it rejects and combats the petty-bourgeois "equalitarianism" fostered by Social-Democracy, so it has nothing in common with the bourgeois idiocy of "the battle of the sexes" or the irrational Freudian "approach" to the woman question. These false ideologies must be combatted by women labor-progressives and in the first place by women Communists. Key participants in the fight against these ideologies, and in the fight to enlist the masses of women for the pro-peace struggle, must be the advanced trade-union women and women Communists on all levels of Party leadership. All Communist women must, as Lenin said, "themselves become part of the mass movement,"

taking responsibility for the liberation of women.

We must guarantee that women cadres end isolation from the masses of women, by assigning these cadres to tasks of work among women, on a mass and Party basis. The Women's Commissions of the Party must be strengthened. All Party departments and Commissions must deal more consistently with these questions, putting an end to the false concept that work among women represents "second-class citizenship" in our Party. A key responsibility of all Women's Commissions is increased attention and support to the growing movements of youth.

We must gauge our Party's work among women by our effectiveness in giving leadership and guidance to our cadres in mass work, with a view to concentrating among working-class women and building the Party. To this end, further, working-class and Negro women forces need to be promoted in all spheres of Party work and mass activity.

An examination of our work among women is necessary in all Party districts. There is need of Party conferences on the problems of working women and housewives. The good beginnings of examining the long neglected problems of Negro women must become an integral part of all our future work among women. This arises as an imperative task in the light of the militancy and tenacity of Negro women participating in struggles on all fronts.

Experience shows that a major area of our work should and must be in the field of education, where monopoly reaction and the Roman Catholic hierarchy concentrate in a policy of inculcating militarist, racist, pro-fascist ideology in the minds of our children; of victimizing progressive teachers, of conducting witch-hunts, etc. Where good work has been carried on in this sphere, victories have been won, as in the defeat of reactionary legislative measures directed at progressive teachers. In developing struggles to alleviate the frightful conditions of schooling, particularly in Negro, Puerto Rican, Mexican and other working-class communities, Communist and progressive women have an important task to perform and an opportunity for developing an exceedingly broad united front for successful endeavor.

By connecting the struggle against the seemingly little issues of crowded schoolrooms, unsanitary conditions, lack of child care facilities, etc., with the issues of reactionary content of teaching—racism, jingoism, etc.—the political consciousness of the parent masses can be raised to the understanding of the interconnection between the demand for lunch for a hungry child and the demand of the people for economic security; between the campaign for the dismissal of a Negro-hating, anti-Semitic Mae Quinn from the school system and the fight of the people for democratic rights; between the protest against a jingoistic school text and

the broad fight of the people for peace.

In keeping with the spirit of International Women's Day, tremendous tasks fall upon our Party. The mobilization of the masses of Americans, together with the enlisting and activation of women cadres, for heightened struggles for peace and for the special needs of oppressed womanhood, is indispensable to the building and strengthening of the anti-fascist, anti-imperialist, anti-war coalition. In working for a stronger peace movement among the women as such, we must draw the masses of women into the impending 1950 election campaign and thereby, on the basis of their experiences in the struggle, help raise their political consciousness to the understanding of the bipartisan demagoguery and the hollowness of Truman's tall promises. Large masses of women can thus be brought to a full break with the two-party system of monopoly capital and to adherence to the third-party movement. In the course of this development, with our Party performing its vanguard task, advanced sections among the working-class women will attain the level of Socialist consciousness and will, as recruited Communists, carry on their struggle among the broad masses of women upon the scientific conviction that the final guarantee of peace, bread and freedom, and the full emancipation of subjected woman-kind, will be achieved only in a Socialist America.

The Course of the Developing Economic Crisis

By Alexander Bittelman

IN HIS economic report to Congress at the beginning of the year, President Truman announced with great fanfare a reversal of the downward economic trend. He declared that "we have regained stability" and that "our economy is moving upward again" (*The Economic Report of the President*, page 2).

On February 6, 1950, just about a month later, the Census Bureau reported that the estimated number of unemployed on January 14 was almost one million—991,000—greater than on December 10, 1949, and that total unemployment in mid-January stood at a postwar high level of 4,480,000. Thus, while the President was proclaiming "an upward" trend and the reestablishment of "stability," nearly one million workers were joining the army of unemployed.

This certainly shows an upward trend: an upward trend in unemployment, which is a strange kind of economic "stability." What the President and his economic advisers were trying to do is to deceive the people about the actual state of economic affairs; to hide the fact that, despite a seasonal pick-up from July to September of 1949, the main economic trend continues downward.

The developing economic crisis is bringing us nearer and nearer to an economic crash of catastrophic proportions.

SOME FACTS AND FIGURES

Between October 1948 and July 1949, which marked the lowest point of the year, industrial production declined more than 18 percent. As we already had occasion to point out, this was a faster rate of decline than from 1929 to 1930. Then came the seasonal pick-up from July to September 1949, which marked the highest point in 1949, amounting to a little over 8 percent. In October the production index took a turn downward, due to the coal and steel strikes as well as to the developing crisis, followed by a moderate pick-up in industrial production in November and December. This produced a rise of about 2.8 percent; but its significance was largely seasonal. This is confirmed by the Department of Commerce, which explains the slight rise by "good Christmas trade" and "the volume of construction put in place" (*Survey of Current Business*, January 1950, p. 1).

Thus, the net decline in industrial

production from October 1948 to December 1949 amounts to 12.6 percent. And this is what President Truman calls "stability."

Unemployment rose 123 percent from November 1948 to July 1949. It fell about 16 per cent from July to September, due to the seasonal pick-up in production. It kept fluctuating within a narrow range between September and mid-December because of seasonal factors as well as the current strikes. Thus, the net increase in unemployment from November 1948 to mid-December 1949 was over 91 percent. Here, too, there is no "stability."

Now, if we take the state of unemployment as of mid-January 1950, the total increase from November 1948, the beginning of the decline, will amount to over 144 percent.

We must note here that the Census Bureau's unemployment figures usually underestimate total unemployment by about 1,500,000, as proved by the analysis of the U.E. This means that total unemployment in mid-January was about 5,900,000 instead of 4,480,000 as estimated by the Census Bureau.

We now turn to the course of capital investments, which is a fundamental factor in the development of the economic cycle. Here we note first a decline of about 7 percent during 1949. But taken from the peak of 1948 to the fourth quarter of 1949, the drop amounts to 16 percent. The outlook is for further decline.

The decline in investment in new plant and equipment which started in the Spring of 1949 will continue through the first quarter of 1950. . . . Based upon the latest quarterly survey by the Department of Commerce and the Securities and Exchange Commission, planned outlays are estimated at 3.9 billion dollars during the first 3 months of next year [1950]—14 percent below the actual expenditures in the corresponding months of this year [1949] (*Survey of Current Business*, December 1949, p. 3).

But if we compare this estimate for the first 3 months of 1950 with actual expenditures during the highest quarter of 1948, as we must, then the decline will amount to about 28 percent (October-December 1948—\$5,410 million; January-March 1950—\$3,900 million). Regarding this outlook, the *Monthly Letter of the National City Bank* (as quoted in the *New York Times*, January 3, 1950), comments: "Developments of 1949 indicated that a drop in business spending will constitute the thing most to be feared this year as the basic cause of business softening."

This comment does not exaggerate. An estimated drop in new capital investments of from 14 to 28 percent in the first quarter of 1950 is bound to accelerate immeasurably the further development of the maturing economic crisis. In this connection it is important to note that "the steel industry's record \$2 billion postwar expansion and improvement

program *was nearing completion as 1949 drew to a close*" (*New York Times*, January 3, 1950, our emphasis—A.B.).

As to the outlook for the export of capital, which Wall Street is working feverishly to promote and which is the main economic motivation behind its drive for world domination, the *New York Times* comments as follows:

United States capital investment is seeking expansion in many areas, but the Point Four program remains little more than a slogan as the new year begins. Latin America, Africa and both the Far and Near East are believed to offer fertile fields for United States investment if political and economic conditions permit (January 4, 1950).

"If political and economic conditions permit. . . ." In this little phrase is buried a major factor of the entire world situation—the national-liberation struggles of colonial and dependent countries. These struggles seek to overthrow imperialist domination and to establish national independence. And imperialist domination means also imperialist penetration of foreign capital, which must be distinguished from normal trade relations on the basis of equality. The new China, for example, favors normal trade relations with all countries on the basis of equality, but is unalterably opposed to the penetration and subjugation of the Chinese national economy by Wall Street and imperialism in general. And this is

what imperialist export of capital means. Consequently, the outlook for imperialist export of capital and for "the Point Four program" is not good, although conditions for normal business relations on the basis of equality will become more favorable to the extent that Wall Street's imperialist and warmongering drive is retarded, restrained and checked by the peace struggles of the American people in alliance with the peace forces of the whole world.

For the present, Wall Street's "cold war" is seriously obstructing the development of normal trade relations and, hence, is speeding up the further development of the maturing economic crisis.

The Census Bureau reports for 1949 a drop of 5 percent in the export of goods as compared with 1948 and of 16 percent as compared with 1947 (*New York Herald Tribune*, February 7, 1950). These are alarming figures, considering that foreign trade was one of the main supports of postwar industrial production in the United States. And what is the outlook here? We shall bring the views of some monopoly spokesmen and capitalist economists.

Many well informed quarters in Europe are apprehensive that currency and other developments, including the technological recovery of Germany, point to a severe international trade war in the next year and a half, according to Jackson Martindell, president of the American Institute of Management (*New York Times*, January 2, 1950).

Marshall Plan foreign economic penetration and its financing of American exports is meeting with constantly growing difficulties. Says the *New York Times*:

With roughly two-thirds of United States exports to Western Europe currently financed by the Marshall Plan, the concern originally felt over its impact on the domestic economy [that it may create shortages at home—A. B.] now has shifted to apprehension over the adjustments indicated by its gradual curtailment and end in 1952 (January 3, 1950).

The "adjustments" meant here are the further decline in American exports to Western Europe and the consequent acceleration of the developing economic crisis. But this will result, not only or mainly from the curtailment or ending of the Marshall Plan funds, but from the approaching economic crisis, which the Marshall Plan itself has done so much to hasten and aggravate in Western Europe.

The sharpening rivalry between American and British imperialism for markets (oil markets, for example) is another indication of the developing and maturing economic crisis. This is evident also in the growing frictions and rivalries of the Marshall Plan countries with Wall Street, as well as among themselves. We are dealing with a growing economic crisis in all capitalist countries.

The state of carloadings is always a sensitive indicator of economic

conditions and prospects. Here we find that 1949 was the lowest in ten years. Carloadings fell 15.9 percent from 1948 (*Wall Street Journal*, January 7, 1950). The decline continues. Carloadings for the week ending February 4 were 3.8 percent fewer than for the preceding week, 10.2 percent fewer than last year and 18 percent fewer than two years ago.

Retail trade shows a similar picture. Department-store sales in 1949 were 5 percent less than in 1948, according to the Federal Reserve Board (*New York Times*, January 6, 1950). The decline continues. "January dollar sales of all but one of the 23 chain stores and mail-order firms reporting showed a decline from the like month of last year" (*Wall Street Journal*, February 10, 1950).

A major factor in retail trade, largely in durable consumer goods, is the extraordinary rise in installment buying and in consumer credit generally. This factor tends for a while to maintain a relatively high level of retail trade, but is at the same time creating conditions for a most profound financial crisis, with devastating effects upon the course of the developing economic crisis.

Says the *Wall Street Journal*: "Deeper into debt went the American people last year, in order to buy such things as television sets, autos and clothes—and to pay various bills. Total outstanding consumer credit stood at \$18,788 million at the close of 1949. This was \$2,469 million more than a year earlier. It was more

than double the amount owed at the end of 1939" (February 2, 1950). This is one of the most dangerous developments in the economic situation.

The same trend continues, and an increasing portion of department-store sales is conducted on credit. With the developing crisis and the rapid growth of unemployment, payments are slowing down.

By the end of 1949, installment accounts receivable were up 22 percent over the previous year's end. For the year as a whole, the collection rate was lower, indicating a slackening of payments of consumers' outstanding indebtedness. These trends, which have been continued thus far this year, suggest that department stores may have an increasing amount of working capital tied up in credit accounts. The problem, of course, would be aggravated by any further decline in collection ratios (J. B. Wallach, *New York World Telegram and Sun*, February 7, 1950, our emphasis—A. B.).

This is one of the foundations upon which rests Truman's estimate of the country's economic "stability." Here, too, we have an "upward" trend, but it is the growth of the people's indebtedness.

And this brings us to one of the most fundamental questions: what is the condition of the home market as far as the masses of the people are concerned? The answer is: *the home market is narrowing down.*

The income of the working class

is decreasing. First, we must fully account for the fact that we already have nearly 6 million totally unemployed and about twice that number partly employed. This removes from the market billions of purchasing power, which the armament program does not make good. Secondly, weekly earnings of the employed workers are decreasing (*Wall Street Journal*, December 3, 1949). Thirdly, the cost of living is high and growing higher. In mid-November last year, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, it was still 26.5 percent higher than in June 1946 and 71 percent above August 1939.

The income of the farmers is decreasing. Farm income dropped in 1949 by 22.4 percent from 1947 and by 17 percent from 1948. According to the *New York Times* (January 3, 1950), "Prospects for 1950 indicate that the downward trend in prices and income will continue. . . . Long-range forecasts predict farmers' net income will slip another 15 or 16 percent in 1950." This spells a catastrophic drop in income for the small farmers, tenants and sharecroppers. It means a terrific worsening of the economic conditions—outright starvation—of the mass of agricultural workers.

At this point it must be noted that the Negro people provide a tremendous proportion of those farmers and agricultural workers who are already paying the heaviest price for the developing economic crisis, just as Negro industrial workers

constitute a great proportion of the growing army of unemployed. In brief, the Negro people have been carrying the heaviest burden of the developing economic crisis. This is the situation which we have analyzed and forecast in our very first economic analyses.

Furthermore: one-third of all buying units are earning less than \$1,000 a year, and two-thirds of all buying units are earning less than \$2,000 a year. This shows dramatically the continued impoverishment of the majority of the American people. It exposes the fact of intensified capitalist exploitation, especially of the semi-skilled and unskilled workers, the Negro workers, the youth, the agricultural workers, the women, the small farmers, as well as broad sections of the skilled workers.

From the *Annual Economic Review* prepared by the Council of Economic Advisers and submitted by the President to Congress in January 1950, we are able to establish the following: The lowest fifth of families and single persons received in money income in 1948 an average of \$893; the second fifth—\$2,233; the third fifth—\$3,410. This means that the average annual income in 1948 of the lowest two-fifths of families and individuals—40 percent of all—was about \$1,562, and that the average annual income of the first three-fifths was \$2,178. Compare these data with the officially established figure of \$2,500 a year as the minimum for a decent standard of living based on

pre-war prices, which means at least \$3,500 today.

