

*Zeit* *Boer*

# political affairs

JULY 1950 • 25 CENTS

- |                 |       |  |
|-----------------|-------|--|
| AN EDITORIAL    | [ 1 ] | In the Tradition of '76, Advance<br>the Fight for Peace and Freedom! |
| EUGENE DENNIS   | [ 9 ] | "Let Us March Forward"   |
| GUS HALL        | [21]  | Raise the Struggle for Peace<br>to New Heights                       |
| HYMAN LUMER     | [32]  | Marxist-Leninist Achievements<br>in the Field of Genetics            |
| JOHN WILLIAMSON | [55]  | For a United-Front Policy<br>Among the Jewish People                 |
| LOU DISKIN      | [71]  | The Courageous Action of the<br>New York High School Students        |
| PHIL SCHATZ     | [79]  | United-Front Victory in the<br>Ford Elections                        |
| HILARY MINC     | [87]  | Some Problems of the<br>People's Democracy                           |

# For the Unconditional Prohibition of the Atomic Weapon\*

*We demand the unconditional prohibition of the atomic weapon as an instrument of intimidation and mass extermination of people, and the establishment of strict international control over the fulfilment of this decision.*

*We will regard as a war criminal that government which first uses the atomic weapon against any country.*

*We call upon all people of good will all over the world to sign this call.*

*We address ourselves to all social and religious groups and workers in culture, all honest people who, irrespective of their views concerning the reasons for the strained international situation, are alarmed because of this and seriously desire to see peaceful relations restored between the peoples.*

---

\*Text of the peace appeal adopted by the Permanent Committee of the World Peace Congress at its meeting in Stockholm, Sweden, March 15, 1950. Delegates from 52 countries, including the United States, approved and signed this resolution.

Tens of millions of persons in all parts of the world and of the most varied political and religious affiliations have already signed the peace pledge.

The campaign to secure the signatures of millions of trade unionists and unorganized workers, farmers, Negro people, the city middle classes, intellectuals, women, the youth, members of the national groups, etc.—now under way in our own country—should receive the enthusiastic support of all American anti-imperialists and anti-fascists. Through united-front struggle to the victory of peace!

---

*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.*

# political affairs

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

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

## In the Tradition of '76, Advance the Fight For Peace and Freedom!

### An Editorial

It is ONE HUNDRED and seventy-four years since the adoption of the Declaration of Independence, the historic document which initiated the revolutionary war for American national independence against the British crown—the war that Lenin characterized, with profound truth, as “one of those great, really liberating, really revolutionary wars of which there have been so few compared with the numerous predatory wars. . . .”

The battle cry of '76 ushered in the first bourgeois democracy, the most advanced state in that period. It inspired the fighters against monarchist-feudal-clerical tyranny throughout the civilized world.

But, while the toiling people—artisans, mechanics, day laborers, farmers—inspired by the Declara-

tion, shed their blood and suffered the hells of a Valley Forge, the “propertied classes,” the big merchants, planters, bankers and Hamiltonian monarchists bent their efforts at the end of the Revolution to nullify the Declaration of Independence. They tried to force upon the people a Constitution devoid of the freedoms and rights for which the people had fought in the Revolutionary War: the freedom of speech, press and assembly, the right to petition for a redress of grievances, the right “to be secure . . . against unreasonable searches and seizures,” freedom from double jeopardy in prosecutions, provisions preventing deprivation of life and liberty without due process of law, the right to a speedy and public trial before an impartial jury, protection against excessive bail and

punishments, etc. The Bill of Rights that was adopted fifteen years later as the first ten amendments to the U.S. Constitution was secured only after bitter popular struggles waged under the leadership of Thomas Jefferson, author of the Declaration of Independence.

\* \* \*

Today, once again, the Declaration of Independence and the Bill of Rights inseparably bound up with it, are threatened by the Tories of our time.

The recent series of ultra-reactionary, "cold-war" rulings handed down by the Supreme Court\* jeopardize the very existence of the trade-union movement, brutally condemn innocent, framed-up Negroes to legal lynching, and generally imperil the basic Constitutional rights of all Americans to freedom of speech, press and assembly. They virtually give a green light for Congress to enact the vicious, fascist Mundt Bill. They provide a "legal" and ideological cloak for the Medinas, McGraths and J. Edgar Hoovers to outlaw the Communist Party, the vanguard Party of the American working class, the Party which most consistently and determinedly leads in the fight for peace. These Supreme Court decisions in effect sanction the clamping of thought control on the nation—the stifling of

all organizations and individuals who, loyal to the true interests of the American working class and the people, are "disloyal" to, or in "contempt" of, Wall Street's drive toward an atomic third world war and a domestic reign of fascist terror. In brief, these Supreme Court decisions make the struggle for peace subversive and the struggle for democracy treason.

The "liberal" Justice Jackson, who must justify evil deed by theoretical rationale, sought in his concurring opinion to give a more lofty-sounding accounting for the Court's decision upholding the Nazi-like "non-Communist affidavit" clause of the Taft-Hartley slave-labor law. He makes an ambitious, but sorry attempt to bolster up ideologically big capital's campaign to bury the Bill of Rights and unleash an anti-democratic, anti-Socialist, imperialist third world war. Chief Justice Vinson, straining to maintain a pretense of regard for the First Amendment, demagogically specified in his majority opinion that he was not barring the advocacy of Communism. But the "liberal" Jackson exposes the true implications of the Court's decision by attempting to lay the ideological foundation, borrowed from the pages of Goebbels, for banning the Party of peace, democracy and Socialism.

But the Communist Party is flesh and blood of the American working class, champion of the Negro people

\* See "The Cold-War Rulings of the Supreme Court," statement issued by the National Committee, C.P., U.S.A., *Political Affairs*, June 1950, pp. 3-6.

struggle  
cause o  
The  
mate r  
bodied  
is deter  
ment a  
in Am  
relation  
the pro  
mate S  
gram  
immed  
class a  
peace,  
—is a c  
Lenini  
mate g  
contract  
role an  
people's  
tention  
won d  
rights  
for eco  
genuin  
Party  
logical  
tionary  
the be  
most o  
the g  
Thom  
Paine,  
muel  
and A  
tucks,  
Brown  
Con  
not "c



struggling for liberation, and of the cause of all exploited and oppressed.

The historical objective of the ultimate realization of Socialism, embodied in the program of the Party, is determined by the laws of development and the contradictions inherent in American capitalism. The inter-relationship and indissoluble unity of the program of struggle for the ultimate Socialist objective and the program of struggle to promote the immediate interests of the working class and its allies, the interests of peace, democracy, economic security—is a cardinal principle of Marxism-Leninism. Hence, the Party's ultimate goal of Socialism stands in no contradiction to its present leading role and immediate program in the people's struggles for peace, for retention and enforcement of hard-won democratic rights, for the equal rights of the tortured Negro people, for economic security; and, as the genuinely democratic and patriotic Party of its epoch, our Party is the logical inheritor of the great revolutionary traditions of our nation, of the best, the most enlightened, the most democratic in the traditions of the great revolutionary-democrats: Thomas Jefferson and Thomas Paine, Benjamin Franklin and Samuel Adams, Frederick Douglass and Abraham Lincoln, Crispus Attucks, Harriet Tubman and John Brown. . . .

Consequently, Justice Jackson cannot "do a job" on the Communist

Party without simultaneously betraying the real needs and interests of the American people: for peace, for democracy, for economic security and social progress. Consequently, too, Justice Jackson cannot "do a job" on our Communist Party without simultaneously doing violence to the great revolutionary heritage of the people, to the Declaration of Independence and to the Bill of Rights.

\* \* \*

Jackson indulges in a shameless distortion of American history, in his attempts to hoodwink Americans into believing that the Communist Party is not protected by the First Amendment because it is "dominated and controlled by a foreign government." Mindful of this mid-twentieth-century recrudescence of one of the most hideous pages in the historical record of reaction, he finds it necessary to resort to a self-defense compounded of falsehood. He hastens to "assure" the American people that the charge of "foreign domination," "foreign agent," etc., levelled against the Communists, has nothing in common with the similar charges directed by the Hamiltonian men of wealth and the monarchists against the author of the Declaration of Independence and his party after the Revolution.

But how can you deny, Mr. Justice Jackson, that the "foreign agent" slander goes back to the reactionary, thought-control measures

taken against the Jeffersonian democrats in the U.S.A., who, in their struggle for peace, for democracy, and for social progress, were inspired by the French and Irish revolutionary movements? The fact is, as the renowned historian of American letters, Professor Vernon Louis Parrington, testifies:

The creative influence of the French revolution upon the western world resulted from the enormous impetus which it gave to the movement to democratize American life and institutions. In no other country to which the sparks of revolution drifted was there such quantity of combustible material ready for the torch; and in setting afire this native material the French upheaval put a stop to the aristocratic reaction which had carried everything before it during the previous decade. It spread widely the spirit of leveling, and destroyed the last hope of the "monarchy men." But it did more—it gave a wide and popular currency to the ideal of democracy. . . .\*

What did the French Revolution mean to America, Mr. Justice Jackson? Consult Jefferson! For, in the words of his well-known biographer, Claude G. Bowers,\*\* "he was persuaded that the fate of the American experiment was bound up with the success of the French Revolution. From this opinion he was never to deviate one hair's breadth."

The spontaneous, joyous reaction

\* Vernon Louis Parrington, *Main Currents in American Thought*, Harcourt, Brace and Co., New York, 1927-30, Vol. I, pp. 321-322.

\*\* *Jefferson and Hamilton*, Houghton, Mifflin, Co., Boston, 1925, p. 210.

of American working people and all true democrats and patriots to the French Revolution reflected, in a qualitatively different historical context, the universal sense of international brotherhood and solidarity. On a higher historical level, and reflecting the most advanced stage of international solidarity, Proletarian Internationalism, the workers of the world, including our own country, enthusiastically greeted the Great October Socialist Revolution of 1917. The toiling people have seen in the Great October Socialist Revolution the great promise, and in the irrevocable triumph of Socialist construction the fulfillment, of the dreams of the oppressed and the exploited throughout the ages—the abolition of classes and of the exploitation of man by man. Hundreds of millions of people throughout the world see in the Socialist Soviet Union the glorious symbol of their future—a future of planned Socialist economy, ever-rising standards of living and culture, and complete security from economic crises and unemployment. They behold in the Soviet Union the realization of national equality and genuine brotherhood among the component nations, and a future free from all the scourges of decaying capitalism: cannibalistic chauvinism and racism, the degradation of womankind, and imperialist subjugation and exploitation of other peoples. Above all, the people throughout the world see in the So-

cialist  
devote  
the p  
This  
every  
best a  
and l  
respect  
drawin  
from t  
of pea  
Who  
armies  
ter-rev  
chist  
floodg  
this co  
umpha  
masses  
import  
victory  
Americ  
behind  
fratern  
The  
chist l  
though  
revolut  
ple as a  
sudden  
grin,"  
cratic  
Paris,  
where  
But  
cipated  
teria, v  
to hea  
men o  
naively

cialist Soviet Union today their most devoted sentinel standing guard over the peace and freedom of nations. This is why the true patriots of every nation, including our own, are best able to promote the immediate and long-range interests of their respective nations and peoples by drawing inspiration and learning from the land of Socialism, the land of peace and freedom.

When the French revolutionary armies began to turn back the counter-revolutionary armies of monarchist Europe, writes Bowers, "the floodgates of enthusiasm broke" in this country. "One prolonged triumphant shout went up from the masses. The 'people of no particular importance' somehow felt that the victory was theirs" (p. 207). The American common people rallied behind the slogan: "liberty, equality, fraternity."

The rich merchants and monarchist leaders of the Federalist Party thought they could ignore the mass revolutionary enthusiasm of the people as a thing of the moment. "Then, suddenly, these Federalists ceased to grin," Bowers records, "when Democratic Clubs, suggestive of those of Paris, appeared like magic everywhere . . ." (pp. 222-223).

But Bowers could not have anticipated the anti-Soviet, anti-Red hysteria, verging on madness, unleashed to heat up the "cold war" by the men of the trusts, because he says, naively: "The shrieks of protest

from the Federalists against these clubs is inexplicable to the twentieth century."

The shrieks of protest against the popular, democratic Jeffersonian clubs and the Bill of Rights, a century and a half ago, sound remarkably like Jackson's opinion, delivered in the mid-century year 1850. "Atheists," "agents of a foreign government," "enemies of the Constitution," "advocates of force and violence"—such were the familiar charges against the Democratic Clubs which sprang up under the inspiration of the French Revolution. But the inspiration flowing from revolutionary France did not make those clubs "alien" or "foreign" to the hearts of the American people.

The Tory-royalist predecessors of the present-day economic royalists called Jefferson's Democratic Clubs "nurseries of sedition," Bowers reports. "It was 'sedition' in those days for people of no special significance to hold views in opposition to the policies of their rulers. It was the kind of sedition that Jefferson liked" (pp. 223-4).

The Alien and Sedition laws were passed in 1798 to eliminate that kind of "sedition." Under the same constitution which was supposed to preserve liberty, a reign of terror was organized by the rich and the "well born" against the common people who had made the revolution not many years before. A big card in the hand of Federalist reaction in those

days was the war hysteria fomented by the Hamiltonians in their efforts to hurl the United States in alliance with Great Britain, into a counter-revolutionary war against France.

The Federalist government machinery was set in motion at high speed on war measures and the fomenting of war hysteria. A navy was built, an army was raised, taxes were increased for military measures. But this was designed, not alone for military intervention against revolutionary France; for, as Bowers says: "Here was the opportunity to destroy the party of democracy" at home (p. 374).

Thus, in an effort "to destroy the party of democracy" and join Britain in a counter-revolutionary, anti-democratic war against France, Hamiltonian-monarchist reaction railroaded through the Congress the notorious Alien and Sedition Laws—those forerunners of the Mundt Bill, the Foley-Square frame-up and the "loyalty" purge—to silence anti-war and pro-democratic newspapers, editors, political clubs, native- and foreign-born artisans. The Sedition Law named the French people "enemies" of the American people, even though France had been *our decisive ally* in the American Revolution, in the struggle for American independence from Britain.

\* \* \*

What a deadly parallel between the anti-democratic, anti-popular course adopted by the royalist pro-

fiteers of 1796-1800 and the post-World War II drive to war and reaction unleashed by the Wall Street imperialist atomaniacs! The anti-French, anti-Jacobin hysteria of a century and a half ago served, within that historical setting, reaction's purpose of counter-revolutionary war abroad and fierce repression at home, much as the anti-Soviet, anti-Communist hysteria unleashed by the men of Wall Street serves their designs of war for world domination and their drive to fascism at home. One all-important difference, however, stands out for our day: The Goebbels-like anti-Red Big Lie of today carries with it consequences for our people and the world incomparably more disastrous and ruinous in its implications. And this is a reflection of two different historical epochs. In the Jeffersonian period, the people fought reaction in a context of the generally progressive expansion and development of capitalism, whereas today capitalism is monopolist, moribund, in a stage of advanced decay. Today capitalism, in the tightening grip of its general crisis, is itself the source of the ultra-reaction of fascism, and the imperialist ruling class evinces growing desperation and frenzy in its futile efforts to destroy peace, democracy and progress at home and throughout the world. The anti-Soviet, anti-Communist, "foreign agent" hysteria is the prelude to, and a condition for, atomic massacre of

civi  
sho  
H  
Am  
T  
smo  
reac  
cost  
Am  
mot  
cent  
mu  
Par  
insa  
wor  
mil  
slav  
tion  
enc  
rati  
Par  
Wi  
the  
cau  
voti  
gle  
and  
eco  
gro  
you  
of t  
bra  
trac  
its  
day  
fene  
mu  
fran  
the  
Des

civilian populations, from which, should it be let loose by the Truman-Hoover-Acheson "total diplomacy," America cannot and will not escape.

The "foreign agent" slander is the smokescreen behind which monopoly reaction has set out to destroy at all costs the vanguard Party of the American working class. The warmongers have unleashed their concentrated attacks against the Communist Party because they see in the Party the major obstacle to their insane, Hitler-like ambitions for world domination by means of military intervention, economic enslavement, destruction of the national sovereignty and independence of peoples and frenzied preparation of atomic war. They hate the Party headed by Foster, Dennis, Winston, and Gus Hall because it is the Party of the working class, because they fear its unswerving devotion to and leadership of the struggle to defend every democratic right and to promote the well-being and economic security of labor, the Negro people, the poor farmers, the youth, the women, and all sections of the people that work by hand or brain. That is why the defense of the tradition of Jefferson and '76 against its monopolist traducers means today an unremitting struggle to defend the legal existence of the Communist Party, to free its eleven framed and convicted leaders, to win the immediate release of Eugene Dennis, outstanding prisoner of the

cold war and all those imprisoned and threatened with imprisonment by the war-making breeders of fascism.

\* \* \*

If the history of the American Revolution and the struggle for the Bill of Rights teaches anything, it teaches us that the masses of common people, the plain, toiling people of town and country, Negro and white, native-born and foreign-born, were able to rout the reactionary, pro-war proponents of the Alien and Sedition Laws. If the study of the world and domestic situation today teaches anything, it teaches us that the potentialities are now greater than at any time in the past for American labor and the people, inspired by and united with the mighty world peace forces, to rout the Wall-Street cartellist conspirators, to stop the war incendiaries in their tracks.

The tidal wave of peace, democracy and Socialism sweeping the world today, the rising wave of peace sentiment on our shores, possesses all the possibilities of engulfing the warmongers and overwhelming the fascist forces.

A simple, but immensely potent weapon ready to hand is the Peace Pledge of the World Peace Congress adopted at Stockholm, a pledge which represents the yearning and aspiration for peace shared by millions upon millions of Americans, regardless of political or religious affiliation and belief, regardless of

age, sex, nationality, race, color or creed.

Those who have built this country with their sweat and toil, all those who have at heart the best interests of the people, all true American patriots, can celebrate the anniversary of the Declaration of Independence and commemorate the War of Independence in no more fitting manner than to consecrate their every breath, thought and energy to outlawing the A- and H-bombs and preserving our cherished democratic traditions and Bill of Rights.

Today it is crucial to bring to the American people a clear understanding that democracy and peace are inseparable. All who cherish peace must understand that the Bill of Rights, that the proud traditions of Washington and Jefferson, are the first victims of the cold war. To wage an effective struggle for peace means to preserve the right to speak and organize against war. It means to safeguard and strengthen the trade unions and labor's hard-won rights to organize and strike, to join and build unions of their choice, headed by leaders of their choice. It means unity to smash the union-strangling, strike-breaking Taft-Hartley Law, to unify the ranks of labor, especially by developing unity of action from below, to isolate and destroy the

influence of the warmongering labor agents of imperialism. It means to advance the independent political role of the working class, in a decisive break with the twin G.O.P.-Democratic parties of Wall Street, to provide the indispensable working-class leadership in forging a broad anti-monopoly, anti-fascist, anti-war people's party, of which the Progressive Party is the basis and forerunner. It means that labor must urgently come forward now to take its rightful place in the van of the struggle for peace. It means to intensify the struggle for Negro rights and full equality, and to effect Negro and white unity in resolute struggle against every expression of Jim-Crow oppression. It means to defend the legal existence of the Communist Party, the Party of Socialism, and of all democratic organizations of the people. It means to wrest the foremost fighters for peace from the dungeons of the warmongers.

*Save the peace! Preserve the Bill of Rights!*

*Reverse the conviction of the eleven Communist leaders!*

*Free Eugene Dennis and all the victims of the cold war!*

*Guarantee the collection of 5,000,000 signatures to preserve life and banish atomic death!*

By E

DEAR

I v  
appro  
ing a  
times  
spoke  
they  
comm  
whic  
of n  
hav  
our  
in 19  
ende  
be, in  
your

The  
Marx  
adher  
and  
the p  
ard-b  
and  
over  
throu  
that  
adher  
class,  
oppre

\* Th  
neous  
Center,  
his imp  
ing his  
New Y

# "Let Us March Forward with Supreme Confidence"\*

By Eugene Dennis

DEAR COMRADES:

I want you to know that I deeply appreciate the warmth of your greeting and value the thoughts and sentiments of the comrades who have spoken here and of those for whom they speak. Above all, I treasure the comradeship and the confidence which you, and the great majority of my co-workers and comrades, have placed in me, especially since our Party's Emergency Convention in 1945. And I assure you that I will endeavor always, wherever I may be, in or out of jail, to be worthy of your trust and your friendship.

The science, the principles of Marxism-Leninism, to which we adhere, which are a part of our lives, and which guide us in our activity, the principles whose greatest standard-bearers in our epoch and Lenin and Stalin, have already liberated over eight hundred million people throughout the world. We know that these principles to which we adhere will also inspire our working class, standing at the head of all the oppressed and led by its Communist

vanguard, to march forward, through struggles, to victory. And the cause for which we stand, the cause of Socialism, will triumph in these United States as it already has triumphed in the Soviet Union, and as it is advancing to realization in the People's Democracies and in the New China. [*Applause*]

We Communists know, too, that victory, victory in the fight for peace, for democracy, as well as for the ultimate goal of Socialism in our country, will not come by itself. It has to be organized and fought for. We know, furthermore, as the history of our own and of other Communist Parties teaches us, and as the history of the international working class teaches us, that we and our class cannot advance uninterruptedly from victory to victory. On the way, there are ebbs and flows, temporary setbacks and reverses, as well as gains and advances, as we and our people march forward. Until the American working class, headed by the Communist Party, becomes the ruling class; until our class reaches its ultimate goal—Socialism; until then, the working class and the whole progressive camp, Communists and non-Communists, are bound to sus-

\* The text, slightly abridged, of an extemporaneous farewell address delivered at the Manhattan Center, New York, on May 2, 1950, shortly before his imprisonment, to a testimonial gathering honoring his leadership, of Party National leaders and New York State functionaries and activists.—Ed.



tain casualties. Here, I do not speak of the faint-hearted who leave the struggle, or of the traitors to whose desertions we say good riddance; I refer to casualties of those good and loyal comrades, leaders and Jimmy Higginnes, many whose names we do not know, who have been killed and may be killed in the struggle. I refer to the many who have been in prison, and to the many others who will be in prison. I refer to all those who militantly participate in the struggle and are bound to endure hardship and sacrifice.

We Communists understand that casualties are inevitable in the class struggle, especially in our own country in this period when the struggle against the looming dangers of war and fascism sharpens into a crucial conflict for the destiny of the working class and the nation. But we Communists also recognize that it is *not inevitable* that the men of Wall Street will succeed in their criminal plans to inflict untold casualties, yes, catastrophes, upon our people, to murder and maim millions of Americans and other peoples in an atomic war. And, further, let me say that unless a great miracle happens (and I don't believe in miracles except those performed by the working class and its allies), on Friday or thereabouts, I shall be going to jail, and by the way, it will not be for the first time. But, it is not inevitable that the five courageous attorneys who defended us, the Eleven, must serve time. It is not inevitable that the

other ten members of the National Committee must join me in jail, or that the Department of Justice will succeed in its publicly stated plans of arresting 12,600 members of our Party. It is not inevitable—if the people's forces of peace and democracy make their will felt.

However, comrades, all this may happen if we do not fight more resolutely and effectively, if we do not reinforce our fighting efforts and activity by enlisting hundreds of thousands, yes, millions, of working-class fighters in a greater and more powerful people's front of anti-war and anti-monopoly struggle. At this juncture, especially in the fight to reverse the infamous Foley Square verdict and to develop the mass struggle against the fascist Mundt Bill, let me add the warning against any tendencies to "go it alone," to regard the independent and growing courageous actions of our Party as a substitute for broader mass movements which we have the task to influence and lead. Let me add to this admonition the need also to be on guard against two dangers. On the one hand, we must guard against legalistic illusions of reliance on the higher courts; on the other, we must guard against fatalistic notions that it is impossible in the United States in this period of rampant imperialist reaction to reverse an outrageous court decision or to check the advocates of a fascist police state and a third world war.

Both of these, legalistic illusions



as well as fatalistic and pessimistic attitudes, lead to passivity, are harmful and must be rejected.

\* \* \*

Comrades, as you have already heard this evening, I shall be leaving you for a while. I leave, so to say, as a prisoner of war, as a prisoner of Wall Street's "cold war." And as I am about to go, I want you to know that I regret that I have not done more for our Party, that I haven't worked more effectively. Above all, I regret that I shall not be in the operative leadership of our Party during the very critical days ahead, at the time when the danger of war grows more imminent and the peril of fascism looms larger from day to day.

Despite these political and personal regrets, I want you to know that I am able to take this involuntary "leave of absence" with certain assurance, with complete confidence, in the outcome of the big struggles ahead. I shall depart for prison knowing that history is on our side, knowing that the world camp of peace, democracy and Socialism headed by the Soviet Union is invincible and grows daily stronger. *[Applause]*

I leave you for a while realizing, too, that new, strong, militant, and progressive currents are developing in our country, in the labor movement, in the people's fight for peace, among the Negro people, among the youth and the intellectuals.

Moreover, I say a brief farewell, confident that I leave our Party in strong and capable hands. And how could this be otherwise, comrades? During the postwar period, since the time of May to August, 1945, our Party has been leading and stimulating a resolute and historic struggle, in the very citadel of world reaction, against the men of Wall Street, who seek to imitate the Krupps, the Thyssens and the Schachts, and their henchmen, the Hitlers and Goebelses.