Another factor intensifying the impoverishment of the working class and narrowing down the home market is the rapid growth of the number of unemployed who have exhausted their right to unemployment compensation. We cite from the report of the Economic Advisers (p. 29):

There has been a rapid rise during the year in the number of unemployed workers exhausting their rights to unemployment benefits. During the third quarter of 1949 more than 500,000 persons exhausted their rights to further benefits before finding employment, while in the comparative quarter of 1948 this was true of only about 225,000 persons.

This is an increase in the rate of growth of this category of workers of over 122 percent during 1949. Moreover: "In a considerable number of the major labor market areas as many as 60 to 70 percent of the unemployed are not now eligible for unemployment compensation" (*ibid.*).

Contrast this process of impoverishment of the masses of the American people with the enrichment of the monopolies. Despite the developing crisis and, in part, because of it, monopoly profits are mounting. Corporate profits in 1949 were \$27.6 billion before taxes and \$16.7 billion after taxes. This comes on top of \$21.2 billion after taxes in 1948, \$19.1 billion in 1947 and \$13.9 billion in

1946 (*ibid.*, page 37). It is significant that an increasing portion of these mounting corporate profits are not re-invested, as seen in the 18 percent drop in capital investments during 1949.

This means a growing accumulation by the monopolies of unused capital, so-called "savings," which are pressing for capital export markets, *i.e.*, for world domination and for preparation of a new world war.

In the annual report of the Council of Economic Advisers we also find:

While personal saving in 1949 was high by any previous peacetime standards, it is estimated that about one-third of all American families did not add to their savings, but instead spent more than their current incomes, either by drawing down their assets or by going into debt (page 46).

We have already shown that the indebtedness of consumers during 1949 has increased by \$2,469 million.

And further:

In the lower two-fifths of the population amounts dissaved greatly exceeded positive saving. Moreover, there was a sharp upward trend in the amount of dissaving by the lower income groups from 1945 through 1948 (*ibid.*, p. 46).

This confirms again the fact of the continuing impoverishment of the masses of the American people and the narrowing of the home market.

FORECASTS, PERSPECTIVES, POLICIES

President Truman and his economic advisers have made all sorts of economic predictions—long range and short range. They have tried to give the impression of confidence and optimism, but a close examination of their predictions reveals very little of either. The truth is that the economic reports of the President and his economic advisers, despite appearances to the contrary, are full of uncertainty and fear as to the economic perspectives. Keyserling himself, the acting chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, felt forced to admit at a "Meet the Press" interview that his reports contain, not predictions, but targets.

To this we should say: not targets, but fears, hopes, wishes, enveloped in a lot of swindle and demagoguery. The same ought to be said about the optimistic forecasts of Murray, Green & Co.

Much of this so-called "optimism" is very limited. It is confined to the first quarter of 1950; at most—to the first half. Beyond that, even the "optimists" dare not be too optimistic. All of this is based upon continuing government spending for armaments and other war preparations. In part, this optimism also rests upon the expectation of greater than normal activity in the construction of housing, and on the \$2,800,000,000 refund on government life insurance to World War II veterans.

Now, it is a fact that the govern-

ment is planning to spend about 70 percent of the total budget for so-called "national defense," which goes largely for armaments and war preparations. This involves a sum of from 28 to 32 billion dollars. The Prentice-Hall business report for January 28, 1950, estimates that for direct military needs alone the Federal government will spend "more than 20 billion dollars," and that this will take place "in a gently rising trend through 1950 and into the first half of 1951" (p. 4).

Also the bombs—atom and hydrogen—are figuring very prominently in the "optimistic" economic forecasts. Some experts feel that the hydrogen business will call for additional spending of more than a billion this year.

But all these tremendous expenditures for armaments and war preparations cannot and do not make any fundamental change in the course of the developing economic crisis. We had similar, and even larger, expenditures in 1949, but this did not prevent the economic decline, nor did it stop the further development of the economic crisis.

In our first analysis (*Political Affairs*, July 1949) of the economic decline, which began in November, 1948, we demonstrated that the rising expenditures for armaments and war preparations cannot prevent the cyclical economic crisis or stop the maturing of the crisis and further development of the economic decline. We said that the monopolies can do

nothing to stop these developments. We said further that the rising expenditures for armaments and war preparations will tend to build up the elements of a war economy in time of peace, and that this may tend to keep war-production industries busy while others were lagging or declining. We concluded that such developments may have the effect of retarding somewhat the *rate* of development of the maturing economic crisis, of slowing down the *speed* with which the capitalist economy of the United States is moving to an economic crash of catastrophic proportions, but that the process itself cannot be arrested. Moreover, we maintained that the very attempt to retard the development of the crisis and to delay the crash by means of building up the elements of a war economy in time of peace is bound to make the crisis deeper and the crash more catastrophic.

Events thus far have shown that the developing economic crisis has not been arrested, though the rate of its maturing may have been retarded somewhat, so that we are in fact creeping or crawling into the economic crisis instead of falling precipitously or rushing headlong into it. The assertion that this crawling way of getting into an economic crisis is "less painful to the masses" usually presented as a "gradual adjustment," is another of those bourgeois economic fictions of the "optimistic" variety.

Discussing the basis of "confi-

dence" as 1950 opens, the report of the Economic Advisers states:

The simplest reason for confidence about the short-run future is the most important. It is that the economy is now moving upward, and thus is itself generating recuperative forces (p. 67).

This is obviously not economic analysis but wishful thinking. The present so-called upward movement of the economy is very halting and uncertain. And the best proof that it is not an upward trend but a seasonal fluctuation is the fact that, *while industrial production has risen from December to January by about 2 percent, total unemployment has risen nearly 29 percent and the number of persons working 35 hours or more has declined by 2,220,000.*

What kind of upward trend is it that produces a 2 percent rise in monthly production and a 29 percent decline in full-time employment and an increase of over 2 million in part-time employment? It is no upward trend at all but a further development of the economic crisis.

It is nothing new that within the development of the crisis phase of the economic cycle, seasonal factors, together with some particular policies of the government, may produce in one or another branch of the economy a slight rise. In this particular instance, a number of seasonal factors in the light industries have combined with especially heavy government expenditures to bring about a temporary arrest in the de-

cline of production and a slight rise, first, between July and September of 1949, and then, from October to December of 1949.

Note two things about this rise. The pick-up from July to September was 8.4 percent, while the pick-up from October to December was only 2.8 percent. The rate of pick-up declined almost 67 per cent. This in itself demonstrates the terrific weakness and transitory nature of this so-called upward trend. The second thing to note is that with all these pick-ups, all that was recovered from the more than 18 percent decline (from October 1948 to July 1949) was 5.4 percent. This shows again that what was taking place was a very temporary, unstable and slight rise in production, accompanied, from mid-December, by a rapid growth of mass unemployment, total and partial; and this within the main economic trend, which is a developing economic crisis leading to a crash of catastrophic proportions.

Truman's economic advisers themselves feel compelled to admit some such "possibility." Says the report:

A distinct upward movement has now been created, and it may be counted upon to continue unless it is interrupted by factors which we shall discuss and which must be faced (p. 67-8).

And what are these factors? One of these is high prices: "business should strive to the utmost to avoid price increases" (p. 73). But what

happens? The steel monopolies are carrying through a major price rise which is beginning to affect unfavorably the whole economic situation.

The second factor is the course of business investments. Here they stress "the maintenance of a sufficiently high level of business investment" (p. 73). On this factor, the report itself is forced to say: "New investment for these purposes [new plant and equipment] in 1949 . . . declined by a substantial amount and surveys of the investment plans of business firms indicate a further decline in the first quarter of 1950" (p. 73).

The third factor is mass consumption. Says the report: "We shall not be completely out of the woods after our recent difficulties until private adjustments and public policies are successful in raising the level of consumption, which is not now sufficiently high for sustained maximum production and employment or for the full prosperity of our business system" (p. 73).

Yet, the whole public policy of the Truman Administration is to prevent wage increases, to discourage and defeat wage movements, in accord with the wishes of the monopolies. This is also the policy of Murray, Rieve, Reuther, & Co.—a policy also followed by Green and Dubinsky with some variations. The meaning of these policies is that working-class income has to decrease, also the income of the farming masses, as well as the level of mass consumption.

The fourth factor is "excess capa-

city" of production. Says the report:

The total real output of our economy in 1949 was between 10 and 13 billion dollars below the output that would have resulted at the maximum level of production and employment (p. 74).

This figure is greatly underestimated. Actually, it is several times larger, considering the production capacity of the idle plants owned by the government. But what are some of the major consequences of this excess capacity? It sharpens immeasurably the contradiction between production and consumption. The monopolies seek to make the workers, farmers and small businessmen carry the burden of excess capacity. This impoverishes further the masses of the people, narrowing down the home market and hastening the outbreak of economic crises. The growth of so-called excess capacity of production (meaning more capacity to produce than is profitable for Wall Street) is one of the most outstanding features of the deepening general crisis of capitalism.

The fifth factor is "the problem of adjusting our policies to the prospective ending of the European Recovery Program" (p. 74). The solution proposed is the Point Four Plan, which we have discussed above. Even the apologists of the monopolists have no faith in the capacity of this plan to affect the present business cycle.

In addition, we must take full account of the approaching economic

crisis in all capitalist countries, especially in the Marshall Plan countries. U.S. exports in the fourth quarter of 1949 ran at an annual rate of 14.1 billion dollars as compared with a rate of 17.7 billions in the first quarter of 1948—a drop of 20.4 percent. Obviously, the further worsening of the economic situation in the other capitalist countries will hasten the further development of the crisis in the U.S.

And the general crisis of capitalism continues to deepen *at an accelerated rate*. The Soviet Union and the People's Democracies are making amazing economic progress and consolidation. Total Soviet production in 1949 was 20 percent above 1948 and 41 percent above 1940, resulting in a steady improvement and advance in the well-being and security of the people.

In the People's Democracies: Polish industry is now producing 2½ times as much goods per capita as in pre-war years, and 96 percent of the entire industrial production is turned out by the Socialist sector of the economy; Czechoslovakia has overfulfilled the quotas of the first year of its Five-Year Plan and 97 percent of the industry belongs to the Socialist sector; industrial production in Hungary has reached 140 percent of prewar and 92 percent of its industry is nationalized; in Romania, industrial production in 1949 increased by 40 percent. Similar growth is registered in Bulgaria, Albania, Northern Korea and the Mongolian People's Republic, all of which are on the

road of becoming transformed from agrarian into industrial-agrarian countries. And the Chinese People's Republic has already, in the very course of military operations against the reactionary Kuomintang, unfolded large-scale activities for the restoration of the national economy.

The liberation movements in Asia are expanding in the wake of the great Chinese victory. Imperialist rivalries and contradictions are growing. Class contradictions in the capitalist countries are becoming sharper.

All of these developments in the course of the general crisis of capitalism are naturally and inevitably hastening the developing and approaching economic crisis in the capitalist countries. These developments are also creating the conditions that determine the catastrophic nature of the economic crash when it comes.

From the foregoing it follows that the action program of the Communist Party, and its policies, retain full force and validity—the program adopted by the Party for meeting the developing economic crisis, for protecting the masses from the drive of the monopolies to make the people carry the main burden of the crisis. It should be added that the fight for higher wages and shorter hours is developing further as a major issue; that the defense of the unemployed, especially the growing army of workers who have exhausted their rights to unemployment compensation, is becoming task number one; and that the fight for expanding and enlarg-

ing the social-security demands of the people is acquiring new urgency.

These demands, together with the other planks of the Party's action program, must be pushed with greater vigor. This includes the taxation program, the demands for the resumption of normal trade relations on the basis of equality with the Soviet Union and the People's Democracies, recognition of, and trade relations with, the Chinese People's Republic, etc. All these struggles must necessarily be linked with the fight to end the "cold war," with the fight for peace, without which none of the other struggles can make much headway.

We must systematically expose the fact that Truman's summary of legislative recommendations, with which he concludes his economic report to Congress, follows his general strategy. It is the strategy of linking demagogic promises to the masses plus slight concessions to the capitalist farmers and the bureaucracy of labor, with the very real measures of promoting further Wall Street's drive for world domination. He links his fraudulent promises to the masses with the Marshall Plan, Point Four Plan, armament budget, war preparations, etc., under the camouflage of building a so-called "welfare state" which, as our Party has already proved, is nothing more than preparations for war. We must systematically expose the fact that *this so-called "welfare state" does not mean peo-*

ple's welfare but is designed to mask and hide the economic, political and military preparation of the capitalist state for waging a new world war and for dragging the American people into it. This "welfare state" demagoguery is designed to mask the process of fascization of the state machinery and methods of monopoly rule—the fascist danger—and the building up of a war economy in peace time. That is why the exposure of the "welfare state" swindle and the fight for the crisis-demands of the masses must be linked with the fight against the fascist danger and for the democratic liberties of the people.

The greatest obstacle to the unfolding of the Party's united front policies, to the further development of mass struggles on the crisis issues, as well as on peace, civil rights, anti-fascism and democratic liberties, is the Truman demagoguery, his "welfare state" swindle. A decisive component of this obstacle consists in the purveyors of this swindle among the masses—the reactionary trade-union bureaucrats and Social-Democratic leaders, as well as the phony—the Truman—liberals. To help bring about united mass struggles against the monopolies and their oppressive and reactionary policies it is necessary to unfold boldly and consistently the Party's policies for the united and people's front, unmasking the deceit of Truman and the treachery of the reformist leaders.

Lessons of the Civil Rights Mobilization

By Pettis Perry

IT IS A FEW weeks now since the great civil rights mobilization initiated by the N.A.A.C.P. and sponsored by more than 50 organizations convened in Washington, D. C. This mobilization, held January 15-17, was organized around the theme of winning civil rights legislation in this session of Congress. It was by far the largest gathering ever to assemble in the national capital on any particular issue.

THE GREAT SIGNIFICANCE OF THE MOBILIZATION

From the beginning our Party said that this mobilization was one of the most significant developments ever to have taken place in the life of the Negro people, that at no time had we ever witnessed such unification around the question of civil rights. This was especially true from three points of view. For one thing, the civil rights mobilization represented the greatest unification of some of the most important national Negro organizations. In fact, it was the broadest unification. Secondly, this was the broadest unification of the Negro people and the labor movement in the field of civil rights or any other issue to date, in view of

the fact that the C.I.O. officially, the A. F. of L. officially, and the United Mine Workers of America joined in the sponsorship of this gathering. Thirdly, this was the broadest coalition representing Negro-Jewish unity that the country has ever seen, almost all of the national Jewish organizations being co-sponsors.

The second conclusion we drew was in connection with the basic cause of this type of gathering. We came to the conclusion that the mobilization reflected the upsurge from below on the part of the Negro masses, which has been growing at an ever-increasing rate throughout the postwar period, and that this trend from below was making its imprint upon leading circles in the Negro movement, to the point where it could no longer be ignored. This trend has expressed itself over a number of years, reaching a real high point during the national tour of Paul Robeson in the last quarter of 1949. At that time, in the face of the most rabid anti-Robeson agitation on the part of the entire bourgeoisie and a section of the Negro middle class, there were outpourings of thousands upon thousands of Negroes from every stratum of the Negro popula-

tion, especially Negro workers. This trend was also expressed in the great upsurge and militant reaction of the Negro people around the events at Peekskill. It was expressed further in the outpouring of many thousands of Negro people in support of Ben Davis week after week in Harlem.

Further, we expected that in the midst of this upsurge there would be an attempt on the part of some of the leaders of the mobilization to turn it into a pro-Truman rally, that undoubtedly a number of people in the leadership of the N.A.A.C.P. would attempt to curtail the militancy of this movement and direct it into pro-Administration channels.

On the basis of this overall estimate, our Party considered that the general significance of the mobilization in contributing toward pushing forward to a new level the struggle for Negro liberation merited for it the full support of the whole labor and progressive movement. It is from this premise that the Communist and Left forces proceeded.

More than 5,000 people descended on the capital in mid-January in a determination once and for all to fight for and win civil rights. The delegates came from more than 30 states and represented many types of organization: 2,764 came from N.A.A.C.P. branches and Youth Councils; 532 from the American Jewish Congress; 350 from C.I.O. unions; 119 from A. F. of L. unions. From Maryland, exclusive of Washington, D. C., there were 1,076 dele-

gates; New York, 1,015; Pennsylvania, 619. And this is exclusive of those that were "screened" out and of those that registered after 4 P.M. of the second day of the conference. Many more registered later, adding considerably to the 4,037 delegates registered until then. There were 294 delegates from eleven Southern states (again, exclusive of those "screened" out), of whom 189 were from Virginia. The Methodists and Baptists, embracing well over 4,000,000 Negroes in the U.S., were represented by 94 delegates.

ROLE OF THE REFORMISTS, TROTSKYITES, AND SOCIAL-DEMOCRATS

In full confirmation of our Party's estimate, it became very clear fairly early in the preparations for the mobilization that the desire of certain forces was to do everything in their power to restrict the movement. These forces embraced people from the National C.I.O., including Philip Murray; certain elements in the Jewish community; the Truman Democrats; the Dubinsky forces in the A. F. of L.; the Wilkins-Murray, Randolph and Townsend forces; and the Trotskyites. Their policy became clear with the exclusion of the Civil Rights Congress; and the hand of Philip Murray was clearly seen in the exclusion of the Left-led unions. This made it apparent that certain forces in the Negro movement were prepared to wreck the mobilization,

if necessary, in order to carry out the line of the pro-imperialist elements.

Earlier, the sponsoring organizations, in a document called "Now Is the Time for Civil Rights," had stated—and quite correctly:

With the end of the first session of the 81st Congress at hand, it is now apparent that campaign pledges to pass effective civil rights legislation have been openly and flagrantly repudiated. If this legislation is to be enacted in the second session of the 81st Congress, the people of America must be mobilized as never before to this end.

Yet what happened? As the preparations for the mobilization proceeded, Red-baiting began to be injected for disruptive purposes, and "Communism" was made a decisive issue. It was along about this period that Herbert Hill, a known white Trotskyite employed by the national office of the N.A.A.C.P., was put on as an assistant field director of that organization. Hill toured the various areas peddling the most disruptive Red-baiting line and organizing provocative actions, all of which could only have the effect of discouraging and disrupting the mobilization.

It is widely rumored that Philip Murray and his fellow top bureaucrats in the C.I.O. were the motive force engineering this disruption, that Murray agreed to underwrite everything in return for "screening" power at the mobilization.

Now what was the contribution of the Murrays, the Dubinskys, the

Truman Democrats, the Roy Wilkins and the other forces of disunity? What did they do while such a mammoth gathering began to assemble in Washington? Did they attempt to lead this mobilization into a struggle to smash through Jim Crow in Washington? Did they attempt to develop and encourage the militancy of this force to exert the maximum pressure on Congress and the Administration? Did they raise high the banner of anti-lynching, keeping in mind that in Kuochiski, Miss., almost at the same time that this conference was taking place, three Negro children were killed in cold blood? Did these people attempt to give the type of leadership to this great assembly to compel Congress to prepare an anti-lynching bill immediately? They did not.

The first thing that greeted this assembly was an L-shaped table dominated by Murray's hatchet men in the form of Willard Townsend, misleader of the Red Caps; Boyd Wilson and Love of the United Steel Workers; and Oliver of the U.A.W. These Uncle Tom Negroes were willing to do the dirty work for Philip Murray and Walter Reuther. Herbert Hill, who bustled around the place behaving like a Southern plantation overseer, bellowed at and directed these Negro people, frequently shouting down to them: "If you can't make up your mind about them [referring to certain delegates] send them into Bill [Mr. Townsend]. We have a good hatchet gang." Imagine

what a reaction came from the Negro delegates to find themselves being ordered around by this arrogant white chauvinist.

It should be pointed out that the F.B.I. was very much in evidence, since they work very closely with the Trotskyites anyway. But more about the Trotskyites's role below.

In addition to this, the hall was not large enough to accommodate all of the 5,000 people that arrived. At no time were all the delegates able to meet together. The largest meeting held was of 2,500-3,000 delegates. This means that the planners of this gathering did not expect or want a turnout of this size and scope.

Many Negro people were highly incensed at this. The white progressives who had come with honest intentions to fight for the greatest amount of unity were simply outraged at this kind of performance.

The meetings themselves were for the most part addressed by white Senators and Congressmen (with the sole exception of Dawson and Powell) and practically all of the other speakers, the exceptions being Randolph and Wilkins, were white speakers, and one might add, white chauvinists. Senator Wayne Morse of Oregon, for instance, in his speech tried to palm off the demagoguery that the reason the Negro people are without civil rights is that they do not understand his parliamentary problems. Senator Humphry, in a speech that same evening, began along this line: "I didn't come here

to talk against the Dixiecrats. I didn't come here to speak against the Republicans," and then went into a tirade of Red-baiting. This combination of evasion and demagoguery was the tenor of the speeches of most of the Congressmen.

It is this kind of confused situation that was thrown up at the very outset by the smokescreen of Red-baiting, about which a number of Negroes were very much alarmed even before the conference convened. For instance, the day before the opening of the conference (January 14) there was an editorial in the Baltimore *Afro-American* that clearly sensed the sinister meaning of the "anti-Communist" provocation:

Most of the organizations blackballed were fingered by the Un-American Activities Committee and it seems tragicomic that the N.A.A.C.P. should adhere to the standards of Americanism established by Rankin and Company in a fight to abolish Rankinism.

We may be more naive than the N.A.A.C.P. leadership, but it seems to us that the question involved in a Mobilization for Civil Rights should not be the ideological, the political or the economic beliefs of the mobilizers, but the simple issue, "Are you for or against civil rights for all people?" Other considerations for the moment be damned.

The delegates, for their part, stood their ground, refused to permit themselves to be provoked, and sought to keep their ranks solid and to present their demands in a militant fa-

shion to the Congressmen and Senators. Many of the delegates, however, as a result of all of the "screening" and provocation, wanted simply to walk away and forget it all; some delegations even wanted to withdraw from the conference. This, of course, would have been wrong, for it would have broken up the conference and have played into the hands of the disrupters. And so, avoiding such a step, many people began to voice their protests at this whole behavior. The resentment was particularly strong against being dominated by the white Social-Democrats and the labor reformist elements of the Murray-Reuther stripe, who sat in the background.

The delegates, in being prepared to see their Congressmen, were presented with a set of "do's and don'ts," as it is called. Just two sentences will indicate the sickening, belly-crawling document they were given: "Your appearance and behavior affects the impression you make. Be neat in appearance and orderly in manner."

In other words, the reason Negroes have no civil rights is because they are filthy, is because they are boisterous, is because their manners are bad, is because their behavior is bad. The delegates, instead of accepting this kind of nonsense, in going to the Senators and Congressmen—and this happened in a whole number of the delegations, including most of the large ones—posed these questions to the Congressmen: "We don't want you to affirm or re-affirm your posi-

tion on civil rights. That you did in the 1948 elections. We want to know whether you are prepared to fight to see that Congress is kept in session until civil rights legislation is passed." And in visiting the senators the approach was: "We don't want to know whether you will vote for civil rights or not. That you said in 1948 during the elections. We want to know whether, if you fail in invoking cloture, you would be willing to keep the senate in session until the filibuster is broken or to put everything on the shelf in the senate and give the green light to civil rights? Further, are you prepared to go to the President and demand that he cut off patronage from all senators who fail to go along with civil rights legislation?" And then, said many of these delegations to their representatives and senators, "Based on your actions on these questions, we will go back and tell the people how you stand on the various bills."

The delegates, in fighting to unify themselves and in keeping together, made the conference a real success under the most difficult and complicated conditions. They fought at every opportunity given them. They attempted to present their demands in a most effective way. They guaranteed the unity of their ranks.

There has been a lot of slander in the bourgeois press. In fact, some of the journalists, including those of the conservative *Pittsburgh Courier* and the pro-Trotskyite *Los Angeles Sentinel*, have been turning hand-

spring over the so-called "Communist screening" that took place at the conference, as have also the big bourgeois papers. Out of 800 people screened, there were probably not over two or three dozen Communist and Left forces. The screening also hit Negro ministers from the deep South whose credentials were not "on letterhead." It hit three busloads of young people, Negro and white students, many of whom were getting into the fight for the first time. It included more than 30 organizations on the campus in Ann Arbor, Michigan. The Committee to End Discrimination at this university embraced delegations from such organizations as Young Democrats, Young Republicans, Hillel Foundation, Student A.D.A., Unitarian Student Group, A.V.C., Inter Co-operative Council, Association of Independent Men, Inter-racial Association, and Dormitory house councils: Allen Rumsey, Anderson, Angell, Cooley, East Quad. Council.

These were the people that were excluded. And so all of the noise about "exclusions of the Communists" is an attempt to cover up the dirty work of the Trotskyites, the Murray forces, the Social-Democrats, the Truman Democrats and Roy Wilkins. I speak of Roy Wilkins because it should be said that the National Board of the N.A.A.C.P. was not in accord with this kind of behavior prior to the conference and this is a product of the Wilkinsons and Gloucester Currents and must be viewed

in that light.

Did the Communists and Left forces participate in this conference? Categorically, yes. Communists and Lefts did participate, and admirably. They made outstanding contributions. In their fight to help unify all of the forces at the conference, they fought splendidly and not altogether unsuccessfully. Without their participation, it is not likely that the conference would have remained together in the face of the provocations. The Communist and Left forces helped greatly in creating a determination in the minds of the people not to permit themselves to be divided. In fact, some of the N.A.A.C.P. leaders from the various large delegations fought against this destructive policy of Murray carried through by Townsend. They knew that this could only bring harm to the organization.

Now as to the role of the Trotskyites. All during the registration, as I have mentioned, the Trotskyites acted in a way that could only incense or have the effect of incensing masses of people against the N.A.A.C.P. because the behavior of these treacherous forces could easily be mistaken for the policy of the N.A.A.C.P. National Board. In delegation after delegation, a great deal of dissatisfaction developed over the treatment the delegates were receiving. The Trotskyites attempted to provoke resolutions condemning the entire National Board of the N.A.A.C.P., although they knew that this

body was not responsible and that the forces responsible were the Social-Democrats and the Murray forces with whom Wilkins was dealing. The Trotskyites knew that Wilkins, Townsend and this whole caboodle were playing the role of the running dogs for the forces of reaction, and that condemnation of the whole N.A.A.C.P. national leadership could only bring harm to the entire organization, could militate against the further growth of the organization, and could serve to break up, not only the conference that was assembled, but the organization itself. This was the kind of disruptive role that the Trotskyites always play.

Thus we see that the Trotskyites carried out the "screening" policy and also did everything in their power demagogically to incite the Negro masses against the N.A.A.C.P. leadership.

The Left-progressive forces, and particularly the Negro people, must be awakened to the spying, wrecking, stoolpigeon role of these agents of reaction.

How does one explain that all day Sunday at the conference Herbert Hill had standing close beside him at a table an agent of the F.B.I.? How does one explain that the F.B.I. and the House Un-American Activities Committee never investigate any really subversive activities that involve these groups, any more than they do the K.K.K. The only explanation that can be given is that these forces are in the service of the

most reactionary, anti-Negro forces in America.

Can we forget that throughout the life of Roosevelt, the Trotskyites had not one word to say in favor of Roosevelt, but in election after election directed their main fire against the Roosevelt Administration and, by indirection, in favor of the Republicans? How does one explain that these forces are some of the greatest mouthers of support for Truman's demagogic civil rights program? The Negro people should ask themselves this question: If the Trotskyites admit that their interest in the middle 'thirties in the Socialist Party (which was at least in name a revolutionary party) was to enter it to wreck it, what can be their purpose in throwing their attention upon the N.A.A.C.P. as they are doing in area after area, if not to wreck the N.A.A.C.P.? We must sound the alarm on this question to the entire Negro community. And what is more, we must wage the most uncompromising fight against Trotskyism in the entire Negro, labor and progressive movement.

As for the role of Wilkins, Randolph and Townsend, they left that conference with their prestige as Negro leaders vastly lowered, as Uncle Toms, and this is what they deserved for the role they played there.

All of this presents us very clearly with the need to fight Trotskyism, Social-Democratism and Negro reformism as an essential part of the fight to unify the Negro people, to

ment Negro-white unity and Negro-Jewish unity and to advance the struggle for Negro liberation. Without this fight, no such unity can be successfully built.

WEAKNESSES OF THE COMMUNIST AND LEFT FORCES

There were some very serious weaknesses on the part of the Left forces as a whole and on the part of some of the white Communist and Left-progressive forces. In general, as has already been indicated, the entire Left made really positive contributions. It must be said, however, that the Left forces as a whole were too slow to see and give organized expression to the vast indignation on the part of the Negro leaders, and particularly of the Negro ministers, over the fact that they were being muzzled. There were no speakers from the Negro Baptist Convention or the Elks, and there was great indignation, not only on the part of those delegations, but generally among the Negro delegates, who would have appreciated hearing from some of their spokesmen on this phase of Negro life. Had organized expression been given to this gathering resentment, there is a good possibility that the political complexion of the conference could have been changed.