During these past five years the bulk of our Party leadership and membership have become further steeled and strengthened in many struggles. Our Party spearheaded the opposition to the Truman Doctrine, the Marshall Plan, and the North Atlantic anti-Communist War Pact. At first, we Communists stood and fought alone. But now growing numbers of workers and progressives understand the correctness of our warnings, organize parallel actions in the struggle for peace, and many join together with us in common campaigns to ban the A- and H-bombs, to achieve a Pact of Peace with the Soviet Union, the People's Democracies and the New China, and to prevent the revival of Nazism and militarism in Germany and in Japan.

The struggle for peace is the central and over-riding task of today. No obstacle can be allowed to stand in the way of the fulfillment of this crucial task. All our thoughts, our

energies, our activities must be devoted to bringing into being a mighty, organized movement of the popular forces for peace against the warmakers. We must work zealously to arouse the millions on these shores in unison with the millions throughout the world in support of the appeal of the Permanent Committee of the World Peace Congress issued at Stockholm to demand the prohibition of the atom bomb and the branding as a war criminal of the first government to use the atomic weapon against any country.

It should not be forgotten, too, that in the past five years our Party, together with other anti-fascists, has had to come to grips with the pro-fascist proposals advanced by the Schwellenbachs, the Rankins, and the Mundts in obedience to the will of the National Association of Manufacturers and the Chamber of Commerce, proposals aimed at outlawing our Party and at crucifying the Bill of Rights. We also have had to fight against a host of state bills, such as the Ober Bill of Maryland, the Callahan Bill of Michigan, the Broyles Bill of Illinois, the Feinberg Bill of New York, and many other such police-state measures.

Our Party and its allies have not been found wanting in these important struggles. It should be noted that we fought well and untiringly, and can record certain significant partial victories.

Yet this should not blind us to the fact that the evil, fascist Mundt Bill

still hovers over America and is in danger of enactment. We cannot rest until a decisive defeat is dealt this Gestapo-inspired measure, a defeat that will signalize a real setback to the plotters of fascism and war.

If we turn to the fight for Negro rights, our Party's place has been in the forefront of the struggle. Whether it be the fight for the enforcement of the 13th and 14th Amendments, for a real F.E.P.C. Bill, for anti-poll tax and anti-lynch legislation, for the freedom of Mrs. Ingram and the Trenton Six, or whether it be to advance the rights of the Negro people to vote in the South—our Party has been present, active, leading the way. The same can be said of our Party with regard to labor's fight against Taft-Harleyism, the struggle against the menacing and growing scourge of unemployment, and against the evils and hardships of the developing economic crisis, which has already produced 6 million unemployed and many more millions of part-time employed workers in our country. Here, too, on this front of struggle, our Party has not been found wanting. We have been on the job, and we have given leadership to unify the workers in struggle around their day-to-day, urgent economic needs.

Yes, there are many weaknesses in our work, and we have made some mistakes. But, as Stalin said in 1910, in an article about the great German working-class leader, Bebel, "Only the dead do not make mistakes."

How  
come  
mu  
striv  
deav  
error

Fi  
our  
these  
of th  
wagi  
front  
oppo  
have  
again  
racy,  
espec  
ulcer  
cliqu  
Unit  
Stro  
kyite

Ye  
rank  
ship  
yet c  
hand

At  
ment  
tiona  
distr  
York  
coun  
and

[A  
ferre  
num  
and  
Ne

However, we are working to overcome our weaknesses and errors. We must overcome them more speedily, strive not to repeat them, and endeavor to eliminate weaknesses and errors from our work.

Finally, I would like to say that our Party has grown stronger in these past years, because in the midst of the mass struggles we have been waging a simultaneous fight on two fronts, against both Right and "Left" opportunism. At the same time, we have been waging a ceaseless war against reactionary Social-Democracy, against labor reformism, and especially against the malignant ulcer and treachery of the Tito clique, which attracts to itself in the United States the Anna Louise Strong, the John Rogges, the Trotskyites, and the Browderites.

Yes, comrades, I leave the operative ranks of our Party and our leadership for a while with keen regrets, yet certain that our Party is in good hands. It is in *your* hands.

\* \* \*

At this point, I should like to mention a few comrades of our national leadership, as well as in the districts, whom you comrades in New York and comrades throughout the country should know more about and who merit your full confidence.

[*At this point Comrade Dennis referred with high commendation to a number of Party leaders in district and national spheres of work.*]

Next, with your permission, let me

make a few remarks—I am aware, without the justice really due them—regarding my close co-workers, the other members of the National Committee, all of whom collectively constitute a strong, devoted, and capable leadership. First, Ben Davis and Bob Thompson. Ben and Bob display considerable political initiative; they are courageous and militant fighters of the working class and the people. There are Irving Potash, Jack Stachel, Carl Winter—comrades who are staunch, fighting Party leaders, very able tacticians. Then there are Johnny Gates and Gil Green, who are tested and stalwart leaders and who combine their firm adherence to Marxist-Leninist principles with great flexibility in applying the Party line.

Then there is a very dear comrade of mine and yours, Elizabeth Gurley Flynn, a comrade who reflects, embodies and symbolizes the most militant and revolutionary traditions of the American working class. Elizabeth is a foremost people's tribune of our Party, and a comrade, I would like you to know, who not only carries the message of our Party to the working people in her speeches, her articles and her activities, but who also listens to the workers, who goes to the homes of the miners and steel workers, learns from the working people, and transmits their thoughts and feelings to our Party.

Before commenting on my three co-Secretaries, the three other Sec-

retaries of our National Committee, permit me at this point to say a few special words about our beloved National Chairman, Bill Foster. Parenthetically let me say, since there has been considerable discussion among comrades in New York in recent months, involving points of criticism of some of Bill's latest publications, that a number of us in the National Committee have called attention to certain faulty or unhappily formulated statements in some of Bill's writings, as well as in some of my own. This was noted in the March Plenum of the National Committee. But in so doing, we the members of the National Committee, and your General Secretary, have recognized the most outstanding feature of Bill's works, his positive and great creative contributions. We have likewise noted that his book *Twilight of Capitalism* received very favorable comment in the great Marxist-Leninist journal, *For a Lasting Peace, For a People's Democracy!* And we took cognizance of the fact that this same book has been published in abridged form in tens of thousands of copies by our great brother Party, the Communist Party of Italy.

Tonight, I wish to say very simply the following regarding Bill. Bill Foster is the best and the finest son of the American working class. Bill Foster stands shoulder to shoulder with such outstanding Marxists as Thorez and Duclos of France, and with the foremost Marxists of our

hemisphere—Blas Roca of Cuba, Vittorio Codovilla of Argentina, and Luis Prestes of Brazil. I know that I need not urge you to do so, comrades, because I take it for granted that next year, in February 1951, you will make Bill's 70th birthday an event of national and international significance. [Applause]

Now I wish to make a few remarks about the Secretariat of the National Committee, about the three comrades who, together with me, as your General Secretary, have been elected by our National Committee as the Secretaries of our Party.

One, as you know, is John Williamson, our National Labor Secretary. Johnny is a worker of Scottish descent. He has been a tested leader of the Young Communist League, of our Party, and of the American working class for over twenty-five years. He is a devoted, experienced and capable leader in mass work. He has political and organizing initiative and he is a firm and skillful Party organizer, as well as trade-union organizer. And Johnny combines political stability with extreme conscientiousness, fearlessness and dependability.

As for our National Organization Secretary, Henry Winston, you know him as well as I do. Winnie is one of the best and finest sons of the Negro people, and one of the great leaders of our Party. He is not only a competent Party organizer. Winnie is an all-round Party political

wor  
and  
wo  
stru  
is a  
vari  
agai  
our  
Neg  
nie  
He  
stre  
who  
ties,  
eral  
La  
Hall  
elect  
in L  
weel  
Gus  
from  
sota.  
tion.  
the  
mitt  
bein  
Pitts  
Gary  
num  
and  
mine  
that  
amor  
mine  
Gus  
Gus  
by th  
has  
Gus

worker who is developing constantly, and is able to guide and lead the work of our Party in many fields of struggle and endeavor. And Winnie is a fiery and passionate worker. Invariably, he directs his fire and anger against the enemies of our Party, of our class, against the enemies of the Negro people. Needless to say, Winnie is one of my closest co-workers. He has been and is a great source of strength, not only to our Party as a whole, but also to me in my activities, in my responsibilities as General Secretary.

Lastly, a few words about Gus Hall. Our National Committee elected Gus as one of its Secretaries in December, 1949, and, as of last week, he is our National Secretary. Gus comes from a family of miners from the Mesaba Range of Minnesota. He is a lumberjack by occupation. He was a field organizer for the Steel Workers Organizing Committee in the days when steel was being organized, in Youngstown, Pittsburgh, Bethlehem, Chicago, Gary and other places. He has led numerous struggles in Youngstown and elsewhere. During the recent miners' strike, it was not accidental that the best work of our Party among, as well as in support of, the miners took place in Ohio, where Gus personally led our Party's work. Gus is a rock-ribbed worker, loved by the workers who know him. He has political initiative and strength. Gus has a capacity for theoretical

work and study, which he combines ably with the practical mass work of our Party.

Such, comrades, are the leaders of our Party, and with such co-workers, and with this great membership of our Party, I assure you, I can leave for prison knowing that our ship of state is in safe and capable hands.

\* \* \*

Let no one misunderstand me. I do not take this so-called leave of absence without deep concern. I realize that while the going is pretty tough today, that stormier days are ahead. I know that before things get better, they will probably get worse, and the struggle will sharpen. Because of this, permit me to make a few additional remarks.

Let me introduce my thoughts by posing a fundamental proposition. If you or I were asked: What is the central and foremost achievement of the great Lenin and Stalin—what would the answer be? We might say that the foremost achievement is the victory of the October Socialist Revolution, which established the highest form of the dictatorship of the proletariat, Soviet power; and they would be correct. We might well place the stress on the triumph of the three Stalin Five-Year-Plans of Socialist construction and the great Stalinist Constitution of human, national, and social freedom. We could well emphasize the decisive

liberating role of the U.S.S.R., under the leadership of Stalin, in the epic military-political struggle that defeated the Axis powers in World War II. We could, further, give prominence to the steadfast peace policy of the Soviet Union, and be equally correct.

However, I think it would not be an error to state that the foremost, the key, and the central contribution of Lenin and Stalin on all questions affecting the Russian and the international working class, which determined and guaranteed the victory of the Socialist Revolution, the construction of Socialism which is now in transition to Communism, is the creation and building of the revolutionary Marxist Party, the Party of a new type.

With this cardinal thought in mind, I would like to stress briefly a few major questions which I consider imperative to insure the further progress and Bolshevization of our own Party, our own American Marxist-Leninist Party—questions that are decisive in equipping our Party for its vanguard leadership of the working masses. I want to raise these questions, although not necessarily in the order of their importance.

First, we must nurture and develop our Party further as the vanguard Party of the working class and of all exploited. This requires the maximum political and organizational initiative of our Party on all levels—of each organization, each committee, each member. To be the van-

guard, however, means neither to lag behind nor to run ahead. This must particularly be borne in mind today, in the central struggle of this period, in the fight for peace. We must stimulate, organize, and lead struggles, taking the initiative and even going it alone when it is necessary, but always with the aim of setting into motion, not only the host of friends and sympathizers of the Party, but the tens of millions throughout the country. This is necessary, if we are to live up to our responsibilities and help to impose the American people's will for peace upon the warmakers.

Next, we must safeguard the purity of Marxism-Leninism. We must wage a relentless war against all deviations, be they Right or "Left" opportunism, whether they are manifested in our trade-union work, in our election campaigns, in the fight for Negro rights, in national-group work, or in any other field of our mass activities. To do this, we must open up, on a wider scale, a merciless, relentless and sustained struggle against Browder and Browderism, against the traitorous Tito camp. [*Applause*]

Thirdly, we must close ranks and establish a greater Communist discipline, guarding the unity of our Party as never before, as our indispensable weapon. Bear in mind, comrades, that precisely while the enemy attacks us from without, while he attacks us frontally, he will also redouble his efforts to weaken

and disrupt us from within. We saw this in 1945 and 1946. We have seen it since. Now, with your National Chairman seriously ill, and your General Secretary going away for a while, be on guard against the efforts of the enemy to disrupt our Party. The enemy will seize on all weaknesses and shortcomings. He will try to utilize all differences and shadings of opinion, as well as to exploit personal ambitions, personal weaknesses of comrades. We must defeat the enemy on this front, as well as on all other fronts, and we must preserve and strengthen at all costs the unity of our Party.

Fourthly, comrades, it is incumbent on us to raise to new heights the struggle for proletarian internationalism, the touchstone of which, for Communists and non-Communists, is the attitude to the Soviet Union, to the land of Socialism. [Applause] We know, and we must help other workers and progressives to realize, that the Soviet Union is *not just another country*. It is the land of Socialism, the land of the workers, of the farmers, of all the peoples and nationalities that make up the U.S.S.R. It is the land where the workers rule and live today free of exploitation, of unemployment, free of the insecurities and the oppression of capitalism. It is the land of freedom and culture, the land of true democracy, the democracy of Socialism.

Yes, we are Americans, we are American Marxists and working-

class patriots. We have a special affection for all workers fighting for peace and progress, for the cause of Communism. But when the workers emancipate themselves, be it in Russia or in China, in the People's Democracies, or in the France and Italy of tomorrow, we have not only a special affection, but a kinship and affinity; we view their Socialist achievements as victories for all workers. Our nation, which achieved its 1776, had a special affection for the people of revolutionary France. In the following century, Abraham Lincoln, the Great Emancipator, acknowledged with warm appreciation the expression of solidarity with the Union cause received from Karl Marx and his followers in London. And we American Communists today, in keeping with that high tradition, strive to awaken the American masses to their great task of proletarian internationalism in the cause of peace and progress. [Applause]

Let me restate what Comrade Foster and I said about a year ago, that: "If, despite the efforts of the peace forces of America and the world, Wall Street should succeed in plunging the world into war, we would oppose it as an unjust, aggressive, imperialist war, as an undemocratic and an anti-Socialist war, destructive of the deepest interests of the American people and all humanity."

In the struggle to realize proletarian internationalism, there are many additional obligations. At this



time, comrades, I want to say only the following: We have a special obligation to the subject people of Puerto Rico, the direct colony of Wall Street imperialism, and to the millions of workers and peasants of the Philippines, to the valiant Huk-balahaps, Communists and non-Communists, who are fighting with arms in their hands for their national independence and freedom. We should not forget and must not fail to aid the workers and the Communists of the tiny Republic of Panama; we must not fail to support the Communists and progressives of Australia, where Wall Street, as in Panama, Venezuela, and elsewhere, is trying by interference and dictation to outlaw the Communist Party in order to strangle the working class and all progressives.

To wage a fight for proletarian internationalism in deeds, not just in words, means, further, to wage a constant struggle against the pernicious ideologies of chauvinist nationalism, of supremacist jingoism within our own country and its influences in our own labor movement. It means to wage a fight to the death against white chauvinism and anti-Semitism. [*Applause*]

And as we fight for proletarian internationalism, let us remember that we Marxists will prove ourselves genuine proletarian internationalists only if we act as real working-class patriots, imbued with the spirit of Jefferson, Douglass, Lincoln, Sylvius,

Ruthenberg and Bill Foster. [*Applause*]

Fifthly, we must, more than ever in the past, strengthen our ties with the masses, especially with the labor movement and the Negro people. Wall Street is desperately trying to isolate us from the working class, especially from the workers in basic industries. The Taft-Hartley Act, for instance, creates many difficulties for us, as it does for all workers. But, while it will result in our sustaining some losses in trade-union posts, we cannot and must not let repressive laws undermine our trade-union base and weaken our ties with the masses of workers.

Sixthly, comrades, we must constantly develop the weapon of criticism and self-criticism. Criticism, to be effective, must be constructive. And self-criticism, to mean anything, must lead to self-correction and must serve to educate the Party and the masses. There are some comrades in our ranks who, after a great deal of criticism and urging, finally do correct themselves; but, in so doing, are very hesitant to take the Party into their confidence and frankly and openly to admit their mistakes. With the attacks on our Party mounting and getting sharper, you comrades, all of you, must help those leaders who are slow in exercising criticism and self-criticism to take this important step toward their own growth and development.

Next, we must work and fight

with a  
perspec  
for pea  
of the  
ment  
anti-w  
govern  
for a  
our fi  
today,  
the str  
most  
people  
that i  
help  
withi  
cause  
Social  
At  
ever,  
and g  
the in  
and p  
purity  
all de  
oppo  
revolu  
emy i  
seek  
learn  
must  
apply  
other  
Marx  
sider  
the  
in th  
relati  
Fir  
all c



with a clear perspective. While our perspective and task in the struggle for peace is to guide the development of the democratic coalition movement toward the emergence of an anti-war and anti-monopoly people's government, we must not lose sight for a moment of our ultimate goal, our final aim of Socialism. Thus, today, we must bear in mind that the struggle for peace is not only the most decisive task confronting the peoples throughout the world, but that it is the key link which will help shape the major realignments within the country and advance the cause of social progress, the cause of Socialism.

At all times, and now more than ever, we must strive to master theory and grasp the Leninist concept of the inseparable bond between theory and practice. We must fight for the purity of Marxism-Leninism, against all deviations and manifestations of opportunism. We must develop true revolutionary vigilance against enemy ideas and agents that ceaselessly seek to penetrate our ranks. We must learn from the Bolsheviks, but we must not copy blindly and try to apply mechanically the lessons of other lands. We must learn to apply Marxism creatively, to take into consideration the concrete conditions, the concrete relationship of forces, in the face of every development, in relation to every changing situation.

Finally, I would like to urge that all of us strive to effect a decided

improvement in our style of work. We must learn, as Stalin taught, to combine Bolshevik zeal with American efficiency. But always, and everywhere, we must be audacious; we must be bold. We must show greater imagination and achieve individual initiative in our work on all levels, at the top as well as below. This requires, today, quantitatively and qualitatively, a new approach in the struggle for peace, a maximum consideration of how we devote our energies and expend our time and resources, and how we distribute our personnel in the great fight to consolidate the broadest possible peace front.

We are entering a period of acute and sharpening struggles. Let us march forward courageously, determined, and with supreme confidence in our Party, in our class, in our cause. Here, let me take just an additional minute or two to mention a personal experience.

In 1933 or '34, I had the honor to work in a fraternal capacity with some Chinese Communist leaders. Those were trying days for the Chinese people and their heroic Communist Party. Our brother Chinese Party fought gloriously and effectively; and yet, for a time, for a number of years in fact, it had been forced to execute a strategic retreat and to abandon the areas of the former Central Soviet Republic of Kiangsi. It was a long march of retreat for the Chinese Red Army.

That retreat is now history, which most of you know about. At that time I had a talk with a leading Chinese comrade in Shanghai, who indicated what lay ahead and outlined the very difficult decisions they had to make. He expressed the famous thought of Mao Tse-tung that a People's Army can make retreats and lose territory in order to keep its forces intact, but so long as it has the adherence of the people it will be invincible. And this comrade expressed complete confidence in the future. He was not sure then in what province they would conclude their march, whether in Szechuan or Shansi; but he did know that wherever they were going to be they would be with the people. He also knew that all the murderous troops of the Kuomintang, all the German military missions, all the foreign imperialist invaders would not stop or daunt the Chinese people and their Communist Party. [*Applause*]

Among the many things that are unforgettable to me in that experience, in that particular exchange of opinion, is how this Chinese comrade spoke about the Bolsheviks. He said something which all of us know but have not always thought through deeply enough. He recalled that the

Bolshevik vanguard Party, the Party of the New Type, was organizationally as well as ideologically crystallized only in 1903, but was after the 1905 Revolution already tested in a period of unspeakable reaction, with its members exiled to Siberia and thousands done to death by the Czar's minions. He pointed with pride to the way the Bolshevik Party had stood that test and triumphed shortly thereafter. And the Chinese comrade said: "From 1903 to 1917 was just a span of fourteen years!" It is perhaps not mere coincidence that it is just a trifle more than fourteen years since I had the discussion with that comrade in Shanghai—and see what has happened in China! [*Tremendous applause*]

\* \* \*

Comrades, permit me to conclude. Most likely, in a few days, I shall be compelled to leave you. Whether or not I am present for a shorter or longer period, whether I am inside or outside of jail, I pledge to you that wherever I shall be, I will be worthy of your confidence and your comradeship, and that I will always conduct myself as a Communist, in a manner befitting a leader of our Party. [*Tremendous applause. Standing ovation*]

By G

It is  
Plenu  
Secret  
to take  
ments  
gle fo  
tional  
front

It i  
Plenu  
realiz  
ousnes  
for pe  
ing i  
vigoro  
phere,  
deter  
stop t  
Wall  
that t  
the ab  
ship t  
organ  
and a  
is beg  
bilitie  
prisin  
The  
as ce  
In  
imme

\* A  
tional

# Raise the Struggle for Peace to New Heights\*

By Gus Hall

IT IS NOW TWO MONTHS since our Plenum. We, the members of the Secretariat, felt that it was necessary to take note of a number of developments in connection with the struggle for peace, and to project additional thoughts on the tasks that confront the Party in this crucial field.

It is our feeling that since the Plenum there has been a growing realization in our Party of the seriousness and urgency of the struggle for peace. There is indeed developing in our Party a very healthy, vigorous, crusading political atmosphere, characterized by a heightened determination for an all-out effort to stop the war drive emanating from Wall Street. It is also our conclusion that there has been improvement in the ability of the Party to give leadership to the struggle for peace and to organize united-front movements and actions from below. Our Party is beginning to see the broad possibilities of a peace movement comprising the majority of Americans. The struggle for peace is emerging as central in everything we do.

In saying this, however, we have immediately to add that this im-

provement in our work is not yet true of the Party as a whole.

Let me now project some thoughts on certain specific features of the struggle for peace. From the outset I would like to make it clear that we do not want to change what we stated at the Plenum but rather to add some further thoughts to the thinking of the whole Party based on new developments since the Plenum.

## TEMPO IS KEY

The first and foremost conclusion from the new factors in the situation is the utmost importance for us to understand fully the new tempo of the war drive resulting from the growing moods of desperation within the ruling class. Since our Plenum, the preparations for war have not only been pushed further but the drive has been greatly stepped up on all fronts. Because of this new element, we must more fully understand the gravity of the war danger and the need for increasing the tempo of the whole movement for peace. The developments in the world and in the United States force this conclusion upon us. We do not

\* A Report delivered at the meeting of the National Committee, C.P., U.S.A., May 17, 1950.

have all the time in the world. Speed, tempo, the sense of urgency, is what we must now emphasize.

The recent Plenum correctly stated that time worked against the camp of war, that the ruling class with each passing day would find it more difficult to launch the war, and that its chances of victory would diminish. But from this correct analysis, we must not draw the conclusion that we, and the peace forces as a whole, have all the time in the world. I mention this because it is our feeling that such wrong conclusions have been drawn by some elements in the peace camp. The contrary is true. The ruling class, with each passing day, finds itself in more difficulties. With each passing day the world camp of peace grows stronger. The resistance to the imperialist war plans is on the increase, and the capitalist world finds itself sinking deeper into the swamp of economic crisis. To save itself from this dilemma, imperialist capitalism grows ever more desperate and is given to adventurist moods of plunging the world into war. Therefore, we must stress that the question of time, of tempo, is vital.

It was correct for the Plenum to state that the camp of peace is a stronger force in the world than the camp of war, as it was to state that the winning of peace is a realistic outlook, a practical possibility. But to this we must add that today the forces for peace are not yet strongly

enough organized to be able to stop the war. Especially for us in the United States, where the peace movement is as yet on an elementary level, it is important for us to realize this fact and not indulge in any feeling of complacency.

Peace can be won, but only with an all-out effort—an all-out mobilization of the peace forces of all strata of the population. Good intentions, wishful thinking, day-dreaming, or empty boasting will not stop Wall Street's drive towards war. Only the full mobilization of all who want peace can accomplish this. We, therefore, want to add this to the thinking of our Party.

It was correct for our Plenum—and it continues to be correct today—to emphasize the broad character of the peace sentiment in the United States and the need for our Party to give leadership to the peace movement on every level, including the most elementary levels. There is no basis for changing this estimate. We must add now that, while continuing to give leadership to the growing movement for peace on elementary levels, our Party must organize and develop more advanced forms of struggle — demonstrations, picket lines, mass actions of all kinds—forms of struggle in which the broad peace movement is not yet fully ready to participate. The absence of mass demonstrations and other actions is dramatized by the fact that shipments of arms continue and, in

fact, has  
a ripple  
We m  
ship is  
for pe  
height  
tion o

It w  
empha  
the str  
of the  
strugg  
the w  
and p  
necess  
tentio  
around  
war"  
crisis  
lay-of  
still r  
direct  
condi  
drive  
conn  
econ  
fight

The  
betw  
lers.  
tract  
of th  
G.M  
of ty  
war-  
ers  
and  
mili  
the  
war-

fact, have been stepped up, without a ripple of protest from any quarter. We must now improve our leadership in this phase of the struggle for peace, while raising to new heights other methods, such as petition campaigns, forums, literature.