And our white comrades, despite the very aggressive struggle against white chauvinism that many of those present have been engaged in, did

not see and fully appreciate the fact that the Negroes were being subjected to the most vicious type of white chauvinism from white Trotskyites, Social-Democrats and Truman Democrats. They did not step forward and express their great indignation, though this was possible at some, if not all, of the delegation meetings. Had they, as white Communists and progressives, spoken up in sharp condemnation of a Humphry or a Wayne Morse for their insults to the Negro people, or had they spoken up sharply against the indignities that were being inflicted upon the Negro people by Hill, it would have resulted in a sharp differentiation between white progressives, on the one hand, and white Trotskyites, Social-Democrats, Truman Democrats and Republicans, on the other. It would have helped further to clarify for the Negro people the seriousness and danger of excluding the Left-led trade unions, since the role of the Left would have been unmistakably clear to them. That this was not done was a serious weakness that raises before us the necessity to continue to maintain the struggle against white chauvinism and to take this fight out among the masses, which is the only way to get the necessary results.

We are accused of having special, particular interest in the Negro people. To this charge, we say Yes, we have a special interest in the Negro people. The forces of reaction also have a special interest in them: To

use the Negro masses as a means of supporting the cold war of the Truman Administration which is responsible for the intensification of the attacks and oppression of the Negro people; to chain the Negro masses to the chariot wheels of imperialism; to guarantee that the forces of reaction will continue their domination of the Negro people. This is the objective of the Social-Democrats, of the Trotskyites and of Negro reformism, represented by Wilkins, Randolph, Townsend and company. And this was made unmistakably clear when Wilkins, crawling on his knees at the feet of President Truman on January 17, had this to say:

We are convinced that nothing will aid the entire Fair Deal program as much as passage of the civil rights bills. Nothing will do as much to strengthen our foreign policy, assist the cold war against totalitarianism, help our national economy, or bolster the morale of the masses of the American people as the enactment of this legislation (our emphasis).

So it is clear. He wants civil rights for the cold war. He wants civil rights to advance the foreign policy of Wall Street and the bipartisans.

But our interest lies in our desire to achieve complete liberation for the Negro people, including self-government and the right of self-determination for the Negro nation in the Black Belt. Our desire is to fight for full citizenship rights for the Negro people as an indispensable part of the

fight for full-fledged unity of the Negro people with the white workers and progressives. Our interest in the Negro people is to build their unity with the working class in the common fight against imperialism, fascism and war. That alliance is vital and indispensable in the struggle for Negro national liberation. In that alliance the working class strengthens itself for the fight against capitalist exploitation, for the Socialist reorganization of America, that society which will forever abolish exploitation, wars and national oppression. And so we say categorically we have special concern and special interest in the whole Negro people, for which we make no apology. We are very proud of this fact.

TASKS FOLLOWING THE MOBILIZATION

The Washington Civil Rights Mobilization raises before us the following tasks:

1. We must fight against the danger of people anywhere in the country mistaking the action of a few reactionaries and misleaders as representing the aims and desires of the Negro people. We must view the action of the Negro misleaders at the present time as that trend in Negro life which is running counter to the liberation currents in the Negro movement, to which end they are raising divisively the issue of "anti-Communism." The Negro people are fighting determinedly for equal rights

and liberation and we Communists are fighting side by side with them. The primary task is to maintain the unity of all groups that assembled in Washington and are genuinely devoted to the struggle for Negro rights, and to extend this unity among the many hundreds of thousands of people represented by the delegates in order to build the most powerful, united movement for civil rights legislation that the country has ever seen. There must be no tendency of pessimism.

2. We must fight against any tendency for any group to use the action of Wilkins as an excuse for withdrawing support from the N.A.A.C.P. on the local branch, state or national level. Rather, the maximum cooperation must be given by the entire Left to strengthening and developing the N.A.A.C.P. into a real fighting organization, to helping it build itself along progressive lines. The entire Left should concern itself with this task. While doing this, all possible cooperation must be realized with the various other Negro people's organizations—religious, fraternal, etc. Unity must be built with every group that is willing to fight on one or more issues, irrespective of what their past may have been or what some of their present tendencies may be.

3. In the present situation, we must do everything to maintain the biggest movement the country has ever seen for the passage of F.E.P.C.,

preferably the Powell Bill H.R. 4453. We must flood the Truman Administration with this demand. Only by generating the greatest amount of pressure will Congress pass any aspect of civil rights legislation. Here again, the Left and Communist forces, particularly in the trade unions, can make a major contribution by throwing everything they have into the fight openly and energetically in order to unite the broadest sections of the population and all the labor and progressive forces around this burning issue.

Even if the F.E.P.C. bill is defeated, this will not end the fight for civil rights. It will not end the fight for the program of the Washington Mobilization, which included, in addition to F.E.P.C., the outlawing of segregation in Washington, D.C., passage of an anti-lynch bill, against Jim Crow in the armed forces, passage of an anti-poll-tax bill, etc. These and many other issues are still before us and we must organize the fight as we never have before.

As for the Communists, we will do everything in our power to help to realize this and we say with all forthrightness that despite all of the negative, disruptive things that took place at this conference, this was a successful conference, an historic conference that can mark a real turning point in the fight for Negro liberation. It is our job to realize this, and this is the task ahead of us.

Capitalism's Crisis—and Mr. Browder's

By Gilbert Green

AT THE OUTSET, this writer wishes to apologize to the readers of *Political Affairs* for the rather considerable delay in the completion of this series of articles begun in the October issue. We are certain, however, that the reader will readily understand that with the removal of physical constraints on our personal liberty and activity, and with our consequent immersion in the daily political struggle, it has been exceedingly difficult to find the time to complete this job.

* * *

In the second article of this series, which appeared in the November issue, we showed how false and mendacious is the claim of the apologist for American imperialism, Earl Browder, that only in the U.S.A. was there a break-up of the war-time national coalition, while elsewhere in the world these coalitions are still intact. We conclusively proved the very opposite—that when confronted with the chemical changes of an entirely new world situation, the various national coalitions dissolved, giving way to qualitatively

new coalitions at varied levels of development and stages of formation, depending on the concrete relationship of class forces in each country.

In this article we shall touch upon the following subjects: 1) Browder's position on whether a third world war can be prevented, and how; 2) Who is responsible for the disunity and internecine warfare in the labor movement? and 3) Why some of the Left-wing labor set-backs?

THE RELATIONSHIP OF FORCES IN THE STRUGGLE FOR PEACE

In our previous articles we concentrated on the way in which Browder distorted the facts of history and grossly misrepresented the character of the Second World War in order to "prove" that our Party, by rejecting a policy of coalition with the "intelligent" sections of monopoly capital, is essentially predicating its policies on the "inevitability" of a third world war. Let us therefore give treatment to certain important phases of our Party's analysis of the relationship of forces in the struggle for peace.

Is th
conten
Party
inevita
and th
There

Our
Ameri
ped in
war ar
ing it,
appeal
rather
ment
take h

Anyth
any i
ism"
attem
lead t
and t
the cl
dome

In
of ou
quote
V. M
viet
bourg
upon
book
U.S.

It v
intell
1939
mind
"A
simu
impe
dang

Is there any truth in Browder's contention that the position of our Party is essentially based upon the inevitability of a third world war and the victory of domestic fascism? There is not an iota!

Our Party is firmly convinced that American imperialism can be stopped in its drive toward a new world war and fascism, but not by appeasing it, as Browder advocates, not by appealing to its "intelligence"; rather, by creating the kind of movement that can *compel* it to pause, take heed and stop its suicidal course. Anything less than this approach, any illusion about the "progressivism" of U.S. monopoly capital, any attempt at unity with it, can only lead to complete and utter betrayal and disaster—can only help grease the chute to a new world war and domestic fascism.

In answer to this Marxist position of our Party, the renegade Browder quotes Soviet Deputy Prime Minister V. M. Molotov to prove that the Soviet leaders place much stock in bourgeois "intelligence" and depend upon it as a major factor. In his booklet *World Communism and U.S. Foreign Policy*, Browder writes:

It was the Roosevelt type of bourgeois intelligence to which Stalin appealed in 1939 . . . and which Molotov had in mind when he said, on Nov. 6, 1947:

"A sober attitude to the matter shows simultaneously that in our time new imperialistic adventures constitute a dangerous game with the destinies of

capitalism.

"Certain Ministers and Senators may fail to understand that. But if the anti-imperialist and democratic camp consolidates its forces and utilizes its opportunities, it will force the imperialists to be wiser and to conduct themselves more calmly" (p. 37).

Only one who worships at the posterior of American imperialism can read into these remarks of Molotov, what Browder would have us read. What will make the imperialists wiser and calmer, Mr. Browder? Appeasing them? Cajoling them? Humoring them? Unity on the part of the working class with them? Appealing to their intelligence? No! The *only* thing that can accomplish this is the *strength* of the "anti-imperialist and democratic camp," which, if it "consolidates its forces" and "utilizes its opportunities," will be able to "*force* the imperialists to be wiser and to conduct themselves more calmly."

Yes, Mr. Browder, the word used was "force." Not necessarily the kind that Grant used against Lee, but force none the less—namely, the bringing to bear of a superior political strength sufficient to compel a certain course of action.

And it is entirely possible to achieve this in respect to U.S. imperialism, which finds itself in the quandary of both needing time and yet witnessing the sands of time run against it. *Its dilemma arises from the very fact that the world camp of*

peace and democracy is already stronger than the camp headed by U.S. imperialism and is bound to become still stronger.

U.S. capital needs time because, even though its military strength does now correspond to its economic development, as distinct from the situation a decade ago, this is insufficient to win a war against the Soviet Union and the world democratic camp. One reason for this is that U.S. imperialism cannot hope successfully to wage war upon the Soviet Union except through the territories of other European and Asiatic nations. For this it requires, not only willing imperialist allies and slobbering Social-Democratic lackeys, but these must be able to guarantee docile working classes. However, this is not so simple to bring about when the great bulk of the working class in such countries as France and Italy is united under Communist leadership. This is quite different from the situation that obtained in pre-Nazi Germany, where the working class was split and its main industrial section headed (be-headed) by Social-Democracy. And that is why the American bourgeoisie is paying such loving attention to the so-called European "third force"; for it realizes how important to it is the achievement of a split working class. Any attempt to impose fascism upon France and Italy, or to involve these countries in an anti-Soviet war,

could only mean civil war, and the ruling classes of these countries know it. That is one of the reasons why U.S. foreign policy depends so much upon a rebuilding of a reactionary Germany as a general counter-revolutionary and anti-Soviet economic, political and military base of operations in Europe. That is also why the traitor Tito plays so large a part in their plans, and why Yugoslavia, Greece and Turkey are considered the Balkan military and political bridgeheads of U.S. imperialism.

The nature of the quandary facing U.S. imperialism can best be seen in respect to the two major *irrevocable* defeats suffered by it in the past year—China and the atom bomb. Both of these defeats make the imperialists more frantic, more rabid, more desperate, and yet at the same time narrow down their base of operations, lower their world prestige, weaken their military-strategic positions, and thereby also *force* some of them, at least, to "conduct themselves more calmly." Certainly in respect to China one can see both of these tendencies in operation at the same time—the panic, the desperation, the new H-Bomb diplomacy, and yet at the same time the growing note of realism which admits that the new people's China is here to stay "at least for the time being" and that the U.S. will have to follow the footsteps of British diplomacy and give it recognition.

No,
favor
a cons
mover
will le
camp
grow
only
reachi
and
New
are d
politi
streng
the c
peopl
for P
this c
heret
forcis
secon
with
(it a
their
the
alism
the S
worl
jectiv
Nor
surro
anou
mon
At
is no
inne
trad
over
a va
gon

No, the world situation does not favor U.S. imperialism, and, given a constant strengthening of the mass movement and struggle for peace, will less so tomorrow. For the world camp of peace and democracy will grow in strength and influence. Not only is the mighty Soviet Union reaching new heights of economic and cultural attainment, but the New Democracies of Eastern Europe are daily becoming economically and politically more consolidated and strengthened. Throughout the world the overwhelming majority of the people fear a new war and crave for peace. Even many of those in this country and elsewhere who have heretofore supported the bipartisan foreign policy are today giving it a second look; for they realize that with the atom-bomb monopoly gone (it always was only a figment of their imagination), so also is gone the illusion that American imperialism can bludgeon or intimidate the Soviet Union and the rest of the world into Truman's peace (!) objective of "unconditional surrender." Nor can this illusion be so easily resurrected by its being wedded to another—the promised H-bomb monopoly.

At the same time, U.S. capitalism is now entering a period of sharpened inner (class) and outer (world) contradictions. With the postwar "boom" over, we are beginning to witness a vast sharpening of all class antagonisms; for the monopolists are

striving to maintain both their exorbitant volume and rate of profit by seeking a rapid increase in superprofits from investments abroad, and by drastically increasing the rate of exploitation of the working class here at home, especially of the Negro people. This is *inevitably* leading to sharper class battles and to new attempts on the part of the monopolists to break the backbone of organized labor. The first attempts in this direction we are now witnessing in respect to the mine workers and the Left- and progressive-led unions.

Thus, while the economic crisis and the intensification of the class struggle will accelerate the danger of war and fascism as the "way out" for the bourgeoisie, these will, on the other hand, greatly diminish the prestige of American capitalism in the eyes of the masses, weaken the economic foundation for the postwar illusions about American "exceptionalism," draw vast new millions into the arena of militant class struggle, and thereby create also the conditions favorable for the defeat of the forces of war and fascism.

Furthermore, as the postwar economic crisis looms ever closer and in more menacing proportions, this leads to a sharpening of the inter-imperialist contradictions. It especially leads to an ever sharper intensification of the contradictions between the colonial peoples and imperialism.

The crisis of overproduction that

is developing throughout the capitalist world is inevitably leading to a sharpened imperialist struggle for world markets. At the same time, the growing economic problems faced by the American bourgeoisie, accentuated by the failure of the Marshall Plan, are leading it to exert a greater and greater pressure upon its imperialist satellites in Britain, France, Italy, etc., to "put their houses in order." By this is meant, the adoption of sterner measures against the working class and the living standards of the people in the "home" countries and especially in the colonies, and the reduction of their own share of the profit booty—guaranteeing the lion's portion for Wall Street. This can only lead to mounting friction within the imperialist camp and to a sharpening of the class contradictions in each capitalist country.

The growing economic difficulties will also tend to increase the differences within the ranks of the American bourgeoisie. Even in the ranks of big capital, differences over policies will assert themselves more frequently and with greater intensity, although these differences over policy will not be over the basic strategic objective of world domination, but only over the *best tactics* by which to achieve this. Thus, while the working class must make use of these differences, it must avoid reading into them the basis for an alliance.

How futile and false it is to read the possibility à la Browder for a class alliance with one or another section of monopoly capital, can best be seen in respect to that monopoly grouping which has opposed the Marshall Plan in the course of the recent past and which is even more strongly opposed to it today. If one were to follow the Browder line of reasoning, then this certainly must be the "intelligent" section of monopoly capital, for it has from the very outset prophesied the failure of the Marshall Plan. And yet, a closer glance indicates that the grouping of monopoly capital which occupies this position is rabidly anti-Soviet in its foreign policy, and violently anti-labor and pro-fascist in its domestic orientation—its ideological high priest being none other than Col. McCormick of the *Chicago Tribune!* Need anything more be said about the futility and criminality of seeking for an alliance with one or another section of finance capital?

FOR A BROAD ANTI-MONOPOLY, ANTI-WAR COALITION

From all of the above, it can be seen that American imperialism may be a mighty giant, but with feet of clay. This, however, does not mean that it can *automatically* be stopped from plunging the world into war and this country into fascism. Even though its dreams of complete world domination are like a madman's hal-

lucinat
be cou
tempti
is only
the wo
erful e
and to
Anyth
a new
We
culties
possib
of coa
peace
a thin
cism.
course
Mine
It can
of th
mass
work
patie
Party
strug
neces
perie
playi
W
of h
cialis
is n
the
tow
'fina
ist
Do
only
pers
to

lucinations, its "intelligence" cannot be counted upon to keep it from attempting this insane venture. There is only one way that this can be done: the world peace camp must be powerful enough to *bridle* the warmakers and to *prevent* their breaking loose. Anything less than that will make a new war inevitable.

We do not underestimate the difficulties, but we do know that it is possible to weld together the kind of coalition which, together with the peace forces of the world, can prevent a third world war and domestic fascism. Such a coalition cannot of course spring forth ready-made like Minerva from the brow of Jupiter. It can arise only out of struggle, out of the *postwar* experiences of the masses of people and first of all the working class, and as a result of the patient, painstaking work of our Party among the people, guiding their struggles, helping them to draw the necessary lessons from *their own experiences*, and in every other way playing the role of a vanguard party.

When Browder accuses our Party of having no perspective short of Socialism and of believing that "there is no practical, effective obstacle to the march of American imperialism toward world conquest except the 'final conflict,' the proletarian socialist revolution in America" (*Where Do We Go From Here*, p. 11), he only means that he, Browder, has no perspective except that of holding on to the petticoat of American im-

perialism. For Browder it is either unity with monopoly capital, or the abyss.

On our part, we adopt the opposite point of view. We say that the reality of the postwar period is such that there can be no unity with monopoly capital, in fact, the unity which we strive to achieve is in the first place directed *against* monopoly capital. For the objective of the coalition must be to prevent a new war and fascism, and it is U.S. monopoly capital which stands as the deadly foe of this objective.

This does not mean that we are thinking of a narrow, restricted coalition. We are thinking in the first place, of course, of the united front of the working class, and of its alliance with its most important allies, the Negro people and the poor farmers. But we are also thinking of a much broader alliance inclusive of the middle farmers, the small businessmen and professional people, and *all* social strata, including non-monopoly capitalist elements, who have an interest in preserving peace, maintaining and extending democratic rights and raising living standards. This means that the broad coalition will undoubtedly include many forces that disagree with, and are even hostile to our Socialist objectives, that are strong believers in capitalism, but that are nonetheless ready to unite *with* the Communists in joint struggle to prevent war and fascism.

THE IMPERATIVE NEED FOR WORKING-CLASS UNITY

Point number one in the approach to our present-day coalition policies is the struggle for the unity of the working class. For without this it is impossible to create the broader coalition. This is so because the very anti-monopoly character of the coalition means that there is only one class, the working class, which—due to its role in production—can play a consistently progressive role and can become a magnet attracting the intermediary classes—those which vacillate between the two main classes of society. Without this decisive role played by the working class, the broader progressive coalition cannot be firmly welded together, and all attempts to do so will only prove abortive.

It is precisely the past inability of the American working class to take the bit in its own teeth, and to head in a direction independent of the bourgeoisie, that explains the petering out of the great popular anti-trust movements that developed in this country during the past half century. These in the main were petty-bourgeois radical movements; without the working class playing the role of catalytic agent, they were doomed to failure in their attempts either to change the character of, or to break up, the two-party system in this country (*i.e.*, monopoly capital's monopoly over politics).

Browder has written much of late about the importance of "labor unity." He has even become its "defender," accusing the Party of being responsible for the lack of labor unity. But the labor unity that Browder advocates is the same kind of "unity" that William Green, Philip Murray, or Harry Truman advocates. This is a "labor unity" based upon class-collaboration policies and leadership, which only means the "unity" of the lion and the lamb—the "unity" of abject surrender to the bourgeoisie. Likewise, when Browder speaks of the political role of the labor movement and its "political action," he also means no more nor less than what a Keenan of the A. F. of L., a Kroll of the C.I.O., or any bourgeois politician means—namely, class collaboration in the political field, as against the *independent* (of monopoly capital) political action of the working class. Thus, Browder is capable only of visualizing the working class as playing the role of the anvil, and never that of the hammer.

This point of view Browder has spelled out for us in a number of his writings of the recent past, especially his pamphlets *Where Do We Go From Here*, and *Labor and Socialism in America*. In these pamphlets he literally licks his chops in wishful anticipation of "the collapse of a great Left-wing labor movement" and heatedly denies that there is any objective cause for the sharpened struggle over policy in the labor movement.

For
backs
mover
in ob
single
of one
muni
1945)
der,
Comm
perio
the I
gener
for th
bor a
But
wind
sum
ing
tellig
(Bro
the
(Ro
Br
ersh
sibil
stru
ship
and
cont
bor
agai
brea
the
cam
Mu
(ibi
I
of
the

For him, the recent postwar setbacks and difficulties in the labor movement stem, not from any change in objective conditions, but from a single subjective factor, the removal of one, Earl Browder, from the Communist ranks. Until that time (July 1945), everything, according to Browder, was just going along fine, the Communists "for a whole historical period . . . put their mark upon" the labor movement and "set the general tone, character and direction for the whole labor movement" (*Labor and Socialism in America*, p. 38). But then, all this was thrown to the winds. And why? It can all be summed up in the fact that the working class had removed its own "intelligent" ("creative Marxist") leader (Browder), after death had removed the bourgeoisie's intelligent leader (Roosevelt). Modest man!

Browder says that the Murray leadership in the C.I.O. bears no responsibility whatsoever for the Right-Left struggle and for the C.I.O. leadership's violent and rabid Red-baiting and anti-Sovietism. He insists, on the contrary, that "Murray resisted stubbornly all the pressure brought against him from clerical circles to break his cooperative relations with the Left wing. When that break came, it was not on the initiative of Murray, but of the Left wing" (!) (*ibid.*, p. 22).

In respect to the intensified drive of clerical Catholic reaction against the Communists, the Soviet Union

and the progressive movement generally, the cause here, too, lay not with the Vatican and the Roman Catholic reactionaries, according to Browder, but with the fact that "anti-Catholicism has again become established in the Left wing," "anti-Catholic slogans and clichés abound in Left-wing discussions, and this is literally driving hundreds of thousands of healthy Catholic workers . . . back into the arms of the reactionary clergy. A vicious circle of religious division within the trade unions has been initiated and the Left wing, instead of breaking this circle, is accelerating its development." And further, "The Left wing has lost much and gained nothing by abandoning the policy of the 'outstretched hand' to the Catholic workers, and its relapse into dogmatic and anti-catholic propaganda" (*ibid.*, p. 33).

All this is a baseless lie—completely fabricated! There is not a single document, speech, pamphlet, or article in Communist literature to warrant this slander. What we have given up is Browder's outstretched hand to the reactionary Catholic hierarchy; we have not given up the outstretched hand to the Catholic masses. How low has this man sunk to become both the apologist and ideologist for Philip Murray and Cardinal Spellman in their struggle against the Communist Party!

But if the warfare inside the C.I.O., and the recent split in its ranks, are all due to the fault of the Commu-

nists in the U.S., what explains the Social-Democratic "third force" split in the trade-union movement of France, and the similar split in Italy? What explains the split in the World Federation of Trade Unions? Are Foster and Dennis also responsible for what happened in the W.F.T.U. and in the French and Italian labor movements?

Furthermore, if the vicious anti-Communist and anti-progressive attacks of Roman Catholic reactionaries in this country are due to Communist "mistakes," how can the renegade Browder explain the Mindszenty case and the recent Vatican decree of excommunication? Are the Communists in Hungary, Poland, France and Italy responsible for this infamous decree?—or, is it rather not the product of the connivings of the Vatican reactionaries with the representatives of the U.S. State Department? Or, would Browder like to have us believe that it was his expulsion from the Communist ranks in the U.S. that also caused the Social-Democratic split in the W.F.T.U. and the wave of anti-Communist hysteria in the Vatican? Who said Browder had delusions of grandeur? He is the very acme of modesty!

Possibly there is another and more basic explanation for these developments than the "great man Browder" theory of history. Possibly the explanation is to be found in the changed world situation, and the new

aggressive role of U.S. capital. Maybe it was the ending of the war that brought about the change in relations within the labor movement, as a reflection of changed class alignments, and not the fact that Browder was given a boot in his political pants. And no matter how this may hurt the vanity of Browder, it is the only real explanation.

Browder calls upon the past to bear evidence to the possibility of harmonious working relations with Philip Murray. We know about this as well as Mr. Browder. But we also know that even in the years of greatest working together, in the years when Communists gave unstintingly of their resources, manpower, mass contacts and organizing skill—without which the workers in the great mass-production industries could not have been organized—men such as Murray never changed their basic class-collaboration views. Nor can we forget that even at the moments of closest cooperation neither Murray nor Lewis, nor Hillman ever permitted Communists or Left-wing workers to enjoy positions of prestige or influence in their own particular unions; in fact, they maintained a strict look-out to behead any Left-progressive that developed an independent position of influence among the workers. And all too frequently, the Communists kept their eyes glued only on that which they held in common with the Murrays (first, organizing the unorganized,

and
overl
diffe
class
gle p
The
the
from
had
had
men
class
wea
stren
O
thre
disa
anti
insi
ion
Cor
mu
Fid
Jam
the
mu
oth
to
vea
T
tain
tho
mo
the
bor
nis
ran
Fie
we
ma

and later, winning the war), while overlooking completely the basically different class outlook, expressed in class-collaboration versus class-struggle policies.

Thus, it can be said that although the reformists, even in their united front with the Communists, always had their guard up, the Communists had it down, forgot their fundamentals, themselves succumbed to class-collaboration practices and thus weakened their own potential strength in the ranks of the workers.

Once the war was over, once the threat from Nazi imperialism had disappeared, so also disappeared the anti-fascist music. Now, Wall Street insisted that the Socialist Soviet Union was the new "foe" and anti-Communism the new tune. And it must be said that the trained labor Fidos danced to it with alacrity. As James Carey blusteringly put it: "In the last war we joined with the Communists to fight the Fascists; in another war we will join the Fascists to fight the Communists." How revealing!

Thus it became impossible to maintain even a modicum of unity with those who were carrying out the warmongering orders of Wall Street and the State Department within the labor movement. Try as the Communists did to prevent a split in labor's ranks both here and abroad, the Fidos heeded, not the voice of the workers, but that of their imperialist masters.

Hence, there can be no labor unity without a struggle against Social-Democratic, class-collaborationist ideology and leadership. Only to the extent that the rank and file of organized labor are won away from these influences and join hands in united struggle, especially for peace, can labor unity be established, whether or not the Murrays, Careys, Reuthers or Greens desire it. And the very frenzy of the assault of the employers, the government and the Right-wing leadership against the Left-progressive forces, is an indication of two things: (1) the intensity of the war drive; and (2) the lack of confidence these gentlemen have in their own preachments about "continued prosperity," expressed in an animal-like fear at the potential might of the American working class (of whom some fourteen million are now organized) once it sheds its illusions.

These are the real reasons for the attempt to isolate and destroy the Left in the labor movement. The aim is, first of all, to try to "coordinate" the labor movement, to bring it in line for Wall Street's war drive, to smash all militant resistance and make the labor movement subservient to the monopolies. Further, the American bourgeoisie well knows that in the course of the growing and sharpening class struggles, the American working class can take a new leap forward in political consciousness and class unity. This is what it

fears and is intent on preventing. And despite the momentary split in the labor movement, this must be and is our fighting perspective.

In pointing to the similarity of developments (the splits) in France and Italy to those in the United States, there is of course one very great difference. In those other countries there were no expulsions, only splinter departures. That is, the main body of organized labor remained united under Communist and Left leadership. The splits that occurred were of small minorities led by the Social-Democratic "third force," leaving the main body of the organized working class.

In the United States, unfortunately, the situation is quite different. Here the main force of the organized labor movement is still under reformist leadership and influence, and the split took the form of outright expulsions. The question naturally arises: What explains the difference between the ability of the Communists of France and Italy to emerge from the war with the vast majority of the working class under their leadership, and the much lesser influence and strength of our own party in the ranks of the working class?

The answer to this question must of course include a number of vastly important differences in the objective situation. The relative strength of the bourgeoisie; its continued ability to bribe sections of the workers;

its prestige and influence as a consequence of its war role; the particular historic development of the country and its working class; the level of class consciousness, etc., etc., all play their part.

But if we cannot answer the above question without carefully and concretely weighing all these objective factors, we can, however, answer the question as to why the Communists in this country did not emerge from the war considerably stronger in mass influence and organized strength than they did, especially in the working class and among the Negro people. The *main* reason for this is that our Party left its Marxist rails in matters of policy and liquidated itself as a Communist Party. It became just another anti-fascist organization, extolling the virtues of American "democratic" capitalism, singing paeans of praise to Roosevelt, as if his program was ours, and in every other way trying to blunt the sharp wariness of the masses, who on many questions instinctively adopted a correct, class position.

Thus, as was pointed out in our first article, our Party failed to leave a "class imprint" on the anti-fascist struggle, thereby permitting the bourgeoisie to appear as the unchallenged leader of this struggle in the eyes of the masses. And the logical consequence of this position was expressed in the liquidation of our Party as an independent political party of the working class.

We
of Le
to its
unde
demo
tariat
its "c
strug
to it
and
geois
demo
to st
Tact
Dem
49).