It was correct for the Plenum to emphasize the necessity of relating the struggle for peace in the minds of the masses and in the day-to-day struggles with the harmful effects of the war policies on the economic and political field. It is especially necessary for us to give greater attention and leadership to struggles around economic issues. The "cold war" and the developing economic crisis are the two parents of speed-up, lay-offs, and wage cuts. We must still master the art of exposing the direct connection of these economic conditions with Wall Street's war drive. Workers who understand this connection are better fighters on the economic field as well as better fighters for peace.

The "cold war" class collaboration between the Reuthers and the Chryslers results in a sell-out and a contract that is anything but protection of the auto workers' interests. The G.M. contract is a classical example of tying the workers to a five-year war-time contract. Clearly, the workers are forced today to rely more and more on their own organized militant strength. But along comes the Supreme Court, dominated by war-minded Truman placemen, and

sets up pill boxes against the actions of the workers. The Court puts up one restriction after another, on the right to picket, to strike, and to elect leaders of the workers' choice—restrictions most flagrantly handed down in the 9-H Taft-Hartley ruling. All this leads to further speed-up, to wage-cutting, to the lowering of the standard of living. These are direct products of the war policies of Wall Street. If we expose this connection we can raise to new levels the struggle against the war policies and their effects on the living standards and civil rights of the American people.

Yet, in adopting this correct course, we must be conscious of the fact that the question of the fight for peace cannot be raised solely through the struggles in the economic and civil rights fields. We must see and understand that the question of peace is present as an issue in itself in the country, that there is a deep-going sentiment for peace among the people. We must never lose sight of the fact that there is a growing fear of the horrors of atomic warfare. Therefore we must raise the urgency of peace *directly*, as well as through the day-to-day economic and political struggles of the masses. Thus, instances can be cited where comrades have tended to narrow down the struggle for peace to questions affecting the "pocketbook," *i.e.*, the lack of trade, or to issues of civil rights. The struggle for peace must be con-

tinued on many fronts and cannot be narrowed down to one or another specific phase. The peace movement will develop along thousands of streams, but, given effective leadership, will finally merge into a fully conscious, anti-imperialist force.

### NEW DEVELOPMENTS

Now, a few words on some recent developments that further manifest the urgency and the need for speed in the struggle for peace.

First among these developments, are the recent rulings of the United States Supreme Court and the findings of Justice Jackson. We must grasp the full seriousness and significance of these rulings. These are wartime rulings and findings. The ruling class would not resort to such brazen judicial opinions but for its desperate war drive. These rulings are the "legal" rationalizations for the rapid advance toward fascism in our country. They are attempts to shackle the trade-union movement, to destroy the rising militancy and struggle of the Negro people. The alarming encroachments upon the First Amendment are designed to shut off every voice of opposition to the war policies of Wall Street. They lay the basis for the illegalization of our Party without the passage of the Mundt Bill. These rulings can be understood only in relation to the intensified tempo of war preparation and the increased war danger. They are the rulings of a war-minded

Supreme Court to condition the country for a war that goes against the grain of the people.

The second development of which we have to take note is the meeting of the foreign ministers of the United States, England and France. This was a conference for the purpose of stepping up the war preparations into high gear. This is clear from its main decisions:

1. The unification and building up of a military force that includes atomic-striking power under complete and direct domination of Wall Street's army brass. The conference designated the battle positions and military assignments for each of the participating countries. In return for American arms and ammunition, the ministers of France and Great Britain agreed to offer up to the war lord of Wall Street the bodies of Europe's men and women.

2. The placing of the French coal industry at the disposal of the Wall Street-controlled German steel industry. The aim is to make Western Germany the European front-line arsenal and war production center. The advanced stage of the war drive is further signaled by the French vassal government's complete surrender of the country's independence in capitulating to this steel-coal deal.

3. The agreement to speed the shipments of arms to Europe and Asia.

4. Finally, and arising out of the foregoing, the demand by the senior partner-in-crime for greater sacrifices

on the  
Street.  
The  
to dri  
low st  
of Eu  
The c  
of rep  
of exp  
with  
der. T  
facilit  
expan  
the ex  
of b  
coloni  
iron l  
The  
is the  
gover  
the in  
Bridg  
is som  
partis  
sion  
creati  
unity  
despe  
that  
one  
this v  
istic  
recen  
Hoov  
tions  
milit  
evid  
war  
in L  
bert  
A

on the altar of the war-god of Wall Street, from the peoples of Europe. The junior war-makers fully agreed to drive down further the already low standard of living of the peoples of Europe and the British Empire. The conference hastened the process of replacing the continued decline of exports of food and machinery with exports of the weapons of murder. The conference took action to facilitate the execution of Truman's expansionist Point Four program for the export of capital with the design of bringing additional countries, colonial and non-colonial, under the iron heel of Wall Street.

The next development to be noted is the preparation of the war-time government unity, as evidenced by the inclusion of Dulles, Cooper and Bridges in the Administration. This is something more than just the bipartisan coalition. This is an extension of the bipartisan policy to the creation of a war-time administration unity. It is fusion of the rabid and desperate elements with the elements that have been more cautious into one Administration. If we combine this with the war-mongering, jingoistic speeches of Mr. Truman on his recent tour and the proposals of Hoover to replace the United Nations with a war-bent imperialist military alliance, we have the fullest evidence of the speeding-up of the war drive. The military agreements in London are a follow-up of Herbert Hoover's proposals.

A dramatic contrast to this belli-

conse conference in London, was the pro-peace discussion in Moscow with Mr. Trygve Lie.

Lie's tour of world capitals in behalf of peaceful negotiations met with enthusiastic response from the leaders of the Soviet Union and China and the peace-loving peoples of the world on the one hand, and on the other with the cold, callous, outright rejection of Lie's peace proposals in advance by the State Department. In this, Wall Street and its bipartisan administration stand exposed as the leader of the imperialist camp of war, as against the world camp of peace and democracy which is headed by the Soviet Union. The revelations in the course of the pro-peace mission of Trygve Lie have served further to pillory American imperialism as the arch warmaker in the eyes of the peoples of the world.

A further development that must be taken into account in this entire connection is the mad rush to imprison Comrade Dennis, as well as the 25 other "cold war" victims of the Un-American Committee.

The legal openings to postpone the imprisonment of Comrade Dennis were all blocked by the desperate ruling class. The bipartisan war party was in a great hurry to get Comrade Dennis behind bars. The great rush to jail Dennis is closely bound up with the heightened war preparations. This is characteristic of the class rule of a bourgeoisie hell-bent for war. Always when driving to-



ward an unjust, unpopular war, the ruling class first muzzles the clear-est voice, the staunchest opponent of such policies.

Finally, among these developments is the drive whipped up by American imperialism to illegalize the Communist Parties in key areas of Wall Street's war preparations—Australia, Panama, Japan, South Africa, Western Germany, and this week in Venezuela. These "democrats" brazenly take credit for the fact that they are the back-stage promoters of the moves to outlaw the Communist Parties in 16 countries and plan to do the same in a number of others.

These are some of the salient new developments. One could enumerate many others. But they all clearly speak of a time table that has been speeded up by the war incendiaries. This means likewise for our Party, and all the forces of peace, the imperative need for a speeded up time table. A new sense of urgency is necessary in the struggle for peace.

#### PROBLEMS TO BE MET

Now, a few words about some problems in the peace movement.

First, I think we must underscore that the peace movement in the United States is growing, that the peace sentiment continues to expand. Each day opens up new possibilities and avenues for the people to be mobilized in the struggle for peace. The position taken by the Interna-

tional Red Cross to ban the atom bomb is an indication of the breadth of the world peace sentiment. The enemy has also taken note of these developments. There is a growing attack on the peace movement in America. The officials of the State Department and the Department of Justice who are known to admit privately that the peace movement is embarrassing to them, have worked out their tactical approaches to launch the counterattack. Theirs is a three-pronged move. First, their Red-baiting attack on all peace movements as "Red," and "Communist-dominated"; secondly, their maneuvers to penetrate existing peace movements for the purpose of misleading them; thirdly, their attempt to build pseudo-peace movements; or to revamp certain old movements, like the Atlantic Union, for the purpose of capturing the masses; or to institute "peace" conferences designed to disorient the people.

We must take note especially of the large number of Social-Democrats, Titoites, Trotzkyites and the Musteite pacifists who have been recently corralled into service by Wall Street in its counter-attack against the genuine peace movement. However, the peace movement is holding up and advancing.

The outstanding weakness that must continue to be registered is the slow growth of the peace movement in the working class. True, some local unions, shops and departments have elected peace committees;

other  
peace  
still  
comm  
Comm  
for p  
far t  
work  
form  
tion  
ing c  
main  
Party  
shoul  
peace  
not  
comp  
ing c  
Th  
move  
prof  
the p  
conce  
war.  
there  
and  
the t  
inter  
men  
Social  
less  
again  
top  
ticular  
posit  
of  
limi  
in t  
to  
clear  
basis



others have elected or appointed peace stewards in the departments; still others have designated standing committees, such as the Veterans Committee, to conduct the struggle for peace. But this development is far too sporadic. In general, the working class has not yet found the forms to build shop peace organization or effective neighborhood working class peace movements. This remains the Number One job of the Party. There is nothing that can or should divert us from this task. The peace movement in our country will not go very far, and will not accomplish its task, without the working class as its foundation.

The growth of the many peace movements among the middle-class professional and cultural sections of the population indicates both a deep concern and a desire to unite against war. But within these movements, there are expressions of hesitancy and wavering under the pressure of the terrific propaganda and the direct intervention of the State Department, as well as the influence of Social-Democracy. Confirming past lessons, present experiences have again driven home the point, that top united-front movements, particularly those of middle-class composition, are, especially in this period of sharp struggles, bound to be limited and even more unstable than in the past. For a peace movement to have stability, direction, and a clear perspective, it must have as its basis the working class allied with

the Negro people, the poor farmers, the masses of women and youth. This, of course, must in no way be taken as an underestimation of the role of the middle-class and professional sections of the population. On the contrary, in many cities these forces have played a very important and even an initiating role in the peace movement. But we must understand that these sections of the population can move to new heights in the struggle for peace only if there is a movement developing and growing in the ranks of the working class. Nor does this mean that we will not encourage and work with top leaders, but we must not substitute such united front relations for the basic united front from below, for the peace movement among the working class, the Negro people and the masses of women, youth, etc.

#### SOME IDEOLOGICAL QUESTIONS

A few words on the ideological obstacles the peace movement faces in our country. Only with the unfolding of the peace movement did we begin to face the full effects of the propaganda barrage of jingoism, nationalism and anti-Sovietism. We have noted a tendency in our own ranks to avoid and ignore the problems engendered by the warmakers' ideological offensive. This indicates a deep-seated lack of confidence in our ability to meet the issues and convince the working class and the people as a whole of the correctness of our position. There

is a continued sectarian hesitation to join broad movements. When comrades raise questions "How can you join movements where the Social-Democrats have influence?" or "How can you work with people who are for peace but see the atom bomb as a safeguard for peace?"—such questions and hesitations indicate a lack of confidence in our ability ideologically to win the masses. We must give much more attention to help our comrades surmount these obstacles.

The great popularity of, and admiration for, the Soviet Union, the land of Socialism, presents the imperialist war camp with one of its most difficult and insoluble problems. The majority of the working masses of Europe, Asia and the colonial countries, and an increasing number of Americans, see the Soviet Union as the leader and bulwark of the world forces of peace, democracy, and progress. The capitalist class of the world has for decades attempted to dislodge the Soviet Union from this position of prestige. But the clouds of slander have not been able to hide the sun of Socialism. The failure of this frontal ideological attack has brought the master minds of capitalist ideology to devise a flank attack. This flank attack is the "plague on both your houses" shibboleth, the "co-responsibility," "two big brutes" line. This line of attack has caught some progressives, and even some Communists, asleep at the ideological switch. This was seen at the 1950 Progress-

sive Party convention. This led to the adoption of the pro-Tito resolution at the Lawyers Guild convention, and to the milder version of "a plague on both your houses" resolution at the Mid-Century Peace Conference.

We do not place as a condition for unity the full understanding of the imperialist character of the Wall Street war drive. But this does not mean, and cannot mean, that progressives and Communists remain silent when the Land of Socialism is slandered as being "responsible" for the war drive.

This flank attack is designed to lull the most advanced section of the peace camp to neutrality, while Wall Street pushes into high gear the war drive against the world, in the first place against the Soviet Union. This is the very tactic that was employed by Tito in his betrayal of the camp of peace and Socialism. The Tito-fascist gang then moved from the position of "a plague on both your houses" to a full-scale attack on the Soviet Union.

We must never forget that the Soviet Union is not just another country. It is the Land of Socialism. We must never be silent when a Socialist country is maligned as "responsible," jointly or alone, for the drive toward a war of imperialist conquest, for war-mongering, for national and colonial enslavement, or for any of the evils that only capitalism, and today in the first place Wall Street monopoly capitalism, breeds and seeks to perpetuate.

Or  
progr  
asked  
do if  
the U  
sion  
woul  
any  
impl  
could  
the U  
Ex  
your  
in th  
"B  
"O  
griev  
be sa  
"It  
a str  
Th  
plag  
gress  
gle i  
is no  
weap  
paig  
the s  
reall  
emp  
been  
he  
man  
pick  
brut  
some  
O  
ing,  
Neg  
the  
toug  
ough

On the "Meet the Press" radio program, when Earl Browder was asked the question what he would do if the Soviet Union would attack the U.S.A., he put over his own version of this slander by answering he would defend his country against any aggression, thereby leaving the implication that the Soviet Union could be a possible aggressor against the United States, or any other land.

Examples of the "plague on both your houses" line are a dime a dozen in the lives of every American.

"Both sides are to blame. . . ."

"Of course, the union has some grievances, but there's something to be said for the employers, too."

"It takes *two* to make a quarrel . . . a strike . . . a war."

This kind of "neutrality" has plagued the working class and progressive movement in every struggle in all periods of history. There is no more powerful strike-breaking weapon than the insidious campaign to sow doubts in the minds of the striking workers: Was the strike really forced on the union by the employers? Couldn't the strike have been avoided if the union leaders hadn't made "unreasonable" demands? Was it not the militant mass picketing that provoked violence and brutality? Haven't the bosses got something on their side after all?

Or, let us take the case of a lynching, a "race riot," the bombing of a Negro home. Everybody has heard the arguments: "Sure, things are tough for the Negroes, sure they ought to have a square deal; but

they're in too much of a hurry, they didn't go about it the right way in this particular instance." . . . "The fascists at Peekskill did a terrible thing, but it was a mistake for Robeson to go back and provoke them all over again." . . . "Negroes ought to be able to live anywhere they want, but this particular family shouldn't have moved into a community where the people weren't yet educated to the recognition of the evils of Jim Crow" . . . and so on.

Such arguments are designed to cripple the struggle for economic demands, for trade-union rights, for Negro liberation.

But in addition to their immediate, practical harm, such arguments also negate basic principles. No Communist, no worker, no true friend of labor can accept the proposition that there is something to be said "for both sides" in a conflict between labor and capital, or that the workers and their exploiters are "equally to blame" for a strike.

Communists, in the first place, refuse to tolerate any concept that mitigates the responsibility of the white supremacists for anti-Negro violence or oppression. We can have no truck with a line that seeks to "blame" the Negro people "too" for the violence that may accompany their just struggle for equality and for national liberation.

The introduction of this "plague on both your houses" line into the fight for peace today is calculated and dangerous.

It distorts the facts, obscures the

real responsibility of the American monopolists for the war danger, and tries to blind the people to their recognition of the peace policy of the Soviet Union.

It paralyzes, waters down, and cripples the people's struggle for peace by diverting their fire from the enemies of peace to the champion and bulwark of world peace.

It is an unprincipled position. It seeks to negate the true role of the working class and the country of Socialism.

What do those who claim to advocate world peace based on American-Soviet cooperation mean when they say the Soviet Union, as well as the United States, has "made mistakes," and bears a share of blame for international tensions?

It is noteworthy that they seldom get specific, or come down to cases. But the implication is left that they go along with some of the base slanders against the U.S.S.R. peddled by the bipartisan warmongers.

Do they mean the Soviet Union has been pursuing an "expansionist" policy? If so, they are turning their backs on the facts of life. As regards China, for instance, they in effect deny the corruption of the counter-revolutionary Chiang Kai-shek and the feudal landlords and war-lords; they negate the right of the Chinese people to achieve national and class emancipation; and they "justify" U.S. imperialist intervention by misrepresenting as "interventionist" the Soviet Union's friendly assistance to the sovereign, equal, new Chinese

People's Republic.

The same thing is true of the Soviet Union's policy with regard to the countries of People's Democracy, to the colonial struggles for national liberation in Viet-Nam, Indonesia, Malaya, etc.

To accept the imperialist Big Lie that the Soviet Union intervenes in the affairs of other countries is to play the game of the would-be perpetuators of capitalist or feudal oppression. For this means denying to the workers and peasants the right to throw off the yoke of class exploitation and imperialist oppression. It hides the real intervention, the export of counter-revolution, the fomenting of civil wars by Wall Street imperialism to suppress the democratic will of the native masses for emancipation. There can be no "neutrality" as between the forces of democracy and Socialism, on the one hand, and those of fascism and imperialism, on the other.

The attempt to equate the capitalist United States and the Socialist Soviet Union is like equating the organized labor movement with the N.A.M. and Chamber of Commerce. American workers are wise to this brand of equating. They have heard the demagogy, "*I'm against monopoly*—so let's bust up the big trade unions or 'control' them." They also know the cant about protecting the "right to work"—by going back to the Open Shop. And they are familiar with the one about twisting the Wagner Act ban on employer coercion and interference into a ban on

so-cal  
milita  
bor  
An  
capab  
is on  
thing  
run l  
as a  
Th  
state-  
put o  
fully  
THE  
Th  
day  
that  
arou  
initia  
man  
Peac  
bomb  
paig  
parti  
State  
lions  
pled  
mov  
feren  
men  
as I  
Part  
as w  
befo  
and  
petit  
citie  
This  
the  
to t  
club

so-called "outside interference" by militant trade unionists inside a labor organization.

American workers are perfectly capable of understanding that labor is one thing and Big Business something different, and that a country run by the workers is not the same as a country run by Wall Street.

The Socialist state is a workers' state—this is the key point we must put over if we are to combat successfully the "plague" line.

#### THE WORLD PEACE APPEAL

The peace forces of America today face one, common central task, that is to mobilize for the campaign around the world peace appeal initiated at Stockholm by the Permanent Committee of the World Peace Congress to ban the atom bomb. This is one worldwide campaign. It is a campaign involving all partisans of peace. In the United States the campaign to secure millions of signatures for the peace pledge is being launched by a broad movement representing many different sections of the peace movement. I want to state as emphatically as I know how that the Communist Party must get into this campaign as we have never entered a campaign before. This is one central campaign and not the circulation of separate petitions in different states and cities, as has been the case thus far. This must become the central task of the Party. There will be no exception to this. No district, no section, no club, no member is exempted from

participation with the maximum energy in this campaign. This drive will be launched with a momentous agitational campaign, with millions of leaflets, stickers, posters, etc., to bring this great peace appeal to the shops, offices, streets, and homes of the most outlying regions of the country.

Each section and club will work out a plan of work for the collection of signatures. This means leg work, house-to-house canvassing, ringing door bells. We must not underestimate the hard work that will go into this campaign. It will take thousands of meetings, speaking at unions, churches, clubs, county fairs. We must organize and help broad movements to organize nation-wide tours, caravans into every town and hamlet. There must not be a village or town, including the farming towns, that will not have been touched by this campaign. This is a task in which every single member of the Party can take part.

We must see fully the potentialities of this world-wide campaign. We must visualize the strength the masses will draw from knowing that there are hundreds of millions the world over in the same fight for peace. What confidence the people will draw from knowing that there are tens of thousands within every city, hundreds on every block, scores in every apartment house, that there is a fighter for peace, a friend wherever one turns! This will raise the struggle for peace to new heights. This is the task of tasks!

# The Achievements of Marxism-Leninism In the Field of Genetics

By Hyman Lumer\*

THE GENETICS CONTROVERSY which has raged in the Soviet Union for some twenty years is, in its immediate aspects, a conflict between two diametrically opposed theories of heredity. The scope of the controversy is, however, far broader than this. It extends to such fundamental questions as materialism versus idealism in the field of biology, the methodology of science, and the role of science in society. In fact, basically it involves a struggle between the bourgeois and Socialist outlook on scientific research.

## SOCIALIST SCIENCE VERSUS BOURGEOIS SCIENCE

In capitalist society, science is the handmaiden of the ruling class, for which it serves a two-fold function. On the one hand, it is an indispensable instrument for the development of new productive techniques as a means of increasing profits. On the other hand, the capitalist class looks to science to provide an ideological justification for its rule.

\* Comrade Lumer, who is a Ph.D. in biology, was formerly Professor of Biology at Fenn College, Cleveland, Ohio.—Ed.

Inevitably these two aspects of bourgeois science come into conflict. Technical progress is impossible without real science, without materialist theory which will stand the test of practice. But such theory, far from justifying capitalist exploitation, tends to expose its true character. Genuine science, rooted in practice, lays bare the lies to which capitalism must increasingly resort in order to perpetuate its rule, lies which can only be maintained through pseudo-science — through idealism and mysticism in science.

Hence, under capitalism the separation of theory and practice, of those who think and those who work, is unavoidable. "Under the capitalist mode of production it is, of course, undesirable that 'those who work with calloused hands' should think, because, if they began to think, they would understand that it was necessary to sweep away capitalist social relationships and create new, Socialist relationships."\*

As capitalism becomes more and

\* D. A. Kislovsky, in *The Situation in Biological Science*, p. 522.

more enmeshed in its internal contradictions, the gap between theory and practice of necessity grows. With the emergence of monopoly capital, technological improvements, always limited by the degree to which they offer prospects of immediate profits, become still further suppressed to protect the huge vested interests of the trusts. The talents of scientists and inventors become increasingly restricted to the development of new instruments of war and devastation. Simultaneously, as capitalism becomes ever more reactionary and fearful of progress, obscurantism, mysticism and persecution of the truth become more firmly entrenched in the theoretical field.

Nowhere is this more strikingly illustrated than in the field of atomic physics. Under capitalism the unleashing of atomic energy, an outstanding triumph of modern science, found its first "application" in the devastation of Hiroshima. Today, atomic research is confined to the development of still more frightful atom bombs, for which more money is being spent than the total outlay for scientific research in all of past history, while the development of the boundless potentialities of atomic energy for human welfare is completely stifled.

It is equally characteristic that while the achievements of modern physics are mustered with break-neck speed for the piling up of atomic weapons, the field of theoretical physics is loaded down with

the idealistic rubbish of logical positivism and similar philosophic doctrines whose anti-scientific character Lenin long ago exposed in his *Materialism and Empirio-Criticism*.

In general, theory becomes the property of scientists isolated from practice, who engage in an illusory search of "knowledge for the sake of knowledge." And although it becomes increasingly clear that what they are actually accumulating is knowledge for the sake of the imperialist bourgeoisie and its war program, this illusion of a "pure" science persists.

In the field of genetics, research is carried on in institutes and laboratories by geneticists who (to use Timiryazev's expression) work for themselves as "private gentlemen." The task which they set themselves is not the creation of new varieties of useful plants and animals, but only the abstract aim of discovering the "mechanism" of heredity. The practical tasks are left to the farmers and technicians, who go their own way independently of the "pure" scientists. The latter, in turn, look upon them with scorn. Men like Luther Burbank in this country and I. V. Michurin in Russia have created literally hundreds of important new plant varieties. Yet H. J. Muller, a leader of the campaign of vilification of Soviet science, characterizes them as men who have merely made a few lucky discoveries by trial-and-error methods, and who



have contributed nothing to biological science.

The entire approach of such scientists is inevitably a metaphysical, mechanical approach which isolates living things from their natural conditions of life, as they themselves are isolated from the world of practical production. At the same time, their own ideological adherence to the capitalist class leads them to develop the kind of sterile, idealist theory which that class requires.

In a Socialist society, on the other hand, science plays a totally different role. Here its aim is to serve the interests of the whole people, and not the mercenary interests of an exploiting class. Consequently there is no conflict between theory and practice, no separation of those who think from those who work. Scientists, technicians and the masses of workers and farmers are united in the common aim of constantly raising the level of production, of turning out an increasing abundance of goods for all to enjoy.

Soviet agricultural scientists therefore do not isolate themselves from and look down upon the masses of collective farmers and technical workers. In contrast to bourgeois geneticists like Muller, they hold with Michurin that "every collective farmer is an experimenter, and an experimenter is a transformer of nature." A scientist like Lysenko is not only a leading theoretician, but an outstanding organizer and leader

of thousands upon thousands of collective farmers.

Under Socialism, moreover, scientists are not fettered by an outworn profit system with its recurrent economic crises, unlike scientists in capitalist countries such as the United States, where an increase in the potato crop means only so many more million bushels of potatoes to be burned to get rid of the "surplus," or where an increase in the cotton crop means only so much more cotton to be stored in government warehouses to protect the profits of the big cotton planters, while millions go inadequately fed and clothed.