For
its c
ism,
cont
take
diti
cert
Neg
fied
we
pres
ing
the
ma
righ
stre
den

E
larg
the
rat
sys
the

We completely forgot the teachings of Lenin that the bourgeoisie, owing to its class position, is "incapable of undertaking a decisive struggle for democracy," and that if the proletariat is not strong enough to put its "class imprint" on the democratic struggle, the bourgeoisie "will impart to it the character of inconsistency and selfishness," because the "bourgeoisie looks behind, is afraid of democratic progress which threatens to strengthen the proletariat" (*Two Tactics of Social-Democracy in the Democratic Revolution*, pp. 44 and 49).

For this great error, which found its culmination in Browder-revisionism, we are still paying and shall continue to pay. Certainly, had we taken advantage of the favorable conditions of the war to *force* through certain *basic* reforms in behalf of the Negro people, instead of being satisfied with temporary half-measures, we would have greatly enhanced the prestige of our Party and the working class in the eyes of millions of the Negro people and could have made gains in the struggle for Negro rights that could have greatly strengthened the whole camp of democracy in the country.

But we are paying also in that large masses to whom we helped sell the erroneous ideas of class collaboration, of accepting the two-party system, of accepting the Murrays in the labor movement as true progres-

sive labor leaders, must now be unsold on these propositions.

Thus, the root cause for some of the recent setbacks suffered by the Left-progressive forces is to be found, not alone in the united assault of the government, the employers and the labor reformists, nor a number of sectarian tactical errors, but in the opportunism of the Browder period and the carry-over of remnants of this thinking into the present. The advice given by Browder during the war, that a good trade-union leader should resemble a Philadelphia lawyer more than a people's tribune, certainly created a corroding atmosphere; it flung the doors wide open to a class-collaboration outlook and type of leadership. How difficult it has been to overcome the remnants of Browderism can be seen in the present-day, continuing struggle to teach Communist and Left trade-union leaders that their job is not to "service" the workers but to lead them; that their task is not bureaucratically to substitute for the workers, but to draw them most fully into *every* struggle—from the handling of the simplest grievance in the department, to the winning of a contract, from the struggle for Negro rights and for peace, to the struggle for independent working-class political action and Socialist consciousness.

Nor have we, even today, despite the great headway made in this respect in the past few years, complete-

ly eradicated the false notion that trade-union consciousness and class (Socialist) consciousness are identical or that the former *spontaneously* generates the latter. It is this concept, whether in conscious or unconscious form, that still lingers on and that *in practice* tends to negate the leading, vanguard role of our Party among the workers and leads to the glorification of spontaneity and narrow trade-unionism.

During the formative years of the great industrial unions, we tended to lose sight of the fact that trade-union consciousness, even when expressed in the most militant struggles (and the American working class is "no slouch" when it comes to militancy in economic, trade-union battles)—is still only a form of bourgeois ideology, and becomes class consciousness only when the workers recognize, not alone the existence of an economic conflict with their employers, but its *irreconcilability*, its logical extension to the political field and to the revolutionary transformation of society. Had this been borne in mind, we would have consciously fought against the ideology of class collaboration and also fought to infuse the struggle with a growing class consciousness, remembering that to fail to do so, and to fail to build our Party in the ranks of the workers, was only to encourage the spontaneous generation of bourgeois ideology within the working class.

ADDENDUM

Since the above article was written, this writer has had the occasion to read the most recent and most scurrilous product of Browder's pen. In it he once again proposes a "third force" for America. He accuses this writer of denying that there can be anything in between those who believe in Socialism, on the one hand, and those who believe in monopoly reaction, on the other. This, of course, is nothing but sheer Browder distortion. It is quite clear that the overwhelming majority of those who must make up the progressive camp in the United States are not supporters of Socialism. But that does not make them a "third force" any more than it puts them into a third camp. Anyone, whether he be for or against Socialism, who is ready to unite with the Communists in the fight against Wall Street's war program, is part of a *single common front*—the front of peace and democracy. Conversely, anyone, even though he may profess in words to stand for Socialism, as does a Browder or a Tito, but who does all in his power to aid American imperialism, to split the unity of the working class and the peace forces, to attack the Soviet Union or the Communist movement, is also part of a *single common front*—the front of imperialist reaction!

The only thing "new" in this new pamphlet is that Browder is forced

to re
his h
of P
Brow
a gro
muni
those
that
"crisi
Com
worl
"the
had
direc
muc
tain
mun
recti
that
be s
solu
crisi
W
whi
muc
all,
and
rank
acce
"wh

to remove still another portion of his hypocritical mask. The readers of *Political Affairs* will recall how Browder tried to pass himself off as a great "defender" of world Communist strategy and tactics as against those pursued in this country. Well, that's ended. Now Browder sees a "crisis," not only in the American Communist movement, but on a world scale. In fact, he says that "the crisis in the American Party had been only a by-product, an indirect and distorted expression of a much more profound crisis in certain parts of the international Communist movement" (*Modern Resurrections and Miracles*, p. 49), and that the American "crisis" could not be solved "except as a part of the solution of the whole international crisis which continues" (p. 50).

Where is this "international crisis" which "continues"? It doesn't take much to figure that one out. After all, has not Browder been exposed and expelled from the Communist ranks? And is this not sufficient—according to Browder—to cause a "whole international crisis" in and

by itself? Alas, the Tito fifth column was also cleansed from the Communist world movement; and is this not another symptom of this "crisis"?

What difference does it make if the Chinese people have won their great world-shaking victory? What difference does it make if one-third of world mankind are now part of the Socialist world and no longer a part of the imperialist one? What difference does it make if a great world camp for peace has now been established directed against Wall Street aggression; or that the working classes of France and Italy are under Communist leadership; or, that the colonial peoples are "storming the heavens" in a great anti-imperialist upsurge?

Are not all these symptoms of "crisis"?—in the eyes of Browder. Yes, indeed, Mr. Browder, they are symptoms of real crisis—but not of the world Communist movement, only of the world capitalist system. And this very real crisis creates a crisis also for the Browders and for all other imperialist lackeys and traitors to the working class!

Comment and Criticism

WHERE THE MAIN BLOW MUST BE STRUCK

By William Weinstone

THE PEOPLE'S WORLD of January 19 publishes, mistakenly without editorial comment, a letter by Martin Hariwayne, which, while praising the George Morris column for its exposure of the reactionary labor leaders, sets out "to register a general criticism" against it because he does this "almost exclusively." "Almost never does he tell us," the correspondent states, "what the rank and file are doing in their struggle against the *main enemy*, the capitalists. I get the impression from Morris that the main enemy is Murray, Green, etc."

The desire of the correspondent for more material on the struggle against capitalism is well founded. It points up a serious weakness in the agitation and propaganda of our movement. We cannot stress enough the necessity continuously to hammer home the Marxist indictment against capitalism as a system. Particularly today, when capitalism is conducting a high-pressure campaign to sell its brutal, crisis-ridden, dying capitalism to the people of America and the world, as the best possible of systems, an all-round ideological exposure of the system is of supreme importance. At the same

time, large-scale education is essential in Socialism, on the nature of the Soviet Union, the People's Democracies, etc., not only in behalf of the immediate fight for peace, but also to advance the class consciousness and internationalism of American labor. This point of the writer's criticism therefore must be well taken.

However, in the reason which he gives for this criticism, the writer of the letter shows unclarity as to the role of the labor bureaucracy and grossly underestimates its harm to the fight against capitalism and the current policies of Wall Street. This unclarity is revealed in the way he places the question of the main enemy, and also in his acrid criticism of George Morris' column of January 4 lampooning the reactionary American labor leaders for their servility and belly crawling. In that column, which dealt with a new batch of knighted labor leaders in England, Morris gave an appropriate list of royal titles which our labor leaders would deserve if they were rewarded for their treachery in the same way as are the British lackeys. The names of such Labor Barons would then read—Sir David Dubin-

sky,
Curra
Sir
Florin
tle, e
attach
column
Morr
does
effect
title.
sheer
leader
a titl
miss
It
ism
class
men
must
the
that
strug
shall
shall
Mar
be
sust
social
and
a w
over
the
talis
the
of t
the
fails
ener
the
ener

sky, Knight of the Garter; Sir Joe Curran, Commander of the Bath; Sir William Hutchinson, Knight of Florida; David Beck, Duke of Seattle, etc.—a satirical, effective, spirited attack. But to the correspondent, the column represented “a figment of Morris’ imagination” since “nowhere does he quote any labor leader to the effect that said leader would like a title.” Apart from betraying the sheerest naiveté in expecting “said leader” to make a quotable bid for a title, the writer of the letter clearly missed the whole point.

It is, of course, true that capitalism is the main foe of the working class and all oppressed. The fundamental aim of the labor movement must therefore be directed against the capitalist class. But to achieve that aim, to achieve victory in the struggle against capitalism, how shall the fight be conducted, where shall the main blows be struck? Marxian science answers that it must be struck against the forces that sustain capitalism. Today that main social force is the labor bureaucracy and the Social-Democratic camp as a whole. The letter here discussed oversimplifies the class struggle of the working class against the capitalist class. It seems to leave out of the reckoning the conscious agents of the capitalist class in the ranks of the labor movement. The author fails to see clearly that the principal enemy which stands in the way of the fight against capitalism, the *main enemy within the labor movement*,

are the Murrays, Greens, Reuthers, etc.

It is the merit of George Morris’ column which has won it widespread praise that he does not obscure this fact, but has made it clear and has conducted an effective struggle to expose this enemy precisely because they do not fight against the capitalists. To blunt this fact and to diminish the attack on the labor bureaucracy at a time when the attack should be sharpened and increased because of their shameful, imperialist-inspired, splitting activities, can only do the greatest harm to the immediate and ultimate fight against capitalism. In using the term “labor bureaucracy” we mean not only the Murray-Green type, but also the more dangerous Reuther, Dubinsky Social-Democratic type of union leaders, who in essence are alike and increasingly work together.

The labor bureaucrats and Social-Democrats are the agents of capitalism in the labor movement, the carriers of the foul and poisonous ideas of dying capitalism, the accomplices of imperialism. They are bound up economically and politically with the capitalist class and more and more are linked with the state apparatus. The labor bureaucracy and the whole Social-Democratic camp represents the main force that retards labor’s growth, militancy and class consciousness, that lines up labor for imperialism and the war program, that blocks the struggle of labor against onrushing reaction and

the worsening economic and political conditions. Truman's demagoguery would be ineffective were it not for the support of the labor bureaucrats who spread the fraud about a "welfare state," cover up the reactionary character of the Administration and thereby keep labor and the people chained to the parties of Wall Street and impede the development of really independent labor and progressive political action. From this it follows that if labor is to advance, if the conditions of the working class and of the people generally are to be defended, if peace and democracy are to be maintained, if capitalism is ultimately to be beaten, then the Social-Democrats and the labor bureaucrats must be relentlessly exposed, defeated and isolated.

It is wrong, therefore, for the writer of the letter to counterpose the fight of the labor movement against capitalism, to the fight which must be conducted within the labor movement and among the people against the labor bureaucracy, or to regard the fights as two separate struggles, one of which is major and the other minor. The fight against the reactionary labor bureaucracy, in the labor movement, is a class fight—an inseparable and decisive part of the fight against capitalism. The monopolists realize this full well. That is why they throw their weight behind the labor bureaucrats as against the Left wing, violently attack Communists, and all Left and progressive trade unionists and try

to drive them out of the labor movement so as to leave the working class leaderless. At the same time the monopolists and their political agents increase government violence against the labor movement as a whole, and particularly in situations where the reactionary labor leaders are unable to keep the workers in check.

Naturally the defeat of the labor bureaucracy is not a simple task to be achieved merely by denunciation, justified and necessary as it is. It is a hard, many-sided struggle. The ideological battle is of great importance as already indicated, and it calls for a vast extension of our press, pamphlets and other agitational work. But decisive is the mass struggle for the economic and political needs of the people which must be organized today chiefly from below and first of all in the shops and unions. It is the mass struggle which gives the workers strength and confidence and enables the widest masses to learn by direct experience that the labor bureaucrats and Social-Democrats are on the side of the capitalists.

This question of where the main blow must be struck will be made clearer by reference to the brilliant writings of Stalin on "Strategy and Tactics." Defining strategy as the determination of the direction of the main blow at any given stage of the labor movement, Stalin wrote that in the period between March and October 1917 in the preparation for the overthrow of capitalism in Rus-

the Bolshevik Party regarded the petty-bourgeois democratic parties, the Socialist-Revolutionary Party and the Menshevik Party, as "the most dangerous social support of imperialism." This was so, writes Stalin, "because these parties were then the compromising parties, the parties of compromise between imperialism and the toiling masses." Therefore, he continued, "it was natural for the main blow of the Bolsheviks to be directed at that time against these parties, for without isolating these parties, it was impossible to count on the rupture between the toiling masses and imperialism, and without making sure of this rupture the victory of the Soviet revolution could not be expected." Stalin concludes his point with the following pertinent statement: "Many people at that time did not grasp this peculiarity of Bolshevik tactics, and accused the Bolsheviks of displaying 'excessive hatred' toward the Socialist-Revolutionaries and Mensheviks and of 'forgetting the main aim' but the entire period of preparation for October bears eloquent testimony to the fact that only by these tactics were the Bolsheviks able to secure the victory of the October revolution" (Stalin: *The October Revolution*, pp. 116-117).

It might be said that Stalin's remarks were made in relation to a

more advanced working class, and to an advanced stage of revolutionary development. This is obviously true. But they are nonetheless entirely applicable with regard to the proposition involved in this discussion.

The difference between the Russian labor movement in 1917 and the American today would affect tactics, organizational forms and immediate political tasks, but does not invalidate the overall basic, strategic fact that for the working class to get rid of capitalism in America today, it must defeat the agents of capitalism in its ranks. As Stalin put it in 1927, in his article *International Lessons of the October Revolution*, "it is impossible to put an end to capitalism without putting an end to Social-Democracy in the labor movement." Palmiro Togliatti expressed the same thought in his recent report to the meeting of the Communist Information Bureau on the need of unifying the working class against reaction and the threat of war and fascism when he said:

"The main condition of successful struggle for the unification of the working class is the all-around exposure of the policies of the Right Social-Democrats who are in the service of imperialism; of their treason to the cause of democracy and Socialism."

AN IMPERIALIST AGENT'S THREE YEARS IN MOSCOW

By Nat Ross

MY THREE YEARS IN MOSCOW, by Walter Bedell Smith. J. B. Lippincott Co., New York, 1950. 346 pages, \$3.75.

Ambassador Walter Bedell Smith's book is the evil fruit of a cold-war mission to Moscow, 1946-49. His appointment as Ambassador to the U.S.S.R. coincided with Winston Churchill's Fulton, Missouri, speech. As a matter of fact, prior to his departure for Moscow, Smith had a private chat with Churchill in New York. About the same time, he had a talk with President Truman to get his instructions. In this talk, Smith states, the President "expressed the kernel of an idea which later was to grow into the North Atlantic Pact" (p. 27). General Smith went to Moscow with the North Atlantic Pact of aggression, whose outlines had been sketched at Fulton, ringing in his ears.

For the task of warming up the cold war, Smith was a natural choice. He was relieved of his post as head of the Operations and Planning Division of the General Staff—a small but logical shift from the military front of the Anglo-American cold war in Washington, to the most important diplomatic front of the Anglo-American cold war in Moscow.

It is therefore quite natural that the

theme of this vicious book, written not with a pen, but with a gun, in hand, is the inevitability of World War III. *My Three Years in Moscow* is a threat to peace and a weapon against the interests of the American people.

But millions of Americans are increasingly disturbed by President Truman's war policy and anti-Soviet hysteria. Therefore, General Smith has to disinfect this book, which actually is a piece of monstrous and dangerous political garbage, with an air, if you please, of objectivity and fairness, and even of scholarship! He even "praises" some Soviet industrial and cultural achievements. He admits that the leaders of the C.P.S.U. are "without exception, intelligent, able, disciplined and indefatigable." Further, Smith states, "the Soviet citizen today believes he has the fruits of democracy." He also remarks: "I believe that with certain clear exceptions the welfare of younger children in the Soviet Union would not be behind any other country in the world." But behind these and similar "objective" observations made for the purpose of chloroforming the reader, Bedell Smith draws on his main stock-in-trade of anti-Soviet slanders, insinuations and distortions. Sometimes this is done with the new twist that a half-truth is more effective

than an outright lie. At other times the Nazi premise, that an old lie, repeated often enough, may come to be believed, prevails in the book.

PEACEFUL CO-EXISTENCE

Throughout the book, Smith is plagued by the most decisive fact in contemporary developments, namely that the Soviet Union heads the world anti-imperialist peace camp and Wall Street leads the imperialistic war camp. Every effort is made to distort the undeviating Soviet peace policy and to blame Soviet policy for the cold war. Molotov's replacement by Vishinsky is stated as due to the failure of Molotov's "tough" line, which, according to Smith, "caused the West to unite in the North Atlantic Pact" (p. 69). And this, in spite of the fact that almost three years earlier, according to Smith himself, President Truman had expressed the kernel of the idea of the North Atlantic Pact to him.

To justify Wall Street's mad war drive, Smith opines that the Soviet Union will unleash a third world war in the near future unless deterred by the ever more powerfully armed North Atlantic Pact nations! For, according to Smith's perversions, inevitability of war between the Socialist and capitalist systems "is the cardinal principle of Soviet political doctrine."

General Smith makes quite an effort to embellish these mad, militaristic ravings with, if you please, quotations from Lenin and Stalin. He quotes Lenin as follows:

"We are living, not merely in one state, but in a system of states; and it

is inconceivable that the Soviet Republic should continue to exist interminably side by side with imperialist states. Ultimately one or the other must conquer."

And he also quotes from Stalin's remarks to the First American Labor Delegation in 1927:

"... in the further progress of development of the international revolution, two world centers will be formed: the Socialist center, attracting to itself all the countries gravitating toward Socialism, and the capitalist center, attracting to itself all the countries gravitating toward capitalism. The struggle between these two centers for the conquest of world economy will decide the fate of capitalism and Communism throughout the whole world. . . ."

In order to distort the real meaning of these quotations from Lenin and Stalin, Smith tries to pose as "objective." He even admits a few well-known facts about capitalist hostility to the Soviet Union over the years. He says:

"The leaders of the party [C.P.S.U.] remember the German war of 1914, followed by the peace of Brest-Litovsk, the allied intervention, the Polish attempts to seize the Western Ukraine, and the Japanese attempts to probe the Far Eastern frontiers of the Soviet Union.

"Then they saw and remembered paragraphs in *Mein Kampf* about the transformation of vast areas of Russia into a German colony, and finally they

have never forgotten Munich, which they interpreted [!] as an attempt by the Western democracies to turn the German drive eastward against Russia" (p. 313).

And then Smith, having tipped his hat quickly to imperialist aggressive hostility to the Soviet Union, adds his main calumny against the undeviating Soviet peace policy: "These lessons, derived from their own experience, reinforce their preconceived theory—the belief that the Soviet Union and the capitalist world will inevitably clash" (p. 313).

First of all, it is necessary to expose Bedell Smith's hasty effort to pass over so lightly the miserable history of the last three decades of ceaseless capitalist hostility to the Soviet Union and the constant effort of the imperialist powers to undermine and destroy the country of Socialism by every foul means available.

One must not forget the *cordon sanitaire* around the young Soviet Republic, 1918-1920, when its very fate hung in the balance, nor the military, economic, and diplomatic pressures of the capitalist countries, the United States among them, to crush the first Socialist country. Nor must one forget the vile machinations of the imperialist powers through the 'twenties and 'thirties, the non-recognition policy, the Vatican crusades, the Trotskyite fifth column, Munich and the "switch-the-war" period of 1939-40. Nor can we forget that even during the period of the historic Anglo-Soviet-American coalition in World War II, there was the deliberate delay in the Second Front and other reactionary efforts at undermining the coalition. And, finally,

we must remember that Roosevelt's policy of friendship and cooperation with the Soviet Union was completely smashed by the bipartisan postwar policy. For, this policy of striving for imperialist world domination and the subsequent formation of the militarist North Atlantic Pact were obviously intended, not for co-operation with, but for hostility and war against, the Soviet Union and the People's Democracies.

Let us return now to Stalin's "damaging" remarks on this whole question to the First American Labor Delegation, which Smith saw fit to cite only in part, wrenched out of their context. Stalin's words immediately preceding those that were cited by Smith and that we have quoted above are as follows:

"With regard to the international conditions necessary for the complete triumph of Communist society, these will develop and grow in proportion as revolutionary crises and revolutionary outbreaks of the working class in capitalist countries grow. It must not be imagined that the working class in one country, or in several countries, will march toward Socialism, and still more to Communism, and that the capitalists of other countries will sit still with folded arms and look on with indifference. Still less must it be imagined that the working class in capitalist countries will agree to be mere spectators of the victorious development of Socialism in one or another country. As a matter of fact, the capitalists will do all in their power to crush such countries. As a matter of fact, every important step taken toward Socialism and still more toward Communism, in any country, will be inevitably accom-

panied by the unrestrained efforts of the working class in capitalist countries to achieve the dictatorship [of the proletariat] and Socialism in those countries."

Stalin's prognostication of social development has been amply confirmed during the 23 years that have elapsed since 1927, and is as valid today as when it was made. No matter how much Bedell Smith tries to maneuver and squirm, he cannot cover up *the inherent and insoluble contradictions* tearing at the heart of capitalism in in each country nor save it from its ultimate doom at the hands of its own working class. As Stalin told Roy Howard in 1936: "The export of revolution is nonsense."

Marxism-Leninism teaches that the working class in each country will inevitably settle scores with its "own" exploiters and achieve Socialism. Hidden behind his rantings about "Soviet expansion" is Smith's fear of the oppressed millions in the capitalist and colonial countries throughout the world and the inevitable revolutionary advance of the American working class. Smith complains that Stalin stresses the fact that capitalism breeds war. But whose fault is that? Is it not a fact that in the 18th, 19th and 20th centuries capitalism unleashed *hundreds* of wars for its own aggrandizement?

But Communists and other peace-loving people do not propose that capitalism be allowed to unleash one war after another everlastingly while the common people look on, or rather get used up as cannon fodder. *Wars can be prevented* by the will and action of the working class and all peace-loving people. The more the H-Bomb

madmen rave, the more this fact must be repeated that a third world war can be prevented by the aroused will and action of the peace-loving masses of the world. And the most important world factor for lasting peace in our day is the existence of the Soviet Union and its fundamental peace policy, which expresses the essence of the Socialist society.

In December of the very same year in which the interview with the First American Labor Delegation took place, Stalin declared at the 15th Congress of the C.P.S.U.: "The basis of our relations with the capitalist countries is the allowance for the co-existence of two opposite systems. It has been fully justified by practice."

If, as Smith claims, there is a "contradiction" between Stalin's remarks to the American Labor Delegation and the Soviet Government's oft-repeated position of struggling for peaceful co-existence, then what happens to the cynical imperialist "theory" that the Soviet leaders "preach aggressive imperialism" when speaking "for domestic consumption" and that they are seeking to "deceive the non-Soviet world" when they publicly proclaim the desirability, necessity, and possibility of peaceful co-existence? Like the whole system of apologetics for imperialism, it crumbles to the ground. For the fact is that the so-called "window dressing" about peaceful co-existence was *addressed to the C.P.S.U.* in 1927, while Stalin's allegedly "warmongering" words that year were addressed to the American Labor Delegation! No, General Smith! There is no contradiction between Stalin's words to the American Labor Delegation and his words to the C.P.S.U. Many other distorters

of Marxism-Leninism and cunning apologists of imperialism have attempted to twist the facts and to "interpret" Stalin with the same purpose of shifting the guilt for warmongering from the shoulders of the finance capitalists to those of the leaders of the first Socialist state—and to no avail.

Facts are facts, as the saying goes, and the fact is that the Soviet peace policy was born simultaneously with the birth of the U.S.S.R. The first decree of the Soviet Government in 1917 was its decree on peace. Immediately after the October Revolution the Soviet Government annulled all the unequal treaties concluded secretly by the tsarist regime with the aim of conquering foreign territories. The right to self-determination of all tsarist-oppressed nations was proclaimed and enforced quickly after the Socialist Revolution.

In 1919, when the Socialist state was struggling for its life against interventionary armies and an economic blockade, Lenin moved a resolution at the Seventh All-Russian Congress of Soviets which stated: "The Russian Socialist Federative Soviet Republic desires to live in peace with all the nations and to concentrate all its efforts on domestic construction." In 1922, at the first plenary meeting of the Genoa Conference, the Soviet delegation, on the instructions of Lenin, pointed out in its statement: "While adhering to the principles of Communism, the Russian delegation recognizes that in the present historic era, which makes possible the parallel co-existence of the old and of the newly-born social system, economic cooperation between the states representing these two systems of property is an imperative necessity

for universal economic restoration."

In the light of facts such as these, let us reread Stalin's well-known remarks to Harold Stassen in their interview of 1947:

"It is not possible that I said that the economic systems could not cooperate. Cooperation ideas were expressed by Lenin. I might have said that one system was reluctant to cooperate, but that concerned only one side. But as to the possibility of cooperation, I adhere to Lenin who expressed both the possibility and the desire of cooperation. . . .

"There was not a single Party congress or plenary session of the Central Committee of the Communist Party at which I said or could have said that cooperation between the two systems was impossible. I did say that there existed capitalist encirclement and the danger of attack on the U.S.S.R. If one party does not wish to cooperate, then that means that there exists a threat of attack. . . . As you see, this concerns the sphere of desire and not the possibility of cooperation. It is necessary to make a distinction. The possibility of cooperation always exists, but there is not always present the wish to cooperate. If one party does not wish to cooperate, then the result will be conflict, war."

In this interview, as well as in his interviews with Elliott Roosevelt and correspondent Alexander Werth, in his letter to Henry Wallace and in numerous articles and speeches, Stalin has reiterated his belief in the possibility and desirability of peaceful co-existence. This idea, which is based on Lenin's teachings and analysis, is not, as Smith

would have it, mere window-dressing, but the undeviating principle of Soviet foreign policy. It is General Smith and his bipartisan friends who are opposed to and afraid of, and who work against, the peaceful co-existence of capitalism and Socialism. As the semi-official correspondent of the *New York Times*, James Reston, says of U.S. officials: "They are literally more frightened of agreement with the Russians than of disagreement" (February 3).

In his State of the Union message, President Truman spoke glowingly of the future of capitalist America—promising a \$1000 increase in income for the average family in the next five years, national production to increase fourfold and average working-class income to increase threefold by the year 2000. If this were a realistic prediction and not sheer demagoguery, why do the bipartisan politicians fear peaceful co-existence like the plague? Why do they fear peaceful economic, political, cultural and scientific competition with Socialism?

The fact is that Truman's phony 50-year prediction is intended to cover up the developing economic crisis and the present increasing attack on the working conditions and living standards of the workers; it is intended to mask the present colossal war program of American imperialism which spends one-third of the national budget for direct military needs and an additional one-third for indirect military costs. Fearful of their own tomorrow, the profit-swollen Wall Street pirates seek world domination by unleashing a criminal war against the Soviet Union and the People's Democracies, against the forces of liberation and progress.

Marxism-Leninism teaches that as

long as capitalism exists there cannot be an absolute guarantee of everlasting peace, that only the abolition of capitalism will finally end forever the threat to peace. For capitalism, especially in the epoch of imperialism, breeds wars—wars for redivision of the world, for colonies, for raw materials and markets, for plunder and for subjugation and oppression of peoples, for world domination. Marxism-Leninism teaches that when the world camp of peace, democracy and Socialism are rapidly growing and the capitalist system is rapidly disintegrating, every possibility exists for defeating the war drive and the war plans of imperialism. Marxism-Leninism teaches that a third world war can be averted, that lasting peace can be maintained by the ever-growing strength of the world peace camp led by the Soviet Union, expressing the profound peace aspirations of mankind.

General Smith, by preaching the inevitability of war and by slandering the Soviet peace policy, proves that he fears the "threat of peace" more than the plague. *My Three Years in Moscow* is aimed at confusing and demoralizing the American people with the aim of isolating them from the mighty, growing world peace camp.

SOVIET ECONOMY TODAY

As we already indicated, the book is filled with anti-Soviet slanders from beginning to end. Obviously, General Smith, as an inveterate defender of capitalist exploitation, can see no good in Socialist economy. He repeats the most vicious and slanderous lies about Soviet economic conditions. "A uniformity of poverty is being created

across the vast Soviet-dominated areas of Eastern Europe and Asia," Smith states. He quotes enthusiastically from the Moscow Embassy Reports, intended for future American diplomats to the U.S.S.R. that "nothing is obtainable there."