Nor are they compelled to prostitute their labors to the creation of more and more hideous weapons for human slaughter in the interests of a desperate ruling class. It is no accident that the first large-scale atomic explosion in the Soviet Union was not to test the destructiveness of an atom bomb, but was part of a vast project for the reclamation of huge areas of desert land.

Equally, it is no accident that in the U.S.S.R. there has developed a new, Socialist agricultural science and with it a new theory of heredity which challenges the very foundations of the classical genetics of bourgeois scientists. It is a theory which restores and develops further the revolutionary content of Darwinism, which bourgeois genetics had all but buried.

It is against this background that the genetics controversy must be un-

dersto  
ceed  
tion

DAR

In  
mem  
Speci  
the v  
fruit  
this  
the f  
affect  
scien

In  
over  
of th  
unde  
a co  
deve  
varie  
the  
desc  
simp  
the  
Lam  
idea  
cent  
mas  
was  
to h  
estab  
tion

D  
for  
livin  
in t  
thei  
of f  
rise



derstood, and that we may now proceed to examine the theoretical questions involved.

### DARWINISM

In the year 1859, Charles Darwin's memorable book, *The Origin of Species*, burst like a bombshell on the world of bourgeois science. The fruit of years of painstaking labor, this book not only revolutionized the field of biology, but profoundly affected all branches of natural science.

In it, Darwin first of all presented overwhelming and irrefutable proof of the fact that living things have undergone and continue to undergo a constant process of change and development, that the innumerable varieties of plants and animals on the face of the earth today are the descendants of a few, comparatively simple, original forms of life. True, the French biologist Jean Baptiste Lamarck had propounded the same idea at the turn of the nineteenth century. However, the enormous mass of evidence which Darwin was able to muster was not available to him and it was Darwin who first established the fact of organic evolution beyond any possible doubt.

Darwin's work shattered once and for all the theological dogma that living things had at some moment in the past been created in exactly their present forms, and the doctrine of fixity of species to which it gave rise. This dogma, which was an in-

tegral part of the prevalent metaphysical conception of a fixed, unchanging universe, had up to then completely dominated the thinking of biologists, and had long served the ruling classes as a powerful ideological instrument for defense of the *status quo*.

It is not surprising, therefore, that Darwin's theory aroused a storm of controversy and met with tremendous opposition. This opposition stemmed not only from the church, which attacked his ideas as destructive of all religion and morals, and accused him of seeking to degrade man to the level of the beasts, but from the ranks of the biologists themselves.

Such open opposition to Darwinism has by no means died out even today. Aside from the continued antagonism of certain religious groups, among them the Roman Catholic Church, there are in this country six Southern poll-tax states in which the teaching of Darwinism in public schools and colleges is to this day forbidden by law. We need only remember the disgraceful Scopes trial of the 1920's, in which a Tennessee school teacher was convicted of the "crime" of teaching evolution.

In this connection, it is an interesting commentary that the same American geneticists who are so ready to revile a Lysenko and to raise a hue and cry over an imagined lack of freedom of discussion in the Soviet Union, show virtually no con-

cern over this state of affairs in our own country. They are, of course, no different from those other spokesmen for American imperialism who constantly clamor about democracy in the far corners of the earth while they condone and foster the denial of the most elementary democratic rights here at home.

Marx and Engels, however, fully appreciated the revolutionary significance of Darwin's teaching. They recognized in Darwin's theory a discovery of enormous importance and a brilliant verification of the dialectical process in the world of nature. Engels stated, for example:

Nature is the test of dialectics, and it must be said for modern natural science that it has furnished extremely rich and daily increasing materials for this test, and has thus proved that in the last analysis nature's process is dialectical and not metaphysical, that it does not move in an eternally uniform and constantly repeated circle, but passes through a real history. Here prime mention should be made of Darwin, who dealt a severe blow to the metaphysical conception of nature by proving that the organic world of today, plants and animals and consequently man too, is all a product of a process of development that has been in progress for millions of years.\*

Darwin's contribution, however, does not by any means end with this. He also sought an explanation of how the process of evolution of living things is brought about. This he

found in his theory of natural selection, which may be briefly summarized as follows:

1. Living things are capable of producing vastly greater numbers of offspring than the environment can possibly accommodate. The result is a struggle for existence in which only a small fraction of the potential number of offspring succeed in surviving and growing to maturity.

2. Living things vary widely in structure and function, even within the same species. In fact, no two individual organisms are exactly alike. These variations are in large part hereditary; that is, they are passed on to succeeding generations.

3. In the struggle for existence, those variations which are best fitted to their surroundings have the advantage over the others and are selected for survival.

4. As the conditions of life (climate, food supply, etc.) change, new variations, better adapted to the new conditions, are selected by natural processes for survival. Thus new forms of life make their appearance, which may replace previous forms or exist alongside them.

In this theory Darwin offered for the first time a materialist explanation both of the remarkable fitness of living things to their surroundings and of the constant evolution of new forms of life. Previously the fitness of organisms had been explained in terms of the same dogma of a special creation by a divine

\* Frederick Engels. *Anti-Duebring*, quoted in *History of the C.P.S.U.*, p. 107.

Creator who, in his infinite wisdom, had simply made them that way. Even Lamarck, in his efforts to explain the process of evolution, had resorted to the idealist conception of an "inner desire" for progress, of a volitional, purposeful striving of living things to develop. The theory of natural selection, by providing a scientific answer to these questions, put an end to such idealist obscurantism and at the same time paved the way for tremendous advances in the practical task of creating new varieties of plants and animals useful to man.

This is the essence of Darwin's outstanding contribution to the science of biology. The basic correctness of his theories is attested to by the fact that since his day it has proved necessary to change relatively little in them. Nevertheless, his thinking was by no means free of bourgeois limitations, and his work consequently contains certain errors.

First of all, Darwin derived the inspiration for his theory of natural selection from the utterly false and reactionary ideas of the British economist Malthus. Man, said Malthus, multiplies in number far beyond the increase in the means of subsistence. From this there arises an unending, violent competition for existence, and therefore war, famine, pestilence and other scourges must of necessity intervene as a means of holding the size of the population down to the level permitted by the available supply of the necessities of

life.

It is not necessary here to analyze the obvious falsity of Malthus' apology for the dog-eat-dog ethics of capitalism. What is important is that Darwin uncritically accepted the idea of a biological struggle for existence in human society, and transferred the doctrine of a universal struggle for existence bodily to the entire realm of living things. This encouraged later apologists for capitalism to complete the question-begging circle by appealing to the theory of natural selection as a proof of the struggle for existence among human beings. Through this intellectual sleight-of-hand, they have sought to use Darwin's theory as a "scientific" justification of the most brutal exploitation of the working class and as a device for covering up the fact that the real struggle in capitalist society is the *class* struggle.

This is admirably expressed by Engels in the following words:

The whole Darwinian theory of the struggle for life is simply the transference from society to organic nature of Hobbes' theory of *bellum omnia contra omnes* [the war of all against all], and of the bourgeois economic theory of competition, as well as the Malthusian theory of population. When once this fact has been accomplished (the unconditional justification for which, especially as regards the Malthusian theory, is still very questionable), it is very easy to transfer these theories back again from natural history to the history of society, and altogether too naive to maintain that thereby these asser-

tions have been proved as eternal laws of society.\*

As a matter of fact, Darwin and his successors tended to overemphasize the role of the struggle for existence in natural selection. While overpopulation and competition undoubtedly exist in the organic world, natural selection and evolution may take place without their being involved at all, as Engels has pointed out:

Above all, this [the struggle for existence] must be strictly limited to the struggles resulting from plant and animal *over-population*, which do in fact occur at definite stages of plant and lower animal life. But one must keep sharply distinct from it the conditions in which species alter, old ones die out, and newly evolved ones take their place, without this *over-population*: e.g., on the migration of animals and plants into new regions where new conditions of soil, climate, etc., are responsible for the alteration. If *there* the individuals which become adapted survive and develop into new species by continually increasing adaptation, while the other more stable individuals die away and finally die out, and with them the imperfect intermediate stages, then this can and does proceed *without any Malthusianism*, and if the latter should occur at all it makes no change to the process, at most it can accelerate it.\*\*

Furthermore, some of Lysenko's results (such as the discovery that the rubber-bearing kok-saghyz plant grows better when planted in

bunches than when planted separately) have led him to question whether a struggle for existence among individuals of the same species occurs at all.

But despite those shortcomings, Darwin's teachings retain their essential validity and remain a scientific contribution of monumental proportions.

There is one vital question, however, with the investigation of which Darwin did not directly concern himself. That is the question of the causes of the hereditary variations upon which natural selection operates. Lamarck, in his law of use and disuse, had asserted that changes produced in an organism by the action of the environment are passed on to its offspring. Darwin himself similarly believed that heredity can be altered by direct action of the environment, but he made no effort to verify this belief experimentally.

It is in the search for the answer to this question that there have developed the two diametrically opposed schools of thought which have in recent years come into sharp, open conflict: on the one hand, the metaphysical, idealist approach of formal genetics, associated primarily with the names of Weismann, Mendel and Morgan, which became firmly entrenched among bourgeois biologists; on the other hand, the dialectical materialist approach developed by such scientists as Timiryazev, Michurin, Lysenko and their disciples in the Soviet Union.

\* F. Engels, *Dialectics of Nature*, p. 208.

\*\* *Ibid.*, p. 255.

## MENDELIAN GENETICS

The theory of heredity adhered to by present-day Mendelian geneticists is based originally on the speculative theories of the German biologist August Weismann.

According to Weismann, an organism consists of two distinct, independent parts, namely the reproductive cells or germ plasm, and the rest of the body or soma. It is the germ plasm, he asserted, which gives rise directly to both germ plasm and soma of the next generation, and which alone determines its hereditary features.

The germ plasm thus constitutes an unbroken succession from generation to generation, while the soma is merely a mortal by-product which serves as a vehicle and source of nutriment for the immortal germ plasm without in any way affecting its structure. Consequently, modifications of the soma acquired by the individual in the course of its development cannot be expected to have any effect on the appearance of its offspring, which is determined solely by the germ plasm. Thus Weismann concludes, in direct contrast to Lamarck and Darwin, that acquired characteristics are not inheritable.

The core of Weismann's theory is therefore the assertion that there exists a special, immortal hereditary substance which determines the course of development of the organism but which is itself completely insulated from and uninfluenced by

the living body of the organism and its conditions of life. Such a conception, in artificially isolating a portion of the organism from its surroundings, is clearly a metaphysical one. Moreover, the proposition that there exists a peculiar living substance which guides the interaction of the organism with its environment throughout its entire development, yet does not itself take part in that interaction and does not itself develop, is pure, undisguised idealism bordering on vitalism.

Pursuing his ideas further, Weismann declared that the hereditary substance in question is to be found in the chromosomes, minute, thread-like structures contained in the nuclei of the cells of which living things are composed. This proposition, which retains and merely refines the idealist core of Weismannism, is the essence of the chromosome theory of heredity accepted by formal geneticists today.

The basis of the present-day chromosome theory was laid by Gregor Mendel, an Austrian monk who conducted breeding experiments with different varieties of peas. Mendel's ideas were further developed and elaborated chiefly by the American geneticist Thomas Hunt Morgan and his followers, whose main object of experimentation has been the common fruit fly, *Drosophila*.

It is not necessary here to delve into all the complexities of the chromosome theory. Its main featu-

res, however, are the following:

1. The chromosomes contain sub-microscopic, self-propagating units, the genes, which are the determiners of heredity. The set of genes contained in the chromosomes of the germ cells determines the hereditary constitution of the individual which develops from them.

2. Hereditary variations arise from a) reshuffling and recombination of the genes through the process of sexual reproduction in which half the genes are contributed by the male parent and half by the female parent, b) rearrangements of genes, or changes in the structure or number of the chromosomes such that genes are either added or lost, and c) changes in the structure of the individual genes themselves, or mutations.

3. Mutations occur spontaneously in nature and can be produced artificially by exposing organisms to various forms of radiation or to other environmental agents. Artificially produced mutations are the same as those occurring in nature, the only effect of the artificial treatment being to increase the rate of their occurrence. Their direction is indefinite; that is, it cannot be predicted after a particular exposure in what direction the mutation will occur.

4. Modifications of the soma acquired during the course of development of the organism will not be inherited, since they do not change the structure of the genes or chromo-

somes.

It is clear from even this brief outline that the modern chromosome theory fully retains the idealist, metaphysical features of Weismannism, even though many of its adherents maintain that they are not Weismannists simply because they have rejected certain portions of Weismann's original theory. The chromosomes with their component genes constitute a self-perpetuating, immortal hereditary substance, independent of and unaffected by the rest of the body. Moreover, the genes are extremely stable (according to H. J. Muller, the average length of time between two successive mutations of a particular gene in nature is about 100,000 years), and are altered only by comparatively violent shocks which directly affect them.

In addition, the Mendelists introduce a further idealist concept, namely the indefiniteness and inherent unpredictability of hereditary changes, which flows from the principle of the independence of the hereditary substance from the rest of the organism. Thus I. I. Schmalhausen, an exponent in the U.S.S.R. of Mendelism, stated:

The external factor, on reaching the threshold of the organism's tissues, merely gives the first impetus which sets in motion the internal mechanism of a definite complex of form-building processes. It determines neither the quality nor the scale of the reaction. At best (and then not always) the external factor merely determines the

time and sometimes the place of the occurrence.\*

This idea is expressed in the following statement by the American geneticist L. H. Snyder:

The cause of these rearrangements of atoms—mutations—is probably inherent in the molecular structure of the genes. Mutations may be regarded as the results of random inter- and intramolecular motions. They are, in other words, the results of isolated microchemical accidents, not individually controllable.\*\*

This means that it is impossible in principle, by altering the conditions of life of an organism in a given direction, to change its heredity in a corresponding and predictable manner. The most that the plant or animal breeder can do is to hope for a lucky accident which will produce what he is seeking.

In practical breeding, consequently, the Mendelian theory limits our actions to the mere reshuffling of genes, to the selection of organisms possessing particular combinations of genes. Once we have obtained organisms possessing all the desired genes, we have a pure line which no amount of selection will change any further, unless a fortunate mutation should occur. The breeding of plants and animals is thereby confined to securing pure lines and perpetuating them endlessly.

\* I. I. Schmalhausen, *Factors of Evolution*, quoted by M. B. Mitin in *The Situation in Biological Science*, p. 267.

\*\* L. H. Snyder, *The Principles of Heredity*, 2nd ed., p. 252.

Moreover, according to the Mendelian theory, mutations occur rarely and those that do occur are either imperceptible or, if more pronounced, are usually harmful. Therefore, while the heart of Darwinism is constant change, that of Mendelism-Morganism is virtual immutability. Instead of explaining the cause of the appearance of new hereditary variations on which Darwin's theory of evolution is based, Mendelism-Morganism restricts the possibility of such changes to such an extent as, for all practical purposes, to deny them. Although the followers of Weismann, Mendel and Morgan refer to themselves as Neo-Darwinians, their theory is in reality, as Lysenko maintains, a vulgarization of Darwinism. It is fundamentally anti-Darwinian.

In their application to human society, the unscientific principles of formal genetics inevitably lend themselves to the false, reactionary doctrines of inherent class, national, and racial superiority. They become a biological argument for the class stratification of capitalist society. The wealthy exploiters, we are told, have attained their positions as members of the ruling class because of their inherent biological superiority. The fact that families in the lower income groups have, on the average, a larger number of children than well-to-do families is constantly bemoaned as threatening the deterioration of the human stock. The solution for the growing problems



of insecurity, poverty, crime, and war lies not in doing away with the system of exploitation, but in a program of eugenics allegedly designed to produce a "superior breed" of human beings.

In a like manner, the Mendelian conception of heredity serves those who peddle the lie of Anglo-Saxon superiority, and in this country it is used above all to bolster the vicious, corroding lie of "white supremacy" on which the brutal oppression of the Negro people is based. It is no accident that nowhere did Mendelism find stauncher admirers than in Nazi Germany, where it was widely proclaimed as the scientific basis for the bestial racist doctrines of fascism, which found their practical application in programs of wholesale sterilization and ultimately in the crematoria of Maidanek.

#### MICHURINISM: CREATIVE DARWINISM

The Great October Socialist Revolution in Russia brought about not only an unparalleled development of industrial production, but an even more profound transformation in the sphere of agriculture. The small individual peasant farms gave way to the huge collective and state farms which today account for virtually all of the agricultural output of the Soviet Union. The primitive techniques of Tsarist days were replaced by modern mechanized farming on the most advanced level. Furthermore, in a Socialist economy

agriculture was developed on a planned, rational basis, unlike capitalist agriculture where anarchic production, based only on the prospects of immediate profits, is the universal rule.

Obviously, under the new conditions of Socialist agriculture, the old agricultural science developed under capitalism could no longer suffice. A new science was required, a Marxist-Leninist-Stalinist science which would fulfill the needs of the Soviet people. Such a science has been elaborated, and it has played no small role in the astounding economic achievements of the Soviet Union.

To begin with, the manifold problems of agronomy were approached not piecemeal, not by scientists in different fields working on individual aspects of these problems in isolation from one another, but as an integral whole. Climate, soil structure, water supply, use of fertilizers, crop rotation, methods of tillage, improvement of crop plants and livestock—all were dealt with in their interrelationship, as parts of one single complex of factors. Scientists in all branches of agronomy coordinated their labors in accordance with one comprehensive overall plan, and at the same time worked in close collaboration with the millions of Soviet collective farmers.

Outstanding in the elaboration of this approach was the noted Soviet soil scientist V. R. Williams who, following the path charted by his

famous predecessor Dokuchayev, developed the *travopolye* system of agriculture, a system which envisioned both the transformation of vast areas to provide the best possible conditions for plant growth, and the perfecting of plant forms capable of utilizing the improved conditions to maximum advantage.

Through the planting of shelter belts, the construction of irrigation ditches and ponds, and similar measures, soil conditions were radically altered. The theory of diminishing fertility of soils, advanced by bourgeois scientists, was rejected. Instead, through scientific use of fertilizers, proper methods of crop rotation, and improved cultivation techniques employing new types of farm machinery, it was demonstrated that soils could actually be made to increase in fertility from year to year.

The practical application of Williams' principles has produced results which are truly spectacular, among them the remarkable transformation of large areas of semi-arid steppeland into fertile fields. Even more spectacular is the epochal Fifteen-Year Plan which has been launched since the end of the war, whose vast scope is indicated by the recent announcement of the use of atomic energy to level mountains for the purpose of reversing the direction of two large Siberian rivers and converting an area greater in size than France from arid desert to fertile, productive land. Through such

projects drought will be banished, the climate of large regions will be radically improved, and large, stable crops will be assured in the years to come. Such are the unprecedented goals toward which Soviet science is moving.

To the Soviet agrobiologists fell the task of creating new, more productive forms of useful plants and animals, forms able to take the fullest advantage of the best possible conditions of development. In pursuing this aim, they looked for theoretical guidance, not to the sterile Mendelian theory, but to the ideas of such men as K. A. Timiryazev and I. V. Michurin. They based themselves on Michurin's aphorism: "We cannot wait for favors from Nature; we must wrest them from her." Under the leadership of T. D. Lysenko, they have succeeded over a period of years in obtaining results not only of enormous practical value, but which challenge the very foundation of the chromosome theory of heredity.

These scientists approached the question of the relationship between the organism and its surroundings from a Marxist viewpoint. "The organism," says Lysenko, "and the conditions required for its life, constitute a unity."\* It is through the constant interaction of the two that life itself is maintained. If the external conditions are altered, the development of the organism will be altered as a consequence of the

\* *The Situation in Biological Sciences*, p. 35.

changed interaction, and this must apply to the *entire* organism. No portion of it can be set aside as being immune to changes in the conditions of life, as the Mendelists seek to do.

From such a materialist approach, it follows that the organism's heredity *can* be adaptively altered by changing the environment. A *materialist* theory of the evolution of living things, as Lysenko states, "is unthinkable without recognition of the inheritance of acquired characters." This is the heart of the Michurinist approach to heredity. Its correctness has been more than amply demonstrated in practice.

The Michurinists are able to point to innumerable experiments in which, by suitable modification of the environment, one plant type or animal breed has been transformed into another. By such means Lysenko has succeeded in transforming spring varieties of wheat into winter varieties even more frost-resistant than ordinary winter forms, and also in converting winter wheat to spring wheat. Similar transformations have been accomplished with other cereal grains. In a like manner, new and better varieties of flax, cotton, and many other plants have been obtained. Through proper control of feeding, exercise and other environmental conditions, there have been produced such varieties as the famous Kostroma breed of cattle, whose milk yield equals or surpasses that of the finest breeds throughout the

world, a new type of fine-wooled Askania sheep and a number of other new and superior breeds.

Even these achievements are overshadowed by the recent announcement of Lysenko, made on the occasion of Stalin's birthday, of the transformation of winter wheat into rye, a plant belonging to a different genus. This is an accomplishment whose possibility Mendelian genetics flatly denies.

Equally striking is the phenomenon of vegetative hybridization, in which certain features of one plant are transmitted to another through grafting. This cannot possibly be explained in terms of the chromosome theory, since there is no way in which any transmission of chromosomes between the graft and the host plant can possibly take place.

The Michurinist plant and animal breeders have also found that pure lines are not, as the Mendelists assert, uniform and unchangeable. On the contrary, selection within pure lines combined with suitable control of environmental conditions has become a widely used technique for securing new varieties.

These, as well as numerous other types of results secured by the Michurinists, directly contradict the Mendelian thesis of a special hereditary substance unaffected by the conditions of life. The Michurinist trend, therefore, is not founded on a few isolated and questionable experiments, but on a whole system of

connected facts gathered and verified by thousands of investigators over a considerable period of time.

These facts, moreover, have been tested not only in small-scale laboratory experiments. Their proof is to be seen in their practical application over millions of acres in all parts of the Soviet Union.

The labors of the Soviet scientists led by such men as Williams and Lysenko have immeasurably enriched Soviet agriculture, and have contributed greatly to the welfare of the entire Soviet people and, for that matter, of all peoples. Out of this wealth of practical attainment, there has emerged a new body of theory, the Michurinist theory of heredity, which correctly reflects man's ability to transform living things in a given direction and in accordance with his needs.

The main features of the Michurinist theory, as outlined by Lysenko,\* may be summarized as follows:

1. "Heredity is the property of a living body to require definite conditions for its life and development and to respond in a definite way to various conditions." By knowing the requirements of an organism and the way it responds to external conditions, we can regulate these conditions so as to change its development, and thereby its heredity, in a given direction.

2. "The cause of changes in the nature of a living body is a change in

the type of assimilation, of the type of metabolism." That is, when the new conditions to which an organism is exposed are such as to compel a change in the character of its metabolism (the complex series of transformations of substances involved in the processes of life), then its requirements and responses—in other words, its heredity—become altered. On the other hand, superficial changes, such as mutilations, do not affect the organism's heredity.

3. Thus heredity "is inherent not only in the chromosomes but in every particle of the living body." Any portion of the body whose nature is altered by exposure to new conditions will, if it is the starting point of the next generation, produce offspring which are altered to one degree or another. In particular, the extent of hereditary transmission depends on the extent to which the nature of the reproductive cells, which are a product of the development of the whole organism, is changed.

4. As a rule, changes in heredity do not take place all at once. Rather, organisms with a plastic or "shaken" nature are produced. Such destabilization may be brought about by exposure to new external conditions, particularly in certain phases of development when one or another process is proceeding actively, by grafting, or by hybridization, especially of widely differing forms. The heredity of such destabilized organisms can then be directed along the

\* *Ibid.*, pp. 358.

desired paths by providing the appropriate conditions of development.

In contrast to Mendelism, which is basically anti-Darwinian, this Michurinist theory not only retains the heart of Darwin's theory but advances and enriches it. Darwin was content to *explain* the process of evolution. Dialectical materialism, however, is an instrument for *changing* nature and not merely explaining it. By utilizing this instrument, the Michurinists have mastered the problem of changing plants and animals, of creating new types according to plan, and hence of *controlling* the process of evolution. Michurinism therefore raises Darwinism to a new level, the level of *creative Darwinism*.

Michurinism also gives proper recognition to the important contributions of Lamarck, which were slighted by his contemporaries and later by the Mendelians. It was Lamarck who, among modern biologists, first formulated the theory of the evolution of living things, and who correctly, although in crude form, evaluated the role of the environment in the process of evolution. The Michurinists are not "neo-Lamarckians," as they are disdainfully termed by the Mendelists. Rather, while rejecting Lamarck's idealist interpretation of the response of organisms to changes in their environment, they have taken what is correct in the ideas of both Lamarck and Darwin and developed it to new levels.

#### THE GENETICS CONTROVERSY

It was inevitable that sooner or later the Michurinists should come into open conflict with the adherents of formal genetics, who were firmly entrenched in leading positions in universities and institutes throughout the U.S.S.R., and who vigorously opposed the growing Michurinist trend. For a long time, the controversy was confined almost entirely to the Soviet Union with only occasional rumblings in other countries. Within the past few years, however, especially since the session of the Lenin Academy of Agricultural Sciences in the summer of 1948, it has broken out in full fury among scientists everywhere.

Formal geneticists in the U.S.S.R. themselves exposed their position as an untenable one by the very way in which they reacted to Lysenko's challenge. An objective scientist, confronted with an array of facts contradicting his theories, would at the very least check these facts and modify or discard his own ideas if they proved to be correct. This the Mendelists have not done. Not one single experiment has been offered by them to refute the Michurinists' claim.

Instead they sought to ignore them. The universities and academies did not teach Michurinism, and the textbooks, mainly translations of American texts, never mentioned it. As late as 1947, the Mendelist, Dubinin, found it pos-

sible to write an article on recent developments in genetics in the U.S.S.R., published in the American journal *Science*, without so much as mentioning the existence of the Michurinian school.

When they could no longer ignore them, the Mendelists flatly denied the validity of Lysenko's ideas, and ridiculed them as unscientific and absurd. They then reversed themselves and contended that Lysenko was unoriginal, that his discoveries were not new but had already been known for some time. And finally, they maintained that they agreed with Michurin, and that it was Lysenko who was not a Michurinist. But throughout all this, they clung doggedly to the basic concepts of Weismannism.

Even more vicious and unprincipled has been the assault on Soviet science by Mendelian geneticists in the United States and other capitalist countries, who have descended on Lysenko with all the fury and venom at their command, and who have made the genetics controversy the occasion for an unparalleled campaign of anti-Soviet vilification.

Leading the pack is the American geneticist Herman J. Muller. In a series of articles appearing in the *Saturday Review of Literature* in December of 1948, he opened fire with a barrage of gutter language and invective unworthy of any real scientist. He refers to Lysenko as "a charlatan," "an alleged 'geneticist'," a peasant-turned-plant-breeder." Ly-

senko's writings are characterized as "the merest drivel," and the Michurinist theory as "a group of superstitions that hark back to ancient times," and as "naive and archaic mysticism." Such language is clearly not that of an objective critic but of a man who has abandoned all reason.

Muller has since been joined by a host of other Mendelian geneticists. The entire June 1949 issue of the *Journal of Heredity* is given over to an attack on Lysenko by its editor, Robert S. Cook. The leading British biologist, Julian S. Huxley, has devoted an entire book (*Heredity, East and West*) to the subject.

Huxley's book is of particular interest, since he poses as a wholly unbiased, impartial observer basing himself solely on the facts of the case. However, his viewpoint is repeatedly disclosed as that of a bourgeois scientist to whom such things as a class approach to science are utterly incomprehensible, and whose professed impartiality and objectivity actually prove to be nothing more than petty-bourgeois "neutrality" in relation to the class struggle. It is not surprising, therefore, that his conclusions are identical with those of the more hysterical Muller.

In addition, run-of-the-mill book reviewers and professional anti-Soviet scribblers have blossomed forth in droves as "authorities" on Soviet science. These lackeys of American imperialism falsely assert that the Soviet technical literature contains vir-

tually no factual accounts of experiments on which other investigators can check, although accounts of Michurin's experimental work have been available for many years. At the same time, they level the insulting charge that Lysenko's experiments were conducted without adequate controls or precautions against accidental pollination or impure strains. Muller goes so far as to say of Lysenko that "he obviously fails to comprehend . . . what a controlled experiment is." A fitting answer to such gratuitous insults has been given, among others, by the Soviet Academician I. I. Present, who said:

Academician Zhukovsky interrupts and asks: was not the effect of vegetative hybridization actually due to unforeseen pollination by another variety; has there not been an unforeseen error here, a sexual hybrid having been obtained which has been called a vegetative hybrid? This is the usual argument and objection levelled against the Michurinists by the Morganists. I make so bold as to assure you that the Michurinists are far more experienced and subtle experimenters than the Morganists, and that the possibility of such an elementary error was of course foreseen and averted.\*

The Mendelists also accuse Lysenko of going to the ridiculous extreme of denying even the existence of chromosomes. This is absolutely untrue. The Michurinists do not deny the facts which have been accumulated regarding the chromo-

somes and their relationship to certain types of hereditary differences. Lysenko himself, speaking of vegetative hybrids, states:

Does this detract from the role of the chromosomes? Not in the least. Is heredity transmitted through the chromosomes? Of course it is.

We recognize the chromosomes. We do not deny their existence. But we do not recognize the chromosome *theory* of heredity. We do not recognize Mendelism-Morganism.\*

What the Michurinists reject, therefore, is not the body of valid facts which Mendelian geneticists have unearthed regarding the chromosomes, but only their contention that these facts justify their idealist theory of a special, independent, hereditary substance. What Lysenko denies is not that heredity is transmitted through the chromosomes, but that it is transmitted *only* through the chromosomes (or any other supposed special hereditary substance); not that mutations occur, but that this is the *only* way in which new hereditary varieties can arise.

In reality, the meaning of the established facts is completely distorted by their confinement within the straitjacket of an idealist chromosome theory, pretty much as the laws of dialectics were "stood on their head" by Hegel when he sought to fit them into an idealist world outlook. Only by removing the straitjacket and dealing with the facts from a materialist viewpoint

\* *Ibid.*, p. 584.

\* *Ibid.*, p. 609.

can t  
appli  
miss  
trove  
Bu  
fuse  
Men  
ousl  
Amo  
amo  
gist,  
year  
peri  
this  
heri  
The  
biol  
in t  
clud  
vidu  
iden  
Am  
D  
cont  
how  
ciou  
con  
stra  
of  
In  
and  
atta  
ago  
the  
stud  
Me  
but  
ext

•  
see  
Biol



can they be correctly understood and applied. Whoever fails to grasp this misses the entire point of the controversy.

But the Mendelists steadfastly refuse to discard the straitjacket. The Mendelian theory has been seriously questioned by a number of American biologists in the past, among them the noted Negro biologist, Ernest E. Just. And in recent years an impressive number of experiments have been conducted in this country which demonstrated the heritability of acquired characters.\* The experimenters, moreover, are biologists of accepted standing even in the eyes of a Muller. They include, for example, such an individual as Dr. Tracy Sonneborn, president of the Genetics Society of America.

Despite the mounting evidence contrary to the Mendelian theory, however, the Mendelists cling tenaciously to their bankrupt dogma, and continue to insist that no demonstrated instance of the inheritance of an acquired character exists.

It is absolutely untrue, as Huxley and others claim, that what Lysenko attacks is the genetics of forty years ago, that geneticists no longer hold the views he ascribes to them. True, stubborn facts have compelled the Mendelists to modify their theory, but they have done so only to the extent of patching it up by tacking

on additional hypotheses. Its idealist core, however, remains intact.

Thus Muller himself states:

One of the fundamentals of the science of genetics is the demonstration of the existence in all forms of life of a specific genetic material, or material of heredity, which is separate from the other materials of the body. . . . The other materials, making up the body as we see it, have been developed as a result of the co-ordinated activity of the genes. . . . The genes themselves, however, are not changed in any directed or adaptive way by influences outside of themselves. . . . mutations occur as a result of ultramicroscopic accidents.\*

Huxley maintains that "Weismann's general conclusions about the inheritance of characters acquired by the soma still hold, although geneticists today formulate them somewhat differently. . . ."\*

In American textbooks, the Weismannist roots of Mendelism are often expressed even more bluntly. For example, one widely used textbook of biology, in a summary of the chapter on heredity, has this to say:

Germplasm is potentially immortal and is only protected and nourished by the somatoplasm. Environmental influences usually affect only the somatoplasm and do not reach the germplasm. Theoretically, then, acquired characters cannot be inherited.\*\*\*

\* H. J. Muller, "The Destruction of Science in the U.S.S.R." *Saturday Review of Literature*, December 12, 1948.

\*\* J. S. Huxley, *Heredity, East and West*, p. 15.

\*\*\* P. D. Strausbaugh and B. R. Weimer, *General Biology*, 2nd ed., 1947, p. 365.

\* For a review of some of these experiments, see B. Friedman, "Lysenko's Contribution to Biology," *Soviet Russia Today*, January 1949.

Similarly, Sturtevant and Beadle, two of Morgan's co-workers, in their textbook of genetics, state the following:

Weismann (1885-1887 and later) formulated the germplasm theory of heredity, laying emphasis on the germ line as the conservative element in heredity, the successive individuals being produced by it but not themselves modifying it. This concept, the forerunner of the distinction between phenotype and genotype, led Weismann to deny the inheritance of acquired characters, and also paved the way for the appreciation of Mendel's factorial hypotheses.\*

An almost endless series of similar quotations can be cited to show that Weismannism is as prevalent today as it was forty years ago, that *basically* Mendelism has not changed.

Among the most fantastic criticisms of Lysenko is Muller's allegation that the Michurinist theory is vitalistic, that the view that adaptive, directed modifications are inherited requires some sort of mysterious guiding or vital force. This is pure nonsense. Even Muller recognizes that adaptive modifications in organisms occur and that no "vital force" is required to explain them. Why, then, should it be required to explain the fact that such modifications may also affect the organism's heredity? Quite to the contrary, it is the Mendelian theory of a peculiar

living substance which is not affected by its surroundings that is idealistic and vitalistic.

Equally fantastic is Muller's assertion that Michurinism leads directly to the Nazi racist doctrine, since (he argues) it leads to the conclusion that a people which has been culturally backward would develop a hereditary inability to assimilate a higher level of culture. In the first place, such an attempt to transfer biological laws to the sphere of human society is entirely unwarranted and unscientific. Culture is a *social*, not a biological phenomenon, and is governed by *social*, not biological laws. Furthermore, as Muller himself would have to admit, were he not motivated by anti-Soviet bias, in the Soviet Union far more has been done in a short space of time to raise the cultural level of backward peoples than had ever before been dreamed possible. Secondly, it is no mere accident that it was Mendelism and not Michurinism which the Nazis glorified, for it is the Mendelian concept of fixed, inherent differences among human beings which especially lends itself to the claptrap of racism.

These baseless charges against Michurinism are being flung about in an atmosphere of the most intense anti-Soviet hysteria in the cold war on the biological front.

Once more we are treated to tales of those miraculous Soviet "liquidations" in which, years afterward, the "liquidated" individuals turn up

\* A. H. Sturtevant and G. W. Beadle, *An Introduction to Genetics*, 1939, p. 359.

very much alive and vocal. Once more we are told that no freedom of expression or scientific thought exists in the U.S.S.R. Muller gives voice to the outright lie that "from 1936 on, Soviet geneticists of all ranks have lived a life of terror . . ." and that "it has been a long time since the teaching of genetics was permitted in the U.S.S.R. . . ."\* This, in the face of the flood of publications by Soviet Mendelists which continues even to this day, and in the face of the fact that up to 1948 the teaching of Mendelism held almost exclusive sway in Soviet institutions of learning!

The truth is that this controversy was more open, more accessible to the public, and more widely participated in than any previous scientific debate in all of history. The intense interest of the Soviet public in the 1948 discussion is testified to by *Pravda's* devotion of over half its space for more than a week to verbatim accounts of the speeches.

In fact, it is this very interest on the part of the average Soviet citizen which the Mendelians most bitterly denounce. According to their ivory-tower viewpoint only scientists themselves are qualified or have any right to pass judgment on the merits of a scientific theory. They are particularly outraged at the idea of the Communist Party of the U.S.S.R. taking sides in a scientific controversy.

What these bourgeois geneticists fail to recognize is that in the Soviet Union science is the property of the whole people, who consider science to be in their service, and reserve the right to pass judgment on the contribution of scientists to the welfare of Soviet society. Certainly the Communist Party, as the vanguard organization of the people, has a vital interest in such matters, and so has the Soviet Government, since they involve the all-important question of how the nation's funds and energies shall best be utilized in the economic interests of the people. The genetics controversy is therefore not an academic discussion for the edification of a handful of the elite, but a matter of enormous practical importance to all Soviet citizens.

The charge that in the Soviet Union scientific questions are decided on the basis of political considerations comes with exceedingly bad grace from scientists who look on complacently when a teacher in this country is discharged for merely suggesting that Lysenko's ideas should be taken seriously, and who show comparatively little concern over the fact that, as Aragon puts it, "scientists desert the laboratories in order not to be suspected of treason."\* If there is any country where political considerations override scientific truth and where science is made to serve the reactionary interests of a decadent ruling class, it is the United

\* H. J. Muller, "The Destruction of Science in the U.S.S.R.," *Saturday Review of Literature*, December 4, 1948.

\* Louis Aragon, "Storm Over Lysenko," *Masses & Mainstream*, February, 1949.

States and not the Soviet Union.

Among those biologists outside the U.S.S.R. who hold a Marxist point of view, the reactions to the controversy have been varied, and even here a considerable amount of confusion exists. Such confusion stems in part from the fact that these biologists have been trained to accept the Mendelian theory without question and that little material on Lysenko's work has been readily accessible until very recently. Hence there has been a tendency on the part of some, while accepting Lysenko's findings as valid, to tread with extreme caution, and to come to the defense of Mendelism, which they felt was being unjustly challenged. Such a tendency, in fact, was characteristic of this writer's own initial reactions.

This confusion has led some Marxist biologists down the false trail of looking for a middle road, for a reconciliation of the two trends, a line which has been adapted by one section of the Soviet Mendelists. B. M. Zavadovsky, a leading representative of this group, proposes what he claims is a third alternative to both Mendelism and Michurinism. With the utmost impartiality, he attacks both trends "as being two distortions of Darwin's real theory."\* What he offers as "Darwin's real theory," however, turns out to be nothing more than a defense of Mendelism and an attempt to gloss over

the fundamental differences between it and the Michurinist theory.

Any such attempt is inevitably doomed to failure, for there can be no reconciliation between materialism and idealism. To compromise with idealism leads only to idealism. Zavadovsky's supposed third alternative is in reality nothing more than the illusory notion of the "third force," the stock in trade of the Social-Democratic lackeys of imperialism who use it to confuse and split the working class and who, while they pretend to fulminate with equal vehemence against both Communism and imperialist reaction, in practice faithfully carry out every wish of their imperialist masters.

Nevertheless, a number of leading scientists mistakenly, even though sincerely, advocate a so-called middle ground in the controversy. Outstanding among them is the eminent British biologist and Marxist J. B. S. Haldane.\* While Haldane recognizes the value of the contributions made by the Michurinists, he also argues that their attacks on Mendelism are largely unjustified and that the Mendelian geneticists are being attacked for views which they do not actually hold. His defense of Mendelian genetics, however, is based mainly on some rather serious misunderstandings.

Haldane regards Mendel's idealism as lying in his *formulation* of his

\* *The Situation in Biological Science*, p. 338.

\* J. B. S. Haldane, "In Defense of Genetics," *The Modern Quarterly*, Summer, 1949.

theory. "Mendel," he says, "used idealistic terminology." Here he is referring to Mendel's concept of unit characters, each transmitted by a particular gene or group of genes. Since geneticists have discarded this idea, he concludes that they have thereby discarded the idealist aspect of Mendel's theory.

But the point is that it is not merely Mendel's language which is idealistic, but the very theory of the existence of a special hereditary substance independent of the conditions of life of the organism. And this, as we have already shown, the Mendelists have by no means discarded.

Haldane argues further that Mendelists do not regard the genes or chromosomes as the only structures concerned in heredity. It is true, of course, that they maintain that other special hereditary substances exist besides the chromosomes. However, this in no way alters the idealist character of the Mendelian theory. What Lysenko contends (and what the Mendelists in general refuse to accept) is that the material basis of heredity is the *entire organism*, and that this is the only conceivable materialist approach to the question.

The same objection can be raised to Haldane's assertion that Mendelian geneticists do not believe in immutability, since they recognize the existence of mutation. But Lysenko, as we have already seen, does not deny that mutations occur. What he claims is that this is not the only way in which heredity can be changed, that

directed, adaptive changes in response to new environmental conditions can also occur. Haldane himself accepts the idea that acquired characters can be inherited, but it is not true, as he implies, that Mendelian geneticists on the whole accept it.

It is evident that Haldane's views differ in a number of important respects from those of most Mendelists. It is equally evident that he is defending genetics from attacks on grounds that are non-existent. He does so because he does not see clearly just where the idealism in the Mendelian theory lies and consequently does not fully understand in what respects it is incompatible with the materialist Michurin theory.

A similar confusion is exhibited by Bernhard J. Stern in this country. Stern maintains that Lysenko's "critical analysis of genetic theory represents an attack on positions long since abandoned by the vanguard of geneticists" and that "the gap between Lysenko and [present-day] geneticists does not appear to be absolute."\* He presents numerous quotations intended to show that Mendelists today disagree with Weismann, and that what Lysenko is criticizing is in reality only oversimplified or outdated views expressed in certain American textbooks. The "vanguard of geneticists," Stern contends, does recognize the role of environment and the existence of inheritance controlled by factors

\* Bernhard J. Stern, "Genetics Teaching and Lysenko," *Science & Society*, Spring 1949, p. 149.

other than the chromosomes.

But the very quotations he offers only serve to show that the differences between modern Mendelian genetics and that of forty years ago, though considerable, are not basic. The inescapable fact is that, even though they reject the crudities of Weismann's original theories, not only the authors of textbooks but *leading Mendelists themselves* fully accept Weismann's *basic* thesis of a separate, independent hereditary substance. They hold the same idealist view which Weismann advanced, and on this point the gap between them and Lysenko is absolute and irreconcilable. It is exactly this that Stern fails to see. By attempting to "bridge" the gap, he contributes to disarming us in the struggle against bourgeois ideas in the sphere of biology.

#### SOME CONCLUSIONS

The genetics controversy has brought into sharp focus the fact that no phase of human activity is isolated from the social order in which it takes place. In capitalist society, bourgeois ideology penetrates into every field, no matter how remote from the class struggle it may seem to be.

It is the methodology and content

of bourgeois science which the Soviet formal geneticists have sought to perpetuate and against which the Michurinists under the leadership of Lysenko have been compelled to take up arms.

Our vigilance in the fight against bourgeois ideology on *every* front can never be relaxed. It is a struggle in which, on the biological front as on every other, there can be no compromise or reconciliation between the interests of the capitalist class and those of the working class.

In relation to the genetics controversy, Marxists generally and Marxist biologists particularly have a special responsibility—the responsibility of studying and mastering the theoretical questions involved and of waging a relentless, uncompromising fight for a Marxist-Leninist, materialist approach to the science of heredity.

There is no doubt that in the end Michurinism, as the true science of heredity, will win out. It will do so, however, not automatically, not because the supposed classless objectivity of scientists will lead them to accept it, but only through struggle. In the long run, it will emerge victorious only as the working class emerges victorious in its struggle to abolish capitalism and achieve a Socialist society.

# For a United-Front Policy Among the Jewish People—Sharpen the Struggle Against Bourgeois Nationalism\*

By John Williamson

THE NATIONAL COMMITTEE, with the active participation of our General Secretary, Comrade Dennis, spent an entire day discussing the report of the subcommittee that has been meeting with you these last six weeks. You will recall that at our very first meeting I emphasized that the National Committee was interested in four aspects of our work among the Jewish masses.

1. How effectively the policies and tactics of the National Committee are being carried out in this field by the responsible Party organizations and individual comrades, and how they are being fought for among the Jewish masses;

2. How the fight for our Marxist-Leninist ideology, and the exposure and defeat of poisonous bourgeois ideology, are progressing;

3. Why there is an unsatisfactory situation in the relations among our leading comrades in Jewish work, and how it can be speedily liquidated;

4. Whether the organizational set-

up in the field of Jewish work is in accord with the proper functioning of the Party.

Let me immediately emphasize that the National Committee recognizes its own responsibility for not carrying through this examination of our work in the Jewish field earlier. We also feel that the work among the Jewish people has not been sufficiently the concern of all the Party committees heretofore.

All the leading comrades in Jewish work, including those that have participated in our meetings, have expressed full support of the Party line of exposure and struggle against American imperialism and its policies of world domination, war and fascist reaction; of our line for organizing a broad united-front of the American people for peace, against fascism, for curbing the trusts, and for achieving American-Soviet friendship. All who have participated in the discussions also expressed agreement in general terms with our emphasis on the need fully to grasp and boldly to apply the tactic of united labor and peo-

\* A Report, slightly abridged, delivered on May 3, 1950, in behalf of the National Committee, at a conference of leading comrades engaged in activity among the Jewish people.



ple's action on all issues of vital concern to the people.

The National Committee takes note of the many activities that have been developed under the leadership of our Party in the field of work among the Jewish people, of the continued popular support to the *Morning Freiheit* and its generally correct line, of the issuance of the magazine *Jewish Life* in English, of the devotion to the Party of the comrades concerned. Like our entire Party, the comrades in the Jewish field have had to face new and complex problems in the midst of increased reaction in our country. Nevertheless, it is precisely in this period that we expect the entire Party, in a bold and responsible manner, to search out and correct all its weaknesses and shortcomings, in order to strengthen the Party's ties with the workers and more effectively to lead them in struggle against the war-mad adventurers of Wall Street and Washington. It is in this spirit that we estimate and draw conclusions from your work.

#### WEAKNESSES IN OUR IDEOLOGICAL WORK

Now for some conclusions concerning general policies and mass work:

1. In our opinion, the mobilization of the Jewish masses in the fight for peace is not adequate, and the organization and building of a broad united-front movement for peace among the Jewish people and their

organizations is completely absent. The building of such a united peace movement among the Jewish masses, and the involving of the Jewish workers and people's organizations in the general peace camp, remain *the* central tasks of our Party in the Jewish field. Regardless of the specific forms of organizing the Jewish people in the struggle for peace, which should be worked out by the proper Party bodies, it is clear that the prohibition of the atom bomb must be the central issue. Support should immediately be given to all broad non-Party movements for peace and their activities, especially to the various petition drives. It is particularly important to enlist broad support by the American Jewish people for the world peace pledge adopted at Stockholm.

2. While there are some isolated experiences of united-front activity against anti-Semitism, in defense of democratic rights and against fascism, these issues, and in the first place, the question of peace, remain the issues around which the broadest type of united-front movements of struggle can and should be built, by involving the majority of the Jewish workers and people and the branches and locals of their organizations. Consideration should be given to the task of developing, as part of the struggle for peace, a sweeping movement of protest against the American government's policy of resurrecting the Nazi cartels and of restoring leading

Nazis to power in Germany.

In developing these united-front movements of struggle, we shall never be satisfied with the involvement merely of top leaders. While organizational forms will vary, it is always decisive to activate the rank-and-file masses. While exposing the demagogic policies of the top leaders of such organizations as the Americans for Democratic Action and the Liberal Party (in New York), it is necessary to develop forms of joint activity and struggle embracing the rank and file of these organizations. As regards the more progressive groupings within the Zionist fold in America, or for that matter any other mass people's organizations, it is correct for our Party or Left-influenced organizations to try to win them to united-front activities, providing such activities are always based on the well-established Party policy regarding united fronts.

3. It must be recorded that the only substantial united-front experience within a mass organization has been in the American Jewish Congress. However, a general weakness here was the placing of main emphasis on united front at the top without an accompanying fight for a broad united front of struggle involving the membership and local branches. Time did not permit us to gather all the facts to determine whether such progressive mass organizations as the Jewish People's Fraternal Order and the American-Jewish Labor Council could have avoided expulsion from the A.J.C.,

or to form an opinion as to the merits of the handling of the Klein Bill\* inside the A.J.C. Still, it is clear to us that these organizations did not accompany and reinforce their fight in top A.J.C. councils with a great rank-and-file campaign from below. Nevertheless, the united-front experiences in A.J.C. between progressives and other forces should be further built upon, extended and strengthened everywhere. We reject as harmful any ideas against developing united-front activities with the membership of any bourgeois-led mass organization.

We also favor progressive-led Jewish organizations fighting to participate in local Jewish Community Councils on the basis of democratic rights and freedom of action in policy and activities outside the Councils.

4. Our comrades do not possess a grasp of the Party tactic of united labor action among the Jewish workers. Nor is there clarity on the part of everyone, even in these meetings, of the leading role of the workers in the struggle for united action of the progressive sections of the Jewish people on issues of specific concern to them as Jews. This contributes to our great weakness in combatting the influence of Social-Democracy among the Jewish workers.

It is imperative, in addition to car-

\* The Klein Bill is a measure introduced in Congress which calls for outlawing libel against any group on the grounds of nationality, race, color, or religion. An inconsistency of this bill is its "liberal" stipulation that an offender "honestly" believing in what he says is to be considered innocent.

rying through Party policy on all trade-union questions,

(a) that Jewish comrades in the trade unions shall find effective means to influence Left-led unions to initiate and organize united-front actions of Jewish workers in such trade unions as the International Ladies Garment Workers Union, the Amalgamated Clothing Workers, the millinery workers, butchers, etc.; and

(b) that Jewish comrades who are leaders in the trade unions shall identify themselves with Jewish life and fight for policies that affect the interests of the Jewish workers and people as a whole; participation in general Jewish activities must not be left to the Dubinskys, Potofskys, and Zaritskys, with their pro-imperialist, pro-war activities.

5. It is our judgment that greater efforts should be made to work among the English-speaking Jews, particularly workers. The bourgeoisie concentrates special attention on these sections for the purpose of influencing the entire Jewish people with chauvinist nationalism and jingoism and winning their support for imperialist policies. Without neglecting the Yiddish-speaking population, the beginnings of work among the English-speaking Jews made with the publication of *Jewish Life* should be extended, and organized activities initiated among them.

6. In the course of our meetings, there has been considerable discus-

sion concerning three documents. I now wish to express the position of the National Committee concerning them:

(a) The November 1946 Resolution on Jewish Work, adopted by the National Groups Commission of the National Committee,\* was basically sound, gave correct perspectives and correctly outlined our immediate tasks. It is only unfortunate that we have not fulfilled many of the tasks then adopted. However, the National Committee also recognizes that, while the Resolution corrected some of the main expressions of bourgeois nationalism that had particularly shown themselves during the period of Browder revisionism, there nevertheless remained remnants of bourgeois-nationalist influence. These were expressed mainly in the use of the slogan: "For a Jewish National Homeland." While it is true that in the Resolution this slogan was used in relation to "the realization of the national rights of the Jewish Yishuv" (the Jewish community in Palestine), its constant repetition, together with the formulation that: "This old, widespread and popular slogan among the Jewish people has been appropriated by the Zionists," gives the impression that, in its entirety as a concept, it could be successfully separated from the reactionary Zionist propaganda of a world Jewish nation, etc.

(b) The article by Ilya Ehrenburg,

\* "Communist Work Among the American Jewish Masses," *Political Affairs*, November 1946, p. 1025 ff.

which discussed such issues as Zionism and the Socialist solution of the Jewish question, was, as the National Committee expressed itself at the time of its publication, of major importance. All the leading comrades in Jewish work should be criticized for allowing five months to pass without discussing it. The statement of the Morning Freiheit Association Executive correctly supported the ideas of the article and criticized Comrade Katz. Nevertheless, the form in which this article was treated was wrong. Further, we cannot be satisfied with the type of self-criticism that was there engaged in.

(c) The article by Comrade Bittelman in the January 1950 issue of *Political Affairs* on Jerusalem and the U.N. decision ("Jerusalem, National Independence and Peace") was basically sound, although it still did not fully incorporate all the tactical emphases of the National Committee discussions. That article by Comrade Bittelman appeared after two discussions by the National Committee. Prior to that, in the discussions and writing of leading Jewish comrades there were two wrong approaches:

1. Implied approval of the assertion of the Ben Gurion government—that Jerusalem could never be severed from Israel—as representing the sentiment and interests of the Jewish people; and, further, the continued failure to express any concern for the Arab toilers and a tendency to lump all Arabs with Abdullah.

2. There was also a tendency to support the idea of "internationalization of Jerusalem" without any qualifications.

In relation to this, we must ask: What about the most recent U.N. developments regarding Jerusalem, specifically, the announcement of the Soviet delegate of the withdrawal of Soviet support to the U.N. resolution for the internationalization of Jerusalem? Some interpret this to mean that the Soviet Union is now ready to support the claim of the Ben Gurion government to Jerusalem; others simply write that the Soviet Union opposes the internationalization of Jerusalem; still others maintain that the Soviet Union has not changed its position at all regarding the relationship of Jerusalem to Israel.

We must warn against all of these tendencies to interpret events according to one's own fancy. Let us stick to the facts. The Soviet Union said it was withdrawing support of the U.N. resolution for the internationalization of Jerusalem because "it does not satisfy the Arab or Jewish population of either Jerusalem or Palestine as a whole." What is clear is that the old proposals for solving this problem are out and that new ones can be expected.

The main approach and policy of the Soviet Union on the Jerusalem question has been predicated on three basic and publicly-declared objectives, which are in accord with its role as the bulwark of the camp

of peace and democracy. These objectives are:

1. To further the interests of the Jewish and Arab peoples in Palestine;

2. To support the independence of Israel as a state;

3. To oppose the efforts and schemes of Anglo-American imperialism designed to transform Israel, Jerusalem and all of the Near East into bases of war preparations.

We should firmly adhere to these publicly-declared facts, popularize them and show how they correspond to the peace interests of the Jewish people in the United States.

We should also take note of certain new developments in Palestine. These include: the increased penetration of U.S. capital investments in Israel; the ever-more open role of the Ben Gurion government of Israel as a tool of American imperialism; the development of discontent among the Jewish and Arab populations in Israel, due to the worsened economic conditions and attacks on their democratic rights; and the annexation of the Arab part of Palestine by Transjordan—which means placing it under direct British control. Further, we must note the anti-imperialist stirrings among the Arabs, as well as the developing dissensions within the Arab League, which always was and is a British tool. These are the new developments that need watching.

In this connection, it is well to bear in mind that the recent Soviet

note on Jerusalem speaks, not only of Jews, but of Jews and Arabs. It also deals with Palestine as a whole, of which Israel is only a part. In our work, however, we tend too often to ignore the masses of poor Arabs and do not counteract an impermissible chauvinist attitude on the part of many Jews in Israel toward the Arab people.

Instead of speculation as to how to interpret the Soviet Union's moves in the U.N., let us popularize the basic policies of the Soviet Union in behalf of the national independence of Israel and for the maintenance of world peace, both of which are threatened by U.S. imperialism. The tasks on which we should concentrate are:

1. exposing the machinations of U.S.-British imperialism to use Israel, Jerusalem, Transjordan as war bases;

2. exposing the Ben Gurion government's policies of surrender to U.S. imperialism, which can only mean aiding Wall Street's drive to unleash a Third World War;

3. developing a broad movement for peace among the Jewish people in the United States that will link up with the promotion of their interests, while learning how to connect such a peace movement among the Jewish masses with defense of the national interests of the people of Israel;

4. developing a mass campaign demanding that the American government condemn the annexation of

the Arab part of Palestine and refuse to recognize it diplomatically. Simultaneously, we should demand an end to the shameful situation in which the Chinese people are denied representation in the U.N.—a situation in which, naturally, the Soviet Union will not participate in the various U.N. commissions, so long as the Chiang Kai-shek agents are recognized as spokesmen for China. Ousting the Kuomintang bandits will enable the Soviet Union to play its full role in the U.N. also in finding a solution to the Jerusalem problem—a solution that will prevent the betrayal of Israel by U.S. imperialism.

#### THE STRUGGLE AGAINST BOURGEOIS NATIONALISM

The National Committee is of the opinion that one of the most serious tasks confronting our Jewish comrades is to organize a more effective and consistent campaign against all expressions of bourgeois ideology that are penetrating the Jewish masses. It is clear that the chauvinist nationalism and jingoism of American imperialism are not without their influence on certain strata of the Jewish people, and one must never forget that Jews are also to be found among monopoly capitalists and in the capitalist state machinery.

The main ideological danger among the Jewish people that must be exposed and fought against is the mounting influence of pernicious

bourgeois nationalism. We cannot close our eyes to the fact that the cannibalistic fascist-Hitler policy of extermination of the Jewish people stimulated the growth of bourgeois-nationalist influences. These influences were further accentuated by the establishment of Israel as a state. Today, bourgeois nationalism is primarily a pro-war instrument of American imperialist policy. It is being used to divert the Jewish people from their true interests, from taking their rightful place as an integral part of the camp of peace and democracy.

This bourgeois-nationalist influence on broad sections of the Jewish people penetrates into progressive and Left circles and brings its pressure to bear among some comrades in the Party. Today, many comrades in mass organizations, as well as some on the *Morning Freiheit* staff, tend to capitulate to this pressure of bourgeois nationalism and do not fight it effectively. This was particularly seen at the time of the U.N. decision on Jerusalem; but it is generally prevalent. The penetration of bourgeois nationalism is seen in the J.P.F.O. children's schools, in the attitude to the United Jewish Appeal, etc. It is necessary that the incoming Commission on Jewish work prepare a thorough discussion with our trade-union comrades to work out a sound and effective policy toward influencing the trade unions to establish a proper relationship with all the Jewish activities

and to fund-raising organizations.

As Communists, we must always recognize moods that influence masses and then work out effective, non-sectarian tactics to combat them. But, while avoiding sectarianism, Communists must under no circumstances allow themselves to be influenced by bourgeois nationalism. Succumbing to such influence is impermissible and must be fought against—but it has not always been fought against effectively or consistently by many comrades in mass organizations and on the *Morning Freiheit* staff.

It must be made clear that the waging of a consistent struggle against bourgeois nationalism has nothing in common with any ideas of neglecting to work in the main mass organizations, which are led by bourgeois nationalists. Our weakness today is that we are not associated closely enough with the members of the major mass organizations of the Jewish people. We will effectively combat the influence of bourgeois nationalism to the extent that we combine our propaganda work with a more effective involvement of the Jewish people in mass struggles on issues affecting them.

We must also recognize that bourgeois nationalism serves today as one of the main instruments for the spread of anti-Soviet slanders among the Jewish people. These slanders must be exposed much more effectively and systematically. We all know that over the years the Socialist

Soviet Union, with the complete abolition of anti-Semitism and its firm adherence to a policy of guaranteeing full equality for the Jewish people within its borders, full development of Jewish culture, possibility of Soviet Jews to build their own Socialist Jewish state in Birobidjan—has inspired increasing numbers of Jews everywhere, including those in our country.

There has been no change in the Soviet Union's Leninist policy on the national question. On the contrary, that policy remains one of the main cornerstones of the Socialist State. In this connection it should be clear that the guarantee of full equality allows unrestricted freedom and provides unstinted aid to all nationalities to preserve and develop their full cultural heritage, national in form and Socialist in content. At the same time, the Socialist State removes all possible barriers to full voluntary integration of all peoples and groups, who so desire, with the Socialist nations in which they reside. It is clear that such Socialist integration has nothing in common with bourgeois assimilation, which is coercive and is based on domination.

The Socialist solution of the Jewish question runs counter to the program of imperialism, which continues to use the Jew as a scapegoat in carrying through its reactionary, pro-fascist policies. It runs counter to the widespread bourgeois nationalist ideas of a "world Jewish nation," of the "oneness" of Jews



internationally irrespective of the country of which they are a part, of a distinct "world Jewish culture," etc.—ideas that still have strong roots among sections of the Jewish people. All the reactionaries in the Jewish field, and in the first place the Zionist and Social-Democratic leaders, have started a new campaign of attack on the Soviet Union and its Socialist solution of the Jewish question. As they have repeatedly done over the years, they shamelessly lie about and misrepresent what is happening. Despite the well-known facts about the magnificent record of the U.S.S.R. in eradicating anti-Semitism in the land which was once marked by hideous pogroms, they concoct fantastic tales about a "rebirth of anti-Semitism" in the Soviet Union. And, reflecting their consciousness of the enormity of that lie, they go to the extent of creating a mystical "Jewish soul," which they claim is now being destroyed in the Soviet Union.

We must combat and expose this reactionary campaign, which is part and parcel of the anti-Soviet war drive of American imperialism. Instead of being on the defensive, as some of our own writers appear to be, we must take the offensive.

We must popularize and explain the Socialist achievement in the Soviet Union of eliminating all forms of social oppression—including national oppression and anti-Semitism. Many comrades in Jewish work and in the *Morning Freiheit* have demon-

strated great ideological weakness on this question and some have themselves fallen victim to the ravings of the bourgeoisie about "what happened to the Soviet Jewish writers?" Such comrades must be sharply criticized. It is the opinion of the National Committee that the comrades in the *Morning Freiheit* should work out a series of projects for self-correction to guarantee a systematic ideological campaign in the *Morning Freiheit* popularizing the Soviet Union, its tremendous achievements in the Socialist solution of the Jewish question.

While developing this educational campaign, we must make it clear that agreement on the Soviet Union's Socialist solution of the Jewish question is not a prerequisite for any group of Jewish workers or others taking joint action with us on the burning issues confronting the Jewish people here in the United States. In fact, because we live in capitalist America, we must emphasize the fight for peace and against fascist reaction, as it relates to the Jewish masses in the U.S.A. and to Israel as a state. Regardless of differences on other questions, we should develop a broad protest campaign against the restoration of the Nazis to posts of government in Germany and demand real denazification in Germany; we must especially develop in our country the broadest struggle against anti-Semitism in all its manifestations.

### SECTARIANISM: MAIN BARRIER TO JEWISH WORKING MASSES

Traditionally, Social-Democracy has been and is a main instrument of the imperialist bourgeoisie utilized among the Jewish workers and trade unionists to confuse, divide and mislead. Today, the Dubinsky-*Forward* Social-Democratic group are the most vicious anti-Soviet and pro-imperialist forces among the Jewish workers. There is a growing collaboration between these Social-Democratic labor leaders and the various bourgeois-nationalist organizations, such as the Zionists.

The defeat and isolation of the reactionary Jewish Social-Democrats among the workers and in the trade unions is an indispensable task in making it possible for the Jewish workers to lead the Jewish people in struggle. While effective propaganda and agitation are a necessary part of this task, the decisive thing is to develop joint struggles of Jewish workers, irrespective of what trade unions they belong to, on the burning issues of the day.

While Left-sectarian approaches, such as the incorrect identification of the mass of the rank and file with the reactionary leaders are the main barrier between us and the mass of the workers in the Social-Democratic-led trade unions, the forces we have in such unions many times combine this sectarianism with Right-opportunist tendencies. Our

forces tend to see only the highly skilled and best-paid workers in the Social-Democratic-led needle trades unions and often neglect to defend the lowest-paid and unskilled workers. They are not in the forefront in organizing unorganized shops; they are not the consistent champions of the unity of Jewish and non-Jewish workers in the industry. They do not sufficiently promote the election of non-Jews to posts of union leadership.

It is our opinion that the Communists in the American Jewish Labor Council should recognize that this organization functions in a narrow way and confines its work almost exclusively to the members of progressive-led trade unions. To be of real service to the Jewish workers, the Council should constantly develop united actions of the Jewish members of all trade unions, irrespective of their leadership.

### NEGRO-JEWISH UNITY

As part of the fight to establish a broad people's camp of peace and anti-fascism, a major feature of which will be the struggle against all discrimination, there is need of closer unity of the Negro people and the Jewish workers. This process of developing Negro-Jewish unity is gaining momentum and had one of its finest manifestations in the Battle of Peekskill. To cement the common bond, of a most elementary but basic character, the Communists and

all pr  
joint s  
of N  
all oth

How  
in thi  
dissim  
ples. T  
in the  
rected  
weapo  
gro pe  
from  
develop

movem  
and fu  
tical ec  
tion of  
the Bl  
within  
tion th  
special  
against  
perialis  
chauvin  
among  
finds e  
and L  
membe

Dur  
tional C  
an inte  
chauvin  
tion of  
in our  
far fro  
gress h  
that ne  
atmosph  
mass s

all progressives must advance the joint struggle against discrimination of Negroes and Jews, in unity with all other democratic forces.

However, we must also be clear in this common struggle as to the dissimilarities between the two peoples. The Jews are a national group in the U.S.A., against whom is directed specifically the ruling-class weapon of anti-Semitism. The Negro people, on the other hand, suffer from national oppression and are developing a national-liberation movement, not only for equal rights and full economic, social and political equality, but for the full realization of their right to nationhood in the Black Belt of the South. It is within the framework of this distinction that we must also estimate the special significance of the struggle against white chauvinism. This imperialist ruling-class poison of white chauvinism has penetrated also among the Jewish people and even finds expression in their progressive and Left circles and among some members of the Party itself.

During recent months our National Committee has again launched an intensive struggle against white chauvinism and against the penetration of its influences and tendencies in our ranks. While this struggle is far from complete, substantial progress has been made, with the result that not only is there a healthier atmosphere in the Party, but the mass struggle for Negro rights has

been raised to a level unparalleled in many years.

The trade unions have been one of the fronts of this struggle against white-chauvinist tendencies and actions on the part of some comrades. The fight against white-chauvinist tendencies even had to extend to some of the members of the Fur Workers' Union, which generally had demonstrated an appreciation of the fight for full equality of the Negro people and had a good record in organizing Negro workers in the leather industry as well as made some beginnings in breaking down the lily-white character of the fur manufacturing industry. I am happy to report that with the full co-operation of Comrades Gold and Potash, we are making headway.

While important progress has been made on this question in the trade-union movement, it is this sector which still represents, *relatively*, one of the weaker fields in the struggle for Negro rights. In spite of progress made in general among the various unions, we find a serious lack of understanding, and in a number of cases a firm resistance, to the full acceptance of a proper understanding of the national character of the Negro question.

None of us should underestimate the importance of the struggle for equal wages and equal working conditions for the Negro workers. This fight, which is as yet far from concluded, represents one of the impor-

tant advances in the understanding of the Negro question by the trade-union movement in the last few years. However, while this represents a significant maturing in understanding the role of the Negro workers as part of the working class, we must quickly point out that an equal wage alone does not mean equality for the Negro workers. Equality for Negro workers and Negro trade-union leaders can only be achieved through united mass struggle based on the understanding of the Negro question as a national question. Oppression and discrimination against the Negro workers takes place 24 hours a day. It affects the Negro workers in relation to where they can sleep, where they can eat. It results in a two-price system for the Negro people in Harlem, for instance, where they are forced to buy inferior goods at higher prices. National oppression is the basis of Jim-Crow oppression and discrimination; equal pay, by itself, cannot bring equal benefits to the Negro workers once they leave the shop.

Equality can only be won to the degree that the struggle on all fronts against every manifestation of national oppression is based upon the understanding precisely of the *national* character of that oppression. Only in the process of such struggle can the Negro trade-union leaders and the Negro workers begin to advance to positions of equality in struggle side by side with their white

union brothers.

In Jewish organizations in whose leadership Communists participate, even among some of our own comrades, there is a lack of sensitivity to expressions of white chauvinism.

A number of leading Jewish comrades make it a habit to go to Miami Beach for vacations. This should be a matter, not for Party decision, but for Party understanding. I hardly deem it necessary to muster all the arguments as to why it is wrong to go to Miami Beach. Let me simply state a few facts and ask one question. In Miami Beach, there is not just the stinking Jim-Crow system that covers the entire South. In that city a Negro cannot be in the city limits without a pass after 6 P.M., and no Negro is allowed to sleep overnight in the city. How comfortable can a white Communist feel in such an atmosphere?

Someone may ask: Will staying away remove the racist label that is on that city? Of course not. The fight to remove that label has to be made by the white and Negro people of the South with the full assistance of a nation-wide struggle. But look at this through different glasses. There are hotels and resorts in different parts of the country with the sign "restricted" or "Christians Only." What would you think of your fellow-Communist who is not Jewish going to one of these anti-Semitic vacation places? I have enough confidence in you that to ask the question is to answer it.

It is comrade  
urns of  
you co  
speeches  
develop  
against  
chauvini  
ranks of  
organiza  
Another  
the und  
role of t  
Jewish p  
and an  
this pro  
Without  
ing lea  
moveme  
ple, this  
main in  
never r  
of the J  
it will b  
imperial  
Today  
moveme  
Freiheit  
orientati  
tively f  
industri  
struggle  
given a  
national C  
entire P  
comrade  
build th  
among  
unions  
of fight

It is necessary that our Jewish comrades everywhere, that the columns of the *Morning Freiheit*, that you comrades in your articles, speeches and above all in activities—develop a really intensified campaign against every manifestation of white chauvinism in our ranks and in the ranks of the Jewish people and their organizations.

Another ideological weakness is the underestimation of the leading role of the working class among the Jewish people in all these struggles and an approach that tries to answer this problem in terms of arithmetic. Without the Jewish workers assuming leadership of the democratic movements among the Jewish people, this movement will always remain in a vacillating position; it will never really advance the interests of the Jewish people as a whole and it will be an easy prey for American imperialism.

Today the entire Left Jewish movement, including the *Morning Freiheit*, has a weak working-class orientation. Because there are relatively few Jewish workers in some industries, the developments and struggles in such industries are not given adequate coverage. The National Committee places before the entire Party, and not just the Jewish comrades, the task of fighting to build the main base of the Party among the workers, their trade unions and other mass organizations, of fighting there for united action.

## IMMEDIATE TASKS

This brings me to the fundamental question: What is demanded of our Party if it is to improve its fight to influence the Jewish masses? I would summarize the answer as follows:

First: The accomplishment of this task is the responsibility of the entire Party, and not just of the comrades on the *Morning Freiheit* and in Party Jewish Commissions;

Second: There must be a deeper understanding of the general line of the Party and especially a better ability to apply concretely the line of the National Committee in each situation. The weakest phase of our work in the Jewish field is the failure to apply boldly the tactic of the united front of struggle.

Third: We must struggle vigorously and *unitedly* against all deviations. They are all harmful to the development of our work. In the opinion of the National Committee there can be no doubt that today the main danger in the Jewish field is bourgeois nationalism in particular and Right opportunism in general. Not to see that is to be blind to what is happening around us and in our very midst. The National Committee emphasizes with equal force that the struggle against bourgeois nationalism is seriously impeded by many sectarian attitudes and practices, especially in our failure to develop a bold united-front approach. Many comrades, irrespective

of their position on some of the present controversial questions, suffer from ingrown habits of "Left" sectarianism. This "Left" sectarianism must also be vigorously combatted with all means at our disposal.

Fourth: We must orientate our comrades to be active among the masses and main organizations of the Jewish workers and people and not to isolate themselves or leave the bulk of the people to the influence of reactionary leadership.

Fifth: Most important of all, the National Committee demands a liquidation of the present situation of disunity among our leading Party cadres in Jewish work. In our opinion this is a situation which has all the earmarks of a factional situation, from which none of the leading comrades is absolved.

This situation is a sign of weakness in our Party work. It impedes the application of Party policy and threatens the unity and life of our Party. It opens up the Party to the work and penetration of the enemy. We cannot gloss over it lightly. We cannot grapple effectively with the big political and ideological problems discussed previously without quickly liquidating this situation, with its factional characteristics, without restoring complete unity in our ranks.

In case there is any doubt about the gravity of this situation, let us look at some of the manifestations:

1. While there are no organized groups with meetings, there are clearly two groupings, with each

group denouncing each other. The comrades in each group see only what is wrong with the other, but seldom, if ever, criticize themselves.

2. Leading comrades come to meetings "armed" with accumulated notes, speeches and articles of many years' background, ready to use them against each other.

3. Criticisms have been saved up and suddenly "sprung" months after the deeds criticized took place, while, at the time they were committed, no criticism was levelled.

4. Comrades have at times refused to participate in meetings with one another.

5. For a brief period, some leading comrades exchanged letters, although they were in offices next door to each other.

6. There have been indiscriminate charges and counter charges.

7. We must note a certain factional tone and some irresponsible statements in one document that came before us, as well as the bad attitudes of certain comrades in these discussions.

As is always the case in such a situation, none of the comrades really knows or practices self-criticism. The complete absence of comradesly criticism and self-criticism is a serious weakness of all the leading comrades.

As loyal Party forces, the leading comrades must each rise to the occasion and examine self-critically their own work, their own responsibility and role in this situation. As I said at the beginning, the National Com-

mittee  
to tact  
when  
We al  
Party  
among  
ple to  
Freihe  
that t  
everyo  
the ex  
and s  
Failur  
to carr  
mittee  
We  
and i  
Bitteln  
Miller  
criticis  
liquid  
of our  
Let  
ing C  
is a c  
Comm  
Party,  
theore  
field,  
est at  
that  
with  
seriou  
our c  
comp  
atmos  
Comm  
the li  
the  
fough  
critic

mittee recognizes its failure boldly to tackle this situation a year ago when it first became evident to us. We also recognize that too many Party committees relegate all work among the Jewish workers and people to the comrades in the *Morning Freiheit*. We start from the premise that the National Committee and everyone associated with it must set the example in developing criticism and self-criticism of their work. Failure to do that means inability to carry through the National Committee policies.

We expect that all the comrades, and in the first places Comrades Bittelman, Novik, Wofsy and Moe Miller will engage in searching self-criticism and take the leadership in liquidating this situation on the basis of our National Committee estimate.

Let me say a few words concerning Comrade Bittelman. Because he is a close co-worker of the National Committee, a national leader of our Party, and our foremost political and theoretical Party leader in the Jewish field, we feel free to adopt the sharpest attitude toward him. We feel that his failure to meet regularly with the *Morning Freiheit* staff is a serious shortcoming. Further, it is our opinion that even he is not completely free from the factional atmosphere around him. In general, Comrade Bittelman has fought for the line of the Party as applied to the Jewish field, but he has not fought most effectively, collectively, critically and self-critically.

While many times he is the first to take the initiative in correcting mistakes, he too often deprives his co-workers of full explanations as to the essence and source of what was incorrect.

The National Committee expects an immediate liquidation of this internal situation and the establishment of complete unity of all our leading cadres. Because of the great amount of subjectivity present, this may be difficult for some comrades. There must be brought about a new, comradesly atmosphere based upon united support of the National Committee policies and tasks recently adopted by the Plenum, as well as of this National Committee estimate. All of the comrades must strengthen their ties with mass work. In addition, all the Communists in the *Morning Freiheit* and in mass organizations must become an integral part of the Party, its clubs and committees, and assume general Party responsibilities.

While we have a high estimate of all the leading comrades, we warn that failure by anyone to liquidate this inner situation, failure to unite the Party cadres and fight for the Party policies in the course of mass work, will necessitate disciplinary action by the National Committee.

Sixth: Another prerequisite to advance our work is to change the present organizational set-up with regard to Jewish work. We consider it impermissible that the National Jewish Commission has only met



twice in over a year. Further, it is clear that the Executive of the Morning Freiheit Association has in effect replaced this Party Commission. It is at all times wrong for any non-Party organization to replace the functions of Party Committees, just as it is wrong for a Party organization to substitute for a non-Party organization.

We conclude that it is essential to establish immediately a small but representative and authoritative Party National Jewish Commission, which shall be the political arm of the Party in the Jewish field and function regularly. In the future, the National Jewish Commission shall be more closely connected with the National Groups Commission of the National Committee.

Seventh: An important condition for the realization of all the above tasks is the immediate organization of a discussion among the comrades in the *Morning Freiheit* staff, and the Communists in the Morning Freiheit Association, the J.P.F.O., the School of Jewish Studies, Yiddisher Kultur Farband (Ikuf), etc., on the National Committee's Plenum reports and how to apply these concretely in the Jewish field. These discussions should cover the

main reports of the Plenum; the comrades should be required to read the material and the discussions should deepen their understanding of Party policy and enhance their ability to apply it correctly and energetically. The organizing of such discussion should be carried through in consultation with the National Groups and Educational Commissions of the National Committee of the Party.

[At this point in his Report, Comrade Williamson outlined a series of organizational proposals.]

Let me say in conclusion, comrades, that we members of the subcommittee who have not been directly connected with Jewish work have learned much from these discussions. The National Committee is confident that, although we face many serious problems in the Jewish field, you, as devoted Party comrades, will play your proper role to correct the political and organizational shortcomings, re-establish firm Party unity in our ranks, and, together with the Party leadership and our entire membership, close ranks to rally the peace-loving, anti-fascist masses in our country in the struggle to defeat the drive of U.S. imperialism to war and fascist reaction.

By Lo

AN "t  
the cit  
the for  
studen

This  
through

scope  
direct  
dents  
of high  
almost  
high s  
were i

The  
of aft  
ivities  
erant  
doorst  
rotten  
extra-o  
the ir  
in sett  
onstra  
we sha  
of Ap  
lated  
menta  
crimin  
degrad  
tem th  
contro  
casine  
ing sp

# The Courageous Action of the New York High School Students

By Lou Diskin

AN "UNEXPECTED" STORM broke in the city of New York last April in the form of the historic high school student strike.

This strike lasted from April 25 through the 28th. Historic in its scope and sweep, it engaged in direct action more than 40,000 students (over one-fifth of the total of high school students). Students in almost every vocational and academic high school in the major boroughs were involved.

The students, suffering the loss of after-school, extra-curricular activities, sought to petition the itinerant Mayor O'Dwyer at whose doorstep responsibility rests for the rotten situation. The deprivation of extra-curricular activities served as the immediate, precipitating factor in setting off the great student demonstrations which followed. But, as we shall see below, the student action of April reflected the long-accumulated resentment against more fundamental, underlying factors: the criminal wave of war hysteria, the degradation of the educational system through a Gestapo-like, thought-control regime, the mounting uneasiness of the youth with the growing specter of mass unemployment.

## IMMEDIATE AND UNDERLYING CAUSES OF THE STUDENT STRIKE

The immediate spark that touched off the great student strike was the teachers' demand for adequate pay increases, and the subsequent refusal of the teachers, solidly united despite maneuvers and Red-baiting by the cold-war budgeters, to supervise extra-curricular student activities without additional pay.

For the students, the Mayor's betrayal of his repeated promises to the teachers brought a cessation to the after-school club life and extra-curricular activities in the sciences, arts, history, etc.; to the traditional boat rides in the spring; it brought a halting of all sports and other special activities, such as plays, operettas, etc., and the prospect of the elimination of senior and junior proms. Confronted with this wretched situation, a group of clear-headed, responsible seniors in one of the high schools called for a mass school delegation to the Mayor. The Mayor's reaction to the several hundred students who sought to meet with him—he let loose a stream of threats and charges and immediately

called out more than 100 foot and mounted police—calls to mind Lenin's comment in *Iskra* (1901) on the vicious and cruel reaction of the Czarist authorities to a demand by the Kiev students for "the abolition of the punishment of solitary confinement and the reinstatement of the expelled students." "Ponder over this astonishing lack of proportion," wrote Lenin, "between the modesty and innocuousness of the demands put forward by the students and the panicky dismay of the government, which behaves as if the axe had already been laid to the pillars of the monarchy. Nothing so much exposes our 'omnipotent' government as this display of consternation."\*

And, indeed, "nothing so much exposes" the instability and fright of the O'Dwyer, Tammany cold-war clique as does this irresponsible and brutal reaction to the modest demands of the high school students. Steeped in corruption, gaining the hatred of new sections of the people daily, the New York City Administration is apparently convinced that it is, to quote Lenin once more, "surrounded by inflammable material, and that a mere spark," a simple protest by high school students, "is sufficient to start a conflagration." Thus, no matter how small, how "in-offensive" the spark, it must be dealt with in a brutal and stupid manner.

But the New York high school youth, undaunted by the insolent cruelty of the Administration, poured out by the thousands to strike for their rights, and to press for them in militant demonstrations throughout the city, in particular at City Hall.

The fact that the students had to resort to militant mass struggles for such relatively minor demands as the restoration of the after-school activities, a demand which was kept in the forefront at all times, reveals the deep decay of the entire school system. This decay expresses itself, not only in the disgraceful underpayment of teachers, in the lack of school-room space, facilities, etc. (features which certainly reflect the general policies of our war-bent government, which spends billions for war preparations and a mere pittance for education), but even more profoundly, in the very content of the public-education system.

It must be noted that, historically, the right to free public education was not willingly granted by the bourgeoisie. It was wrested from the ruling class by a mass popular movement, whose backbone was the trade unions. Forced, after years of bitter struggle, to establish the public-education system, the capitalist ruling class has relied on the public schools as one of the main ideological props for the perpetuation of the monstrous system of human exploitation. The bourgeois school system, a part of the capitalist state machinery, has the function of training docile wage slaves. It has the task of

\* V. I. Lenin, "The Drafting of 183 Students into the Army," *Collected Works*, Vol. IV, Bk. I, p. 71.

corrupt  
in ord  
Throu  
to crus  
tive a  
youth,  
workin  
Social  
The r  
the pu  
home,  
of sec  
are di  
a rest  
hatred  
tem is  
The c  
prison  
hear  
school  
"Why  
What  
So  
educat  
action  
Board  
nounc  
taking  
ing"  
perce  
school  
for in  
ren K  
as "a  
wron  
(New  
found

EDUC  
FA  
Gro

corrupting the youth ideologically in order to perpetuate capitalist rule. Through rigorous discipline, aimed to crush all signs of intellectual initiative and natural inquisitiveness of youth, an ideology hostile to the working class, to peace, progress and Socialism, is forced on the students. The real problems of the students, the problems of the working class home, of jobs, and discrimination, of security and a peaceful future—are distorted, when not ignored. As a result, a spirit of cynicism and hatred for the bourgeois school system is engendered among the youth. The classroom becomes a stultifying prison, and it is quite common to hear students refer to attending school as "going to jail," or demand, "Why do we have to learn this? What good will it do us?"

So rotten is the condition of the education system that even the reactionary, Dewey-dominated State Board of Regents was forced to announce recently that it was undertaking an inquiry into the "alarming" number of students (over 50 percent) who do not finish high school. The assistant commissioner for instructional services, Dr. Warren Knox, has described this situation as "a symptom that something is wrong with our high schools . . ." (*New York Times*, May 24). Profound soul!

#### EDUCATION FOR WAR AND FASCISM

Great moods of uneasiness prevail

among the students. The atmosphere of the classrooms is today charged with war hysteria. Anti-Soviet, anti-Communist slanders run wild in textbook and classroom. Christian-Fronters, representatives of the reactionary Roman Catholic hierarchy, and other fascist-minded characters, as Timone and the notoriously anti-Semitic May Quinn, rule the roost. These forces are attempting to smash all talk or action for peace and democracy in the classrooms, to destroy the trade union of progressive teachers and to maintain the dominating role of the reactionary Catholic hierarchy in the school system. Eulogies to "free enterprise," and "the American way of life" are sung daily. Corrupted textbooks and fascist-like racist "theories" are used in order to inculcate the students with false ideas about the "superiority" of the Anglo-Saxon, Western, Christian, white world. Progressive students are terrorized, teachers fired, and all efforts bent to prepare the youth for a criminal atomic war. That the ruling class is having great difficulties in realizing this nefarious end, does not lessen the seriousness of the situation.

While the gathering clouds of war darken the horizons of thousands of high school youth, the situation of teen-age youth is further aggravated by the job situation today, by the bleak prospects for job security after school. They not only receive firsthand knowledge about the growing unemployment from their jobless and part-time employed parents and

older brothers and sisters, but they experience these difficulties themselves during the summer months. The number of teen agers employed in August 1949 was 500,000 below that of August 1948. The drop is expected to increase during the summer of 1950.\* The frustration, concern and uneasiness of thousands of teen-age youth is mounting.

The mass actions of the students revealed a firm grasp of the question of increased pay for the teachers. Throughout all the actions, the students, in fighting for a restoration of after-school activities, never failed to place the question of adequate pay raises for the teachers as the condition of achieving this. Many of the signs carried and slogans shouted in the demonstrations made it abundantly clear that the students understood the Mayor's responsibility in the matter. "Willie gets the cake, while the teachers get the crumbs!" read many signs, and the indignation of the students rose when references were made to the Mayor's recent pay raise of \$15,000, and his many trips to Florida.

Significantly, Governor Dewey remained silent throughout the fight. "Silent Tom," who had just boosted Superintendent of School William Jansen's salary some \$7,500, could find no words to abate the anger of students or teachers, since his reactionary Republican machine, in deals with the Tammany City Administration, shares guilt for the crisis.

\* *Monthly Labor Review*, U.S. Department of Labor, December 1949.

#### STUDENTS UNDAUNTED BY BRUTAL POLICE, THREATS AND RED-BAITING

The student actions also revealed profound and broad democratic, and at times even consciously anti-fascist currents among the youth. Negro and white fought side by side. Also highly significant was the involvement of thousands of Catholic youth, who displayed daring and militancy.

The brutality and violence of the police taught the students civic lessons they never were taught in their school-books. The Negro youth played a special role in teaching many of the white students the meaning of this fascist-like terror, which is the daily experience of the doubly-oppressed Negro people. Significantly, immediately after the brutal pushing around by the police, the youth in all schools in the predominantly Negro communities came out in large numbers. The utter scorn and fearlessness displayed for the blue-coated horsemen was magnificent. "Not troopers — but storm troopers!" the students yelled, seeing in the actions of the mounted cops much that was in common with the behavior of the Hitlerite beasts.

The minions of "law and order," taken aback by the breadth and scope of the student and teachers actions, did not lose time in trotting out the Goebbels weapon of the "Red menace." The principal of one school—a so-called liberal—admonished the students to return to classes because

their  
Kremi  
permi  
breaki  
dents  
with l  
salute-  
Th  
despite  
press  
jected  
school  
sive st  
ship.  
The  
played  
leader  
in gro  
studen  
"flying  
other  
action.  
corps  
When  
exits a  
Hall  
were  
Throu  
athlete  
signm  
ball  
which  
locked  
leavin  
Of  
did n  
maneu  
the yo  
by pri  
steps v  
whose  
from

their actions were "making the Kremlin happy." But he was never permitted to complete his strike-breaking tirade, for hundreds of students interrupted him chanting—with hands raised in the appropriate salute—"Sieg Heil! Sieg Heil!"

Throughout the entire action, despite the howls of the capitalist press and radio, the students rejected Red-baiting, and at many schools sought out Left and progressive students for advice and leadership.

The students spontaneously displayed a genius in organization and leadership which is always present in great actions. In one borough, students in a key school organized "flying squads" which reached every other school in the county for joint action. At another school, a bugle corps sounded the signal for strike. When the police blocked the subway exits and entrances around the City Hall area, methods of infiltration were employed with great success. Throughout the entire strike, the athletes carried through special assignments. In one school the football team forced open the doors which the principal had ordered locked to prevent the students from leaving the classrooms.

Of course, the O'Dwyer machine did not remain idle. All kinds of maneuvers were employed to split the youth. Special appeals were made by principals and supervisors. Special steps were taken to split the seniors, whose graduation was approaching, from the rest of the students, by

promises, threats and even arrests. (One college in Jim-Crow Maryland announced that they would not accept any of the striking students.) Parents were intimidated. The full force of the Roman Catholic hierarchy was mobilized to drive the students back to school. To no avail! The students had struck and they stuck.

Thus, the entire strike action was infused with the great qualities of youth—with daring and militancy, resourcefulness and enthusiasm, and outstanding acts of heroism.

The historic action of the students buttressed the unity and courage of the teachers. All maneuvers and manipulations by the O'Dwyer machine and the Board of Education have thus far failed to split their unity or lessen the militancy of their demands and actions. Their "strike" continues at this writing, in spite of sharpened attacks by the cold-war crowd. The teachers are continuing their resistance and finding additional ways to press the O'Dwyer clique to meet their urgent demands.

#### ROLE OF THE LEFT AND PROGRESSIVE STUDENTS

The organized Left and progressive high school students were caught unprepared by these sudden outbursts. However, steps were soon taken to move, in a united manner, into the battle. While it cannot be said that these advanced students held the leadership or even wielded decisive influence in this struggle,

they nevertheless made outstanding and major contributions.

The organized Left students helped deepen the understanding of the young strikers. They explained the nature of the cold-war city budget as a main source of conflict. They made it clear, through leaflets, meetings and by word of mouth, that the callousness and harshness of the Administration was a partial forerunner of the horrible tomorrow that reaction had in mind for American youth. They helped draw lessons from the vicious actions of the police, showed its full relationship to the assaults against all civil liberties, the violence against the Negro people, and the jailing of the Communist leaders.

The Left students strove to effect greater student organization in each school and on a city-wide scale. They helped weld together student leaders (G. O. presidents) and many of the club and sports-team leaders. They helped establish some contact between the students and the teachers', parents', trade-union and other people's organizations. And finally, when the force of the action could no longer be sustained, they helped shape a perspective for continuing the struggle through different forms.

Thus, in the course of the struggle, the organized base of the Left and progressive youth was extended. However, it must be added, insufficient attention was paid to this question. Hence the results were far below the possibilities.

#### WEAK RESPONSE OF THE PARTY AND THE TRADE UNIONS

The main weakness in the entire struggle was the passive attitude and lack of activity of major sections of the Party and trade-union movement. Hesitations, and even timidity, marked the situation. The Party membership and large sections of the leadership saw the fight as a "student" question, and stood by waiting for the next steps of the youth. While some activity was carried on, *it was not grasped soon or deeply enough, that the brutal assaults of the police had turned the struggle into a first-rate political battle against the corrupt, cold-war O'Dwyer Administration.* Particularly was this the case when this Tammany-underworld clique demonstrated its anti-labor, anti-people character by its unbounded Taft-Hartleyite attacks against progressive-led trade unions, its encouragements and carrying out of violence against the Negro people, its utter and vicious heartlessness toward the unemployed, etc., etc. Under such conditions, the Party and the trade-union movement bore a great responsibility: to respond immediately to the struggle waged by the students and give it every support. This responsibility presented itself in an urgent sense, as an important element in the fight for peace and against the advance of fascism.

Writing on the demonstrations of the Kiev students, in the historical setting of the rising tide of struggle

precedi  
Russia,  
class,  
measur  
tormen  
nical p  
the stu

...  
to acco  
govern  
this inc  
so muc  
affair."  
to publ  
severity  
if in m  
erty. A  
strata  
challen  
to the  
insults  
can loo  
emmer  
dent yo  
Sociali  
sistanc  
must c

How  
words  
concre  
have i  
and de  
tion th  
onstra  
labor  
shoul  
the lie  
and ra  
official  
"riotin  
ity and  
that o

\* 194



preceding the 1905 Revolution in Russia, Lenin called on the working class, which "constantly suffers immeasurably greater oppression and torment at the hands of the tyrannical police," to give full support to the student strike.

... The government must be called to account not only by the students. The government's own conduct has caused this incident to become something ever so much greater than a mere student affair. The government turns insolently to public opinion as if boasting of the severity of the punishment it inflicts, as if in mocking of all aspirations for liberty. All conscious elements among all strata of the people must take up this challenge if they do not desire to fall to the level of dumb slaves bearing their insults in silence. . . . The worker who can look on indifferently while the government sends troops against the student youth is not worthy of the name of Socialist. The students came to the assistance of the workers—the workers must come to the aid of the students.\*

How clear and alive are Lenin's words in their application to our concrete situation! The Party should have immediately taken the initiative and denounced the City Administration through meetings, leaflets, demonstrations, etc. The Party and the labor and progressive movements should have exposed to the people the lie of the whole capitalist press and radio and of the frightened city officialdom that the students were "rioting." The only violence, brutality and riot in the student strike was that of the corrupt city government

and its brutal police. It is this corruption and brutality that provoked the students into protest, which is their legal and moral right in any case. The progressive forces should have sought to unite in a broad front all sections of the people who on one or another question stand in opposition to the O'Dwyer Administration (trade unions, Negro people, the unemployed, tenant groups, parents' organizations, good government forces, etc.). That this was more than possible, particularly at that moment, was seen in the many sharp statements issued by a whole number of diverse individuals and groups, including the National Education Association, a body not exactly noted for its liberalism. The failure to take decisive action at that moment meant losing a great opportunity for offensive blows against the forces of war and fascism.

#### THE YOUTH CAN AND MUST BE WON FOR PEACE

The great student strike actions, and other events involving high school youth, show that a new type of teen-ager is being molded. It is still too early to characterize this section of the youth with any finality. Several operating factors are, however, apparent.

The high school youth want peace, they want to live and grow up in a world that will match their hopeful visions. At the present time, the progressive youth movement comes to them with the Stockholm Peace Appeal, and the results are gratifying.

\* *Ibid.*, pp. 73-74.

Thousands of these courageous youth are placing their signatures against their would-be murderers, the atomaniacs of Wall Street.

At a time when economic hardships and unemployment are once again boarders in working-class homes, the youth cannot fail to hear related tales of the bleak, miserable days of the 'thirties. Seeing the joblessness of their older brothers and sisters on the increase, experiencing special difficulties themselves, the young people evidence growing skepticism and suspicion of the "health" of the capitalist system. The Negro youth, who find the going exceptionally tough, have the least confidence in the "superiority" of American "free enterprise."

It is particularly important to bring to these youth the true picture of the rich, healthy and happy life of the Soviet Socialist youth, to reveal, in dramatic and graphic ways, the bright future that awaits them in a Socialist America, which will be a land without want, without discrimination, without the awful horror of war or thoughts of war. While, to some extent, educational work in this direction has been carried on among sections of the youth, much more needs to be done.

Another factor that should be mentioned is the influence on the youth of the great struggles of the working class and our Party in the postwar period. It would be a mistake to think that the great strike waves of '46 and '49, and the Peekskill and other battles for liberty and

peace, have been without influence on the minds of teen-age youth. Stemming in the main from the working class, they have seen their fathers, mothers, sisters or brothers go down to the picket line to fight for bread, to struggle to defend their unions, to protest an outrage against the Negro people, etc.

It would be criminally wrong to become complacent about, or inattentive to, this section of the youth. While great confusions and uneasiness still rule their ranks, while talk of war, orgies of murder, hourly stories of increased rape crimes and broken homes, vicious chauvinism prey on their minds—these youth are seeking answers, searching for ways to brighten their frustrated, uneasy lives. These youth are a potential force for peace and social progress, and we must not desert them to the camp of war and fascism. Up to now, Wall Street has not won these youth. It is the high duty of the Communists, of the whole labor and progressive camp, to guarantee that these youth, the great hope of our tomorrows, will never be won by the atomic gangsters.

New political storms are on the horizon. The Communists and all labor and progressive forces must redouble their efforts to expose the true reasons for the school crisis, to unite and lead broad masses of the people in militant struggle against the corrupt O'Dwyer clique. In this way a great contribution will be made to the cause of peace, democracy and progress.

By Phi

Ford w  
Auto V  
election  
this year  
the au  
Democr  
tion of  
assistan

It wa  
Walter  
Preside  
defeat  
control  
in the  
its mil  
and its  
ment fo

Prog  
public  
the str  
1949 a  
negotia  
and wi  
round,  
ticular  
Incumb  
baiting  
oration  
notoric  
includi  
mano.  
against  
official

# Some Lessons of the United-Front Victory in the Ford Elections

By Phil Schatz

FORD WORKERS of Local 600, United Auto Workers—C.I.O., united in the elections held in March and April this year to win a great victory over the auto barons and their Social-Democratic and A.C.T.U. (Association of Catholic Trade Unionists) assistants.

It was the most decisive rebuff to Walter Reuther since his election as President of the U.A.W. in 1946, defeating his attempt to consolidate control over the largest local union in the country, his attempt to destroy its militantly progressive traditions and its influence on the labor movement for peace and democracy.

Progressives and Communists, who publicly fought Reuther's betrayal of the strike against speedup in May 1949 and against ratification of his negotiated contract in October 1949, and who led shop struggles all year round, were swept into office, particularly in the largest buildings. Incumbents who supported his Red-baiting, factional, company-collaboration policies, were ousted. Every notorious Red-baiter was defeated, including Vice-President Lee Romano. So strong was the sentiment against Red-baiting that *Ford Facts*, official union newspaper, stated on

April 21: "Strangely missing was the usual 'Communist controlled' that dominated election literature in previous years."

Negroes won top posts with very high votes in buildings with predominantly white workers. The recording secretary of the local, a Negro worker, was re-elected with a higher vote than either of the presidential candidates. The workers, in a deliberate effort to smash inner-union factionalism, split their tickets to elect candidates without regard to caucus affiliation.

## DEEP PEACE FEELING

Ford workers showed that they are ready to fight against the economic effects of Wall Street's drive to war and fascism, and that they can be mobilized to fight for peace and democracy as well. In fact, there is growing skepticism among Ford workers toward the monopolists' war program, with its spy scares, "loyalty" oaths and efforts to outlaw the Communist Party. Reuther has not won the workers as an appendage of the war machine under the demagogic slogan of a "third force" —"against Wall Street and the

Kremlin." The Ford election is a clear message to workers throughout the world that Reuther does not speak in the name of U.A.W. members when he attempts to destroy the World Federation of Trade Unions and whips up anti-Communist, anti-Soviet war hysteria.

All this is reflected in the action of the newly-elected Ford local officers and even of the defeated candidates, from *all political camps*, who signed the Labor Peace Conference petition and also sent a telegram to President Truman urging a stay of sentence for Gene Dennis.

#### APPLICATION OF THE UNITED FRONT PRIOR TO ELECTION

The dogged two-year fight for the united front, initiated and led by the Party, laid the foundation for the election victories. It was a two-year period of struggle, with the company as the main workers' target. It was a genuine fight for *unity of action* of masses of workers, open to all—Right, Left or Center—willing to fight the company around issues on which they could agree, despite ideological and political differences on other questions. It was a public fight for unity, without "ulterior" motives, without seeking "credit" or partisan electoral advantage. It was a period of continuous mobilization of the workers in an effort to breathe life into paper resolutions, to commit leaders publicly and to develop rank-and-file pressure in support of pledges made by any leader.

Unity of action developed and grew from whatever form of struggle the workers were ready to move on. The 25-day strike of 60,000 workers against speedup was preceded by six months of leaflet distribution, of resolutions, membership meetings, lunchroom speeches, lunch-time demonstrations and stoppages. Other campaigns were launched with leaflets bearing the signatures of thousands of workers exposing the Ford Motor Company on specific issues.

Prior to the election, this consistent struggle for unity on single issues changed all existing relationships in the local. It began the disintegration of the Right-Center coalition (Reuther, A.C.T.U.-dominated President Thompson and the Center combination). As a result of united action on specific issues by the rank and file, those Ford local leaders who followed Reuther found themselves realigned with the Left in struggle against Reuther's policy. The struggle for unity thus provided a testing ground for leaders and policies. Even though particular struggles were lost in the course of the unity campaign, workers remembered who it was that fought for correct policy. It helped establish closer bonds of unity between Negro and white workers, based on joint struggle for common objectives. It created hostility to Red-baiting leaders as disrupters of unity who make it a practice to hide with Red-baiting their failure to fight the company. The struggle for unity led to a progressive atmosphere in the union character-

istic of  
and m  
tion o

MINIM  
FOR

The  
tinued  
to stre  
the Fo  
progre  
unity  
ances  
ents, i  
on Ri  
The p  
rank-a  
leaders  
progra  
progre  
spelled  
was de  
bership  
mediat  
out a  
public  
from c  
shop p  
rmined  
speedy  
It emp  
ination  
any fo  
up an  
union  
ment f  
or po  
called  
to the  
suppor  
activiti

istic of the anti-fascist war years, and made possible official union action on broader political questions.

#### MINIMUM PROGRAM FOR UNITY

The election campaign itself continued the united front, continued to strengthen the fighting unity of the Ford workers. Communists and progressives advanced a minimum unity program as the basis for alliances with former political opponents, including candidates running on Right-wing and Center slates. The program was designed to unite rank-and-file workers and amenable leaders. It was not the full, advanced program usually put forth by the progressive coalition at Ford's. It spelled out methods of struggle, and was designed to mobilize the membership, on the most important immediate issues. It called for an all-out and many-sided union and public fight to prevent the company from carrying through its runaway-shop program, as well as for determined resistance to speedup and the speedy elimination of health hazards. It emphasized opposition to discrimination against Negro workers in any form. It encouraged all to speak up and express disagreement on union policy without fear of punishment for the expression of any ideas or political beliefs. The program called for repeal of, and resistance to the Taft-Hartley Act, for all-out support to the local executive board activities for a state F.E.P.C. and

extension of unemployment insurance to \$35 for 52 weeks, and for exerting the influence of Ford Local 600 to advance the movement for world peace.

All candidates were forced to campaign on the issues facing the workers, thus committing themselves publicly. The rank and file became the guarantor of the program, making more difficult a betrayal of their commitments by candidates after the elections. Candidates signed formal agreements, reproduced as leaflets, to fight for the program and committed themselves to repudiate any who violated it during or after elections. Rank-and-file leaders issued leaflets warning candidates whom they supported of exposure and repudiation if they failed to fight for the program. Support to Tommy Thompson for re-election as President of Local 600 was given *only after* he issued 50,000 leaflets, accepting the unity program and pledging to mobilize the workers to fight for it.

Even in the election of Carl Stellato (who was secretly backed by Reuther and the A.C.T.U.) to the presidency of the local, by the narrow margin of 600 votes, there is demonstrated the correctness and power of a united-front program made the property of the workers. Stellato was forced to campaign on issues which directly contradicted Reuther's policies. He publicly repudiated A.C.T.U. Red-baiting in one building with 10,000 workers, thereby helping to elect a Left-wing administration there. He proclaimed

the right of Local 600 to "make its own decisions . . . without interference from the International Union." Reuther's candidate in this way helped move the workers into greater opposition to Reuther's policies.

The unity program made possible a real struggle against traditional inner-union factionalism. Communist and progressive leaders advanced a unity list for local officers which included Right, Center and Left candidates who subscribed to the minimum program.

The Reuther-A.C.T.U. forces, and factionalists within the Center Caucus, were alarmed by the developing unity and sought to check it by pressuring candidates publicly to repudiate progressive support. The workers were warned in advance through tens of thousands of leaflets, however, of a possible repudiation, of possible capitulation by some candidates to factional caucus pressure. These leaflets spelled out what a blow that would be against all the Ford workers. *No candidate dared issue such a repudiation after these leaflets appeared.*

The workers voted for this unity list, in disregard for organized caucus slate cards, thereby electing all of the candidates on the rank-and-file unity list, with the exception of incumbent President Thompson.

No single political machine or caucus was able to deliver the vote. The workers in their own wisdom elected local officers committed to a fighting program and considered

the best fighters, regardless of caucus affiliation.

Ford workers have thus regained control of their union, making elected officials responsible to the rank and file. They rebelled against unprincipled caucus set-ups operating virtually like "Tammany Hall" machines, with the "outs" fighting all year to get rid of the "ins," while the "ins" fight to keep their control—all at the expense of united struggle against the Company. The workers delivered a devastating blow at Reuther, who, in the false name of "unity" and opposition to factionalism, perpetuates his regime through vote-delivering machine caucuses, unprincipled factionalism and disruptive Red-baiting.

#### SUSTAINING STRUGGLES DURING ELECTIONS

A minimum program must be reinforced during the election period by the continuation of rank-and-file struggles on issues facing the workers.

In the Ford elections, organized struggles gave the workers the opportunity to test candidates by their program and their actions. They taught the workers the difference between reactionaries who speak "unity" to secure unquestioning obedience to their leadership, and progressives who genuinely mobilize the workers to fight the company. It set a pattern for the continuation of struggle after election, despite the intentions of those who were inter-

ested  
In  
tended  
enced  
Right  
posed  
defeat  
themse  
faction  
the wo  
ing, th  
nated  
open l  
ing a r  
rection  
This c  
leaflet  
worker  
preside  
the bas  
ent, "a  
jobs w  
ingly c  
demne  
to parti  
the co  
ponent  
In a  
hent  
were o  
campai  
proven  
election  
leader.  
particip  
angere  
turning  
ing the  
ing the  
ditions  
Prog

ested only in gaining office.

In the struggles, unity was extended to embrace workers influenced by reactionary candidates.

Right-wing office-holders who opposed candidates seeking unity were defeated. These office-holders exposed themselves as enemies of unity, as factionalists unwilling to fight for the workers' interests. In one building, the incumbent A.C.T.U.-dominated president refused to sign an open letter to Henry Ford demanding a meeting to guarantee job protection against the runaway shop. This open letter was issued as a leaflet bearing the signatures of 1400 workers. The A.C.T.U. building president conducted his campaign on the basis of Red-baiting his opponent, "assuring" the workers that their jobs were safe. He was overwhelmingly defeated, however, and condemned by the workers for his failure to participate in the fight against the company initiated by his opponent.

In another building, the incumbent president and vice-president were ousted as a result of a successful campaign for health and safety improvements continued during the elections by a progressive building leader. These incumbents refused to participate in the campaign. They angered the workers by repeatedly turning down the public pleas inviting them to sign the leaflets attacking the company and itemizing conditions needing improvement.

Progressive incumbents, consistent

with their fight for unity, joined in struggles which were initiated by opposing candidates. A Right-wing candidate angrily walked out of a membership meeting after making a constructive proposal for action, because the incumbent progressive building chairman quickly agreed, congratulated him and called for more unity to fight the company.

#### INDEPENDENT COMMUNIST POSITION AND ACTIVITY

Communist trade unionists, as part of the progressive coalition, fought out differences within the caucus and insisted on the right to rally the rank and file as the final court of decision.

During the elections, as in the past two years, united-front relations from the top were reinforced by the united front from below.

On occasion, this required Communists in the past two years to act without their old allies, when the latter faltered too long. The struggle against speedup was initiated through the efforts of the Communist Party when top progressive caucus leaders at Ford's refused to budge. During the strike against speedup, Communists refused to watch passively while Reuther and his henchmen betrayed the strike, though some progressive leaders wanted to "sit it out," so as to say at election time: "We told you not to vote for them. We were right. Vote for us."

Many progressive caucus leaders



opposed any electoral united front. They charged Communists with "unprincipled deals" and demanded strict adherence to support of their caucus candidates only, regardless of the record of other candidates. While rejecting a united front on a minimum program to stop the Reuther-A.C.T.U. bid for complete control, some progressives were in favor of an electoral alliance with these forces to "get Tommy Thompson." Such politicians conceived of schemes to "win over the right people on top," seeing no relation between program, struggle and the elections. Such attitudes were exploited by the Trotskyites, who sought to drive a wedge between the Communists and their progressive allies.

A persistent fight was waged by Communist trade unionists to overcome these factional ways of thinking, the long hatreds dating over many years, personal ambitions and mistrust of motives. This was done through campaigns among the workers for a correct unity policy in the elections and by movements on issues which were often developed despite the lack of assistance by Progressive Caucus leaders.

Leaflets and discussions during the elections stressed that the interests of the workers would best be served through unity, through the sharing of leadership by the best fighters, regardless of group affiliation. As a result many Center leaders issued material pressuring their own caucus for a united-front slate. Workers

signed petitions indicating their agreement with this approach. Groups of Communists and progressives issued their own slate cards containing a list of endorsements, not restricted to any specific caucus. The veteran Communist leader in Local 600, Bill McKie, issued a tabloid size leaflet explaining this united-front approach.

Furthermore, an uncompromising struggle was waged within the Communist Party to overcome a certain resistance to the united front in the elections. The Party had to overcome the effects of long years of caucus activity, which had contributed toward a factional outlook by some Party members.

Communists, maligned by the bourgeoisie and their Social-Democratic allies as "union wreckers," fought consistently, and sometimes single-handedly, to free Local 600 from political machines and caucuses and return it to its 60,000 members.

The Party and the Michigan Edition of *The Worker* greatly influenced the thinking of Ford workers and helped move the rank and file into struggle. In a period of 18 months, 750,000 Party leaflets were issued. Under the inspiration of the Party's activities, 1,750,000 leaflets were issued by individuals and progressive groups. These leaflets promoted intensive discussion on the cold war, the trial of the 12, the Mundt-Ferguson Bill, the miners' struggle, on the question of Negro rights, speedup, runaway shop, etc.

The Pa  
greatly  
a tim  
leaders  
the spe  
Political  
struggle  
was rea  
union  
bringin  
greater  
Negro  
The  
aid of  
ers int  
The  
Work  
paper,  
Ford  
from r  
they c  
official  
Work  
carried  
speedu  
contes  
by wo  
partm  
Pub  
of T  
instat  
prints  
elect  
Speci  
tion  
specif  
away  
rights  
and l  
seque  
Th

The Party leaflets exposing speedup greatly stirred the Ford workers, at a time when no officials or caucus leaders were doing anything to fight the speedup. The June 1949 issue of *Political Affairs*, dealing with the struggle against white chauvinism, was read by 150 important non-Party union leaders, Negro and white, bringing greater consciousness and greater activity to the struggle for Negro rights.

The Party press was the *principal aid of the Party in moving the workers into struggle.*

The Michigan Edition of *The Worker* became, in life, a coalition paper, accepted as "their paper" by Ford workers. It contained letters from non-Communist workers which they could not get into their own official union newspaper. *The Worker*, starting 18 months ago, carried on an incessant exposure of speedup, sponsored a letter-writing contest on speedup, published articles by workers referring to specific departments and foremen, etc.

Publicity in the Michigan Edition of *The Worker* resulted in the reinstatement of fired workers. Reprints from the paper helped to elect progressive candidates to office. Special issues of the Michigan Edition of *The Worker* prepared on specific occasion on speedup, runaway shop, struggle for Negro rights, etc., were widely distributed and became the forerunner for subsequent mass activity.

The paper further helped elect

committeemen in departments where a great number of workers were subscribers. Unparalleled Red-baiting by the incumbent A.C.T.U.-dominated president and his entire executive board in a building of 10,500 workers resulted only in their overwhelming defeat, in no little measure because in this building one out of every 20 workers was a reader of the Michigan Edition of *The Worker*.

#### CONCLUSION

The election results at Ford's confirm the correctness and effectiveness of the united-front policy of the Party. The key to future victories lies in the *continuation of the fight for unity.*

Upon the Communists and progressives newly elected to leadership devolves the responsibility of carrying on the work of cementing the united front from below, of resisting and combatting any and all tendencies and pressures to replace that basic unity with "easy" unity on top levels. There may be tendencies to forget about the workers; to seek gains through clever, "practical" negotiations without rallying the workers; to neglect rank-and-file mobilization and education in support of resolutions passed by a progressive leadership. The leadership will certainly have to struggle against all such tendencies that would weaken the mass rank-and-file base on which alone a progressive leadership can wage struggle in behalf of the workers.

There is also the danger of continuing to act as an opposition. Factional hangovers may take the form of ignoring official union channels open for action, or failing to use the powers of official position and continuing to act like an "opposition," and of organizing narrow caucuses instead of speaking to the entire membership.

A fight to avoid both dangers will be necessary. *The united front from below remains the main base for all activities.* In the new situation, however, the united front from below takes on a new aspect. It becomes a front of struggle in support of activities of progressive leaders, instead of a front of struggle to initiate activities to move and pressure leaders. The united front from below, together with the united front on top, is required in this situation to raise the struggle to new and higher levels.

What is decisive to understand at all stages of the struggle is that only a consolidated, larger Communist Party with well-functioning clubs will help maintain and extend the gains which have been made.

It is to be expected that the election victory will call forth desperate activity on the part of Reuther, the A.C.T.U. and the company to attempt to destroy the unity achieved, to undo the results and to prevent Local 600 from influencing the entire labor movement in the developing struggles for peace and democracy.

To carry through more fundamental activity, to advance Ford workers from militant trade unionism to class consciousness, requires that the Party begin to tackle ideological questions in the same mass way that shop struggles are developed. The ideological exposure of Reuther must be undertaken: he must be unmasked as the agent of the auto barons in labor's ranks, who daily sells the workers "capitalism with improvements," anti-Communism, allegiance to the Democratic Party and Truman's reactionary war program, as well as hostility to the Soviet Union. It is necessary also to place in the center of the thinking of Ford workers the connection between their shop problems and the struggle against war and fascism. To advance the beginnings which have been made in Negro-white unity requires intensified ideological work, constant struggle against white chauvinism and round-year battle on the many issues confronting Negro workers in and out of the plant.

These tasks require a sustained, continuous effort to build the Party and to establish new standards of Press circulation and distribution of literature and Party leaflets.

Ford workers have, since 1940, always been viewed within the labor movement as the barometer of events to come. The election victory presents the opportunity for Ford workers to play a distinctive national role in the struggle against war and fascism.

By Hi

The proletarian political Leninist

Marx of the established and shopletarianism to the tators!

Leninist and estate, dictate

". . . inism of the problem: cretize: grade

\* Re Affairs mine: saw: is \* \* \* gauges Note: able in those

# Some Problems of the People's Democracy in the Light of the Leninist-Stalinist Teachings on the Dictatorship of the Proletariat\*

By Hilary Minc

The theory of the dictatorship of the proletariat is the fundamental and central part of the science of Marxism-Leninism.

Marx and Engels created the theory of the dictatorship of the proletariat, established theoretically the necessity of smashing the bourgeois state machine, and showed that, as a result of the proletarian revolution, the proper content of the period of transition from capitalism to Communism can only be the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Lenin fought mercilessly against revisionist and Centrist attempts to distort and efface the Marxian theory of the state, the proletarian revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat.

"... The fundamental thing in Leninism is the problem of the dictatorship of the proletariat, the elaboration of this problem, the substantiation and concretization of this problem," wrote Comrade Stalin.\*\*

\* Reprinted from *Bulletin of the International Affairs Department*, published by the Central Committee of the Polish United Workers' Party, Warsaw, issue of February-March 1950.

\*\* J. Stalin, *Problems of Leninism*, Foreign Languages Publishing House, Moscow, 1947, p. 126. Note: In all instances where sources cited are available in American editions, the references are to those editions.—Ed.

As Comrade Stalin indicated,\* the new elements which Lenin introduced into the teachings on the dictatorship of the proletariat consist of the fact that he:

a) discovered the Soviet form of government as the state form of the dictatorship of the proletariat;

b) developed the formula of the dictatorship of the proletariat, defining it as a special form of the class alliance of the proletariat and the peasantry, with the proletariat playing the leading role in this alliance;

c) elaborated the problem of the dictatorship of the proletariat as the highest type of democracy in class society, expressing the interest of the majority (the exploited), as against bourgeois democracy which expresses the interest of the minority (the exploiters).

Comrade Stalin, the co-creator and continuator of Lenin's work, creatively developed further the Marxist-Leninist teachings on the state and the dictatorship of the proletariat, victoriously directed and directs its realization.

Similarly as Lenin, in the struggle against the revisionists and Centrists,

\* See J. Stalin, *Interview with the First American Labor Delegation*, International Publishers.

safeguarded the Marxian theory of the state and the dictatorship of the proletariat from distortion and effacement and raised this theory to a new, higher level by generalizing upon the historical experience of the epoch of imperialism and proletarian revolutions, so Stalin, in the struggle against the Trotskyites and the Right-wing deviationists, safeguarded Leninism from distortion and effacement, and generalizing upon the historical experience of the period of the general crisis of capitalism and upon Socialist construction developed the Marxist-Leninist theory of the dictatorship of the proletariat, in this way developing the science of Marxism-Leninism creatively and universally. On the basis of Stalin's teachings and under his leadership, the Soviet Socialist state developed into a mighty and invincible power, the building of Socialism in the U.S.S.R. was completed, and in the U.S.S.R. the period of a gradual transition toward Communism was commenced.

On the basis of Stalin's teachings and under his leadership the mighty, invincible Soviet Socialist state smashed Hitlerite Germany. As a result of this victory, the world front of capitalism was broken in a number of new places and Stalin's brilliant prophecy, made already in 1934 was completely fulfilled:\*

"And let not the Messieurs and bourgeois blame us if some of the governments so near and dear to them, which today rule happily 'by the grace of God,' are missing on the morrow after such a war."

On the shambles of these governments "by the grace of God," the states

of People's Democracy have arisen.

The class nature of these states is the realization of the dictatorship of the proletariat through the hegemony of the proletariat; their aim is the building of Socialism in their countries.

The states of People's Democracy, which arose as a result of the victory of the U.S.S.R. over Hitlerism, develop on the basis of the experience of the dictatorship of the proletariat and Socialist construction in the U.S.S.R., of the theoretical generalization of this experience given by Comrade Stalin and of the priceless direct indications and advice of the C.P.S.U. (B.) and Comrade Stalin personally.

"All nations," wrote Lenin,\* "will reach Socialism; this is inevitable. But not all nations will reach Socialism in the same way; each will introduce a special feature in the form of democracy it adopts, in the form of the proletarian dictatorship, and in the rate at which it carries out the reconstruction of the various phases of social life."

The Communist and Workers' parties in the People's Democracies, basing themselves on Stalin's teachings, his indications and advice, have understood the particular traits of the international situation and the specific internal situation of their countries in the period after the Second World War; and on this basis they have determined their specific way of exercising the function of the dictatorship of the proletariat, forging a variant of it—the People's Democracy, and in this way they marked out the best and most advantageous road toward Socialism in their countries, in the given historical condi-

\* V. I. Lenin, "A Caricature of Marxism and Imperialist Economism," *Collected Works*, Vol. XIX, International Publishers, pp. 256-257.—Ed.

\* J. Stalin, *Problems of Leninism*, p. 464.

On the other hand, the science of Marxism-Leninism developed by Stalin was the weapon with whose aid the Communist and Workers' parties in the People's Democracies grasped the fact that the road of their countries toward Socialism is the result of the victorious path of the U.S.S.R., that their type of state is a variant of the dictatorship of the proletariat and that, as Lenin wrote:

"The transition from capitalism to Communism, will certainly bring a great variety and abundance of political forms, but the essence will inevitably be only one: *the dictatorship of the proletariat.*"

On the basis of this consciousness, the Right-wing and nationalist deviation which sought to present the road of People's Democracy as a "third" road between Socialism and capitalism and to oppose the road of People's Democracy to the Soviet road was overcome and smashed.

Therefore, the arising and successful development of the People's Democracies states is not only still one more proof of the correctness of the Marxist-Leninist teachings on the state and the dictatorship of the proletariat developed by Stalin; it is the further development of this theory under new historical conditions, a development which took place on the basis of Stalin's teachings and under the direct ideological influence of the C.P.S.U. (B.) and Comrade Stalin personally.

## I

In the science of Marxism-Leninism

the concept of the dictatorship of the proletariat is inseparably linked with the concept of the proletarian revolution. The dictatorship of the proletariat is the instrument and principal content of the proletarian revolution.

"The question of the proletarian dictatorship," Comrade Stalin wrote,\* "is above all a question of the main content of the proletarian revolution. The proletarian revolution, its movement, its scope and its achievements acquire flesh and blood only through the dictatorship of the proletariat. The dictatorship of the proletariat is the instrument of the proletarian revolution, its organ, its most important mainstay. . . ."

The tremendous social upheaval which took place after the war in the countries of Southern and South-eastern Europe, an upheaval which resulted in the consolidation in these countries of the dictatorship of the proletariat in the form of the People's Democracy state, had the character of a proletarian revolution, of a Socialist revolution. It was, however, a Socialist revolution which was achieved in special historical conditions, differing from those in which the Great October Socialist Revolution occurred.

What did the difference in these conditions consist of?

1. The People's Democracies were liberated by the Soviet Army. The coming of the Soviet Army made possible the growing of the national-liberation struggle conducted by partisan forces into a national-liberation war conducted in state form at the side of the Soviet Union by the entire nation and by its regular army, which arose with Soviet aid. The working class, which led the

\* V. I. Lenin, "The State and Revolution," *Collected Works*, Vol. XXI, Bk. II, p. 177.—Ed.

\* J. Stalin, *Problems of Leninism*, p. 39.

struggle against the occupant, now gained extensive possibilities of seizing political power and carrying out a broad struggle for the abolition of the rule of the capitalists and landowners.

"The working masses, the working class, and its political organizations had a class ally in the Soviet Army, an ally who liberated the nation from the yoke of Hitlerite slavery, an ally who by his very presence rendered powerless the camp of reaction and made it incapable of dealing by force of arms with the revolutionary movement, an ally who guaranteed that the imperialist powers would not decide the fate of a given country against the interests of the people."\*

It is a historical fact that in the countries which were occupied by the imperialist Anglo-Saxon armies, as for example France or Italy, the working class, in spite of the great scope of the national-liberation struggle and the tremendous role and influence of the Communist Party in this struggle, was unable to seize power, and these countries, under the influence of brutal imperialist force, were unable to depart from the road of capitalism.

In this way, in distinction to the Soviet Union, where the Socialist proletarian revolution was carried out without any external aid and exclusively with internal forces, the Socialist revolution in the People's Democracies was based in its sources on the aid and power of the Soviet Union and its Army.

2. The revolutionary struggle of the masses under the leadership of the working class and its Communist and

Workers' parties against the landowners and the capitalists was intertwined in this upheaval with the national-liberation war against the Hitlerite occupant.

Rosa Luxemburg in her time, when formulating erroneous conceptions of the national question which later were to be a burden upon the ideology of the Communist Party of Poland, advanced a thesis in her polemics with Lenin to the effect that "there can be no more national wars," understanding by this that the epoch of national wars was passed, due to the consolidation of imperialism and the imperialist division of the world among the great powers.

In answer to Rosa Luxemburg, Lenin in 1916 wrote the following\* on the question:

"... It cannot be said that such a transformation [of the imperialist war into a national one—H.M.] is impossible: if the European proletariat were to remain impotent for another twenty years; if the present war [the imperialist war of 1914—H.M.] were to end in victories similar to those achieved by Napoleon, in the subjugation of a number of virile national states; if imperialism outside of Europe (primarily American and Japanese) were to remain impotent for another twenty years without a transition to Socialism, say, as a result of a Japanese-American war, then a great national war in Europe would be possible."

This brilliant hypothesis of Lenin was fully confirmed. During the Second World War, Europe was the arena of a great liberation struggle of a number of nations against the Hitlerite yoke. This struggle was closely connected with the great war of the Soviet nation-

\* Boleslaw Bierut, Report delivered at the Unity Congress of the Polish Workers' Party and the Polish Socialist Party, December 15, 1948, reprinted in condensed text, *Political Affairs*, March 1949, p. 66.—Ed.

\* V. I. Lenin, "The Pamphlet by Junius," *Collected Works*, Vol. XIX, pp. 203-204.—Ed.



in the defense of its homeland. The guiding force of the struggle against the German occupants was the working class and its Communist and Workers' parties. The working class and its Communist parties closely linked the national-liberation struggle with the struggle against the capitalists and landowners, discredited by capitulation to Hitlerite Germany or collaboration with it—and with the struggle for the overthrow of the rule of the capitalists and landowners.

In this way, at the sources of the Socialist revolution in the People's Democracies lies the intertwining, already during the period of the occupation, of the national-liberation struggle with the revolutionary struggle against the capitalists and landowners.

Herein lies the second trait which differentiates the Socialist revolution in the People's Democracies from the October Revolution.

3. In the People's Democracies the formation of the state of People's Democracy as the organ of the dictatorship of the proletariat took place in a long-term process. The bourgeoisie and the landowners, as well as their political organizations, were not smashed by a frontal attack of the working masses.

The political arena was not completely cleared. In the existing political system many organizations were active which not only vacillated in relation to the great tasks of the Socialist revolution, but were thoroughly hostile toward them and aimed at the restoration of capitalism.

The concrete setting of internal and international circumstances often called for an at least partial sharing of the government, on the part of the Communist and Workers' parties, not only

with their wavering allies, but also with thoroughly bourgeois parties. Hence, the apparatus of bourgeois power was not broken fully or in all its sectors—and hence, the relatively slow tempo of great social transformations, etc. In the process of a long and stubborn class struggle, the discrediting and shattering of hostile political organizations, the overcoming of the vacillations of political allies, the forging—through the united front—of the organic unity of the working class; in the process of extending the foundations of a new system among the masses of the nation, the activation of these masses in the ever-growing conviction that the new system is *their* system, in the process of fortifying the apparatus of the new state power and purging it from bourgeois trash, deepening the social transformations, extending the front of the class struggle and directing the fire of this struggle not only against the large capitalists and landowners, but also against the village rich; in the process of a long number of difficult but victorious class battles—the new states of People's Democracy fulfill the functions of the dictatorship of the proletariat in an ever greater scope and with ever greater effectiveness.

It is clear that boundaries in nature and society are "conventional" and "movable" as Lenin said. The process of the crystalization of the dictatorship of the proletariat in the People's Democracies occurred differently in various countries. The point of departure in respect to the composition of forces, the achieved degree of breaking the old apparatus, etc., also differed in these countries.

In the light of the long duration, complicated nature and difficulties of

this process, it is clear and understandable why the formulation of the People's Democracy as fulfilling effectively the functions of the dictatorship of the proletariat—a formulation which called for the theoretical generalization of the experiences of the People's Democracy—was given by Comrades Dimitrov and Bierut at the end of 1948.

Thus, in distinction from the Soviet Union, where the dictatorship of the proletariat was fixed in the form of Soviet power from the first days of the Socialist revolution, the crystallization of the dictatorship of the proletariat in the People's Democracies took place in a long-lasting and difficult process.

Herein lies the third trait which differentiates the Socialist revolution in the People's Democracies from the October Revolution.

Regardless of the divergence of the social upheaval in the People's Democracies