But the irrefutable fact is that in spite of the appalling industrial backwardness and wreckage left by the tsarist autocracy and more than six years of war and intervention, the land of Socialism was able to develop *in less than two decades* into the most powerful industrial country in Europe—an unprecedented feat of world historical significance. It was able to produce 30,000 tanks, self-propelled guns and armored cars, and 40,000 planes yearly during the war against the fascist Axis. And while Smith keeps prating about Soviet "backwardness," "regimented labor," "feudal concepts" and other rot, he reluctantly admits some facts which by now are known to millions:

"The Germans considered the Soviet tanks the best in the world . . . and our own artillerymen paid tribute to the excellence of Russian artillery material and technique of fire. French air officers . . . classed the YAK fighter as the best short-range interceptor pursuit plane in use during the war."

In spite of the colossal destruction of Soviet industry and agriculture and of entire cities,* by the Nazi invasion and occupation, in spite of 20,000,000 military and civilian casualties and 25 million made homeless by the war, Soviet economic and cultural reconstruc-

tion has been phenomenal. Postwar output has increased annually by 20 percent and more. In 1949 production was 41 percent higher than in the highest pre-war year of 1940, while the 1949 grain harvest and output of basic industrial crops exceeded 1940. In the three pre-war Five-Year Plans the number of factory and office workers increased by twenty millions. In 1948 the number of workers increased by ten percent over 1940. In 1949 Soviet agriculture received 3.4 times more tractors and agricultural machinery than in 1940. In studying these data, it is important to keep in mind that by 1940 the Soviet volume of production had surpassed that of every European country and was second only to the output of the United States.

Smith quotes Soviet workers who complained in the press about their housing conditions. He gloats over these letters as typical. But he ignores, on the one hand, the extent of Nazi destruction, and on the other, the amazing speed of reconstruction. In the first three years and nine months of the postwar Five-Year Plan there were built or rebuilt 61 million square meters of housing space in the cities; two million houses were built or rebuilt in the countryside. And by quoting workers' complaints in the press he unwittingly shows that the Soviet workers are confident that their complaints will be considered, that there is a living democracy in actual practice in the Soviet Union.

Within two years after the war an A.P. dispatch from Moscow (*New York Herald Tribune*, October 26, 1947) could state: "All physical evidence coming under the eye of the foreign observer in Moscow is that working

* The loss as a result of the German occupation of Soviet territory is estimated at 128 billion dollars.

and living conditions have been improved since the war."

The abolition of rationing, the currency reform and lowering of prices of consumer goods at the end of 1947 and again in March 1949 and February 1950 further improved living conditions. In 1949 the Soviet population was able to buy twenty percent more consumer goods than in 1948.

Fulfillment of the three Five-Year Plans before World War II resulted in raising average yearly wages in the Soviet Union six-fold. The fulfillment of the present Five-Year-Plan this year calls for an overall increase in wages of 48 percent. Bedell Smith's statistical computations designed to "prove" the "poverty" of the Soviet people also ignore such vital facts as, for instance, that the free social services, social security and other material and cultural benefits are equal to an estimated 38 percent of the cash income of the Soviet worker, while his rent amounts on the average to only four percent of his wage.

An all-embracing system of social insurance for *all* workers is guaranteed by the Constitution. It is financed by the government and run by the trade unions. Social security covers disability and old age, aid to families in the event of loss of bread-winner, special maternity benefits and grants for child care; funeral expenses; sick benefits equal to 50 to 100 percent of wages; rest homes and sanatoria, etc. The Soviet Union has the most progressive labor legislation in the world, with equal pay for equal work for men and women. Unemployment is simply non-existent, due to the planned, crisis-less, Socialist character of the economy and the guaranteed constitutional right to

work. Thus, the Soviet working class today is without doubt the happiest and most flourishing of all the peoples of the world.

The Soviet Union today stands first in the world from the standpoint of technique of production (degree of saturation of industry and agriculture with new machinery) and the rate of industrial development. In the next decade or so it looks forward to an output of 50 million tons of pig iron, 60 million tons of steel, 500 million tons of coal, 60 million tons of oil, and is out to achieve first place in the world in the next decade or two in per-capita industrial output. Mechanization of labor-consuming work and the automatization of the process of production, which will ease the labor of the Soviet worker, is being rapidly carried out.

With 90 percent of all Soviet workers already engaged in Socialist emulation, the goals for increased productivity and improved quality of production will no doubt be achieved. The rapid mechanization and electrification of agriculture and the mastering of agricultural science by the collective farmers are preparing the ground for the titanic transformation of nature in the greater service of the health and welfare of the people. The Soviet Union confidently looks forward to the highest standard of living for its people in every respect. That is *really* what General Smith and his superiors in the State Department and the Army are worried about and are desperately trying to hide from the American people; this is why they are opposed to trade and peaceful economic competition between the Soviet Union and the United States.

It is to be expected that General Smith would embrace the imperialist agent, Tito. In fact he devotes a lengthy chapter to Tito in order especially to slander the Soviet policy of respect for the sovereignty of peoples and nations and of aid to the People's Democracies in particular. But Smith's invective about "Soviet imperialism" and "interference" with small nations cannot refute the historical facts. In a series of articles on Yugoslav Foreign Trade in the magazine, *Soviet Russia Today* (January 1950), Victor Perlo presents irrefutable evidence and documentation on Soviet economic policy in Eastern Europe, which is the direct antithesis of the imperialist enslaving Marshall Plan. The Council of Economic Mutual Aid embracing the Soviet Union and the People's Democracies is striving in the mutual interest of the countries concerned to develop a diversified industry and agriculture in the New Democracies, which are building a Socialist society. The Soviet Union, which is technically and economically independent, receives goods from the People's Democracies which these countries can produce without special capital expenditures. Its exports to these countries show a preponderance of equipment, machinery and industrial raw materials designed to aid the industrial development of these countries, while it serves as a market for their manufactured goods. In a 1948 report the United Nations stated: "Trade with the Soviet Union tends to assist the industrialization of the region [Eastern Europe]." Perlo cites facts and figures proving that Soviet economic relations with Yugoslavia prior to Tito's treachery were on mutually favorable terms. In fact, Tito himself

stated on June 1, 1946: "Of course we have received some help from abroad, namely from U.N.R.R.A., but the principal and most substantial aid came from our great ally the Soviet Union." And subsequently the Yugoslav Department of Information said:

"It would be difficult to imagine what would have happened to our economy during the past year without the unselfish assistance of the U.S.S.R., consisting of fuel, raw materials, semi-finished products and spare parts, most urgently needed by our industry and mines. The U.S.S.R. punctually fulfilled their obligations resulting from the agreement, showing at the same time an understanding of our difficulties."

These facts give the lie to General Smith and the Titoite clique. Soviet economic policy in Eastern Europe, based on mutual economic aid and technical exchange, on increasing trade, on Soviet credit and loans, has enormously assisted the People's Democracies in reconstructing their war-shattered economies, while in the past two years the Titoites have betrayed the independence of Yugoslavia, step by step, to the interests of Anglo-American imperialism.

SOCIALIST DEMOCRACY AND CULTURE

An important aspect of Bedell Smith's labors to heat up the cold war is his desperate effort to convince the reader that the Soviet Union is not a democratic country. In order the better to put this fraud over, Smith tips his hat occasionally to certain undeniable facts. He says, for example, that "the

Soviet
fruits
critic
sprea
genui
and
beco
with
posit
certa
is be
scho
acce
and
brou
ope
of p
W
an
mai
"po
B
can
mo
birt
viet
crat
ge
A
spo
star
nov
in
wa
ow
gen
dat
eff
cit
go
tio
wi
an
me
ple

Soviet citizen today believes he has the fruits of democracy" (p. 130). Of self-criticism, he relates that this widespread Soviet practice "reflects a genuine desire for self-improvement and a craving for culture which has become almost a national obsession with the Soviet people. . . . On the positive side Soviet culture has made certain remarkable advances. Illiteracy is being eradicated, the enrollment in schools and universities has multiplied, access to literature has been made easier and a state-supported program has brought the theatre, the ballet and the opera ever closer to increasing numbers of people."

With such grudging admissions as an eye-wash, Smith launches into his main theme: Soviet "totalitarianism," "police state," "forced labor," etc.

But such vile, Nazi-like slanders cannot negate the facts of Soviet democracy. As Lenin stated soon after the birth of the Soviet Republic: "The Soviet state is a million times more democratic than the most democratic bourgeois republic."

And since that day on which Lenin spoke Soviet democracy has been constantly deepened and broadened and is now advancing to Communism, while in many countries bourgeois democracy was transformed into fascism and our own country today is developing dangerous fascist trends. Even in its heyday, bourgeois democracy could not effect the real mass participation of the citizenry in running the country and government, could not solve the national question or the question of the widest mass development of culture and science, could not effect the real moral and political unity of the peoples or the flourishing of the individual

—tasks fulfilled by the Socialist democracy of the Soviet Union.

Smith may say, cynically, that the Communist Party of the Soviet Union forms a minority group numbering not more than one-thirtieth of the population. But he "forgets" that the Party is the leading force in Soviet society, that it is enthusiastically supported by the entire population, in war and peace. In the 1946 elections to the Supreme Soviet more than 101 million citizens voted (99.7 per cent) for the bloc of Communist and non-Party candidates. Of the 1339 deputies elected, 1085 were Party members. By a further analysis, 277 are women and almost half of the deputies were under 40 years of age; 571 were workers, 349 farmers, and 479 salaried employees, white-collar workers, professional people and intellectuals. The leadership of the Party is fully accepted by the nine million Komsomols, the 28 million in the trade unions, the 36 million members of consumer cooperatives, the tens of millions of organized collective farmers. Let General Smith try to cite another example of democracy such as was manifested in the course of the adoption of the Soviet Constitution in 1936, when half a million meetings were held and 154,000 amendments (many of them duplicates, of course) were suggested by the citizenry.

For the Stalin Constitution is a constitution of the free Soviet people which guarantees them employment, with payment for work according to its quantity and quality, the right to social security, to free speech, press and assembly, to demonstrations and parades, the right to unite in mass and public organizations and to activity in politics and government. These rights, which

are translated into the living democracy of the 200,000,000 Soviet people, are the unequivocal answers to the slanderers who, like General Smith, prate about Soviet "totalitarianism," about "anti-Semitism" in the Soviet Union, about "Great Russian domination," etc. For the Soviet Constitution and Soviet practice is the living proof of the friendship and equality of all peoples in the U.S.S.R. It is proof of the profound internationalism of the Soviet Union, which considers any vestige of racial or religious prejudices a barbaric crime punishable by law. And it is for this reason that the Soviet people are conducting an uncompromising fight against bourgeois cosmopolitanism as an ideological weapon of Anglo-American imperialism in its drive to dominate other peoples and nations.

In connection with Soviet culture, the "expert" General Smith tries the trick of "separating" Gorky from Soviet culture, as he tries to separate Soviet literature from the Russian literary heritage and Soviet culture from the best traditions of the literature of Western Europe and America. On this point it will suffice to say that in 1948 alone the Soviet Union published 40,000 titles and 800,000,000 books. With regard to the Western classics the Soviet Union has published over four million copies of the works of Hugo and Rolland, over two million of Dickens, Balzac and Zola, almost two million of Shakespeare and Anatole France, over one-half million of Cervantes and Goethe and almost one-half

million of Byron. Thirty-six million copies of books by 201 American authors have been published, the most popular being Jack London, Mark Twain, Upton Sinclair, Theodore Dreiser, Ernest Hemingway, O'Henry, Fenimore Cooper and Bret Harte. *Uncle Tom's Cabin* has been published through the years in a total of 10,500,000 copies.

* * *

My Three Years in Moscow, this monstrous book of slanders and distortions, by "the general of the day before yesterday, the diplomat of yesterday, and the libel writer of today" (Ilya Ehrenburg), was ground out as a weapon against peace and for war, a weapon for a greater arms program and for the fascization of our country. If further proof were needed, we have Bedell Smith's role as a featured speaker at the pro-fascist conference "against Communism" organized by the American Legion brass together with the Chamber of Commerce and the N.A.M. at the end of January, a conference attended by some of the most notorious fascists and war inciters in the country.

No honest American can afford to retreat a single inch before the Niagara of Soviet-baiting. Every American patriot, and every Communist in the first place, *must take the offensive* and tell the truth about the Soviet Union and its peace policy. This is in the direct interests of the American people and the cause of world peace.

Young America's Voice

FOR PEACE, JOBS, AND FREEDOM

CHALLENGE

"The youth of our country—especially the sons and daughters of the working people, Negro and white—need more than ever a strong voice of their own. *Challenge* will be the first American youth paper in almost a decade that advances a Marxist outlook and champions the principles of scientific Socialism, bringing clarity and confidence to the young people in the fight for peace, democracy, and a better life. . . .

"*Challenge* will be greeted warmly by the workers and by the Negro people, who know to what lengths Wall Street is going in its effort to corrupt and brutalize young Americans through warmongering, anti-Communism, and white chauvinism in the classroom, at the work bench, in the movies, and everywhere else. It will be greeted by all who honor the militant democratic traditions of our youth, and who are confident that they will march forward in a decisive way in the ranks of America's working people."

—WILLIAM Z. FOSTER.

Issued Twice Monthly

Single Copy 5 cents • Subscription \$1 a Year

On Sale at Workers and Progressive Bookstores

or direct from

CHALLENGE, Room 527, 799 Broadway, New York 3, N.Y.

Just Published by International—

THE LIFE AND WRITINGS OF FREDERICK DOUGLASS

VOL. I. EARLY YEARS

By Philip S. Foner

When completed, the publication of the four volumes of *The Life and Writings of Frederick Douglass* will comprise a monumental contribution to American history. Following the present volume, *Early Years*, will come *The Pre-Civil War Decade* (in April), *The Civil War* (Fall, 1950), and *Reconstruction and After* (January, 1951).

Dr. Foner, the author, spent six years in collecting and preparing the vast body of writings and speeches that Douglass left behind him, scattered in libraries, old newspaper and magazine files, historical societies, documents, etc.

In *Early Years*, the reader will find a remarkable collection of material written by the young Douglass who had just escaped from slavery. Before he was thirty, this self-taught man was already emerging as the foremost spokesman, orator, and organizer of the Negro people, and indeed of the Abolitionist movement. The founding of his first newspaper, *The North Star*, his relations with such figures as William Lloyd Garrison, Wendell Phillips, and Horace Greeley, his championship of woman's rights, his uncompromising stand on civil liberties, his stirring calls to the oppressed Negro people are presented here in rich detail. The author has also contributed a full-length biography of Douglass to these volumes, of which *Early Years* includes the section covering the period from 1817 to 1850.

Price \$4.00

NEW CENTURY PUBLISHERS

832 Broadway, New York 3, N. Y.

F

*The
onu-
sent
(in
and*

pre-
lass
aga-

ion
es-
nan
and
aist
ar,
en-
m-
cir-
in
og-
in-

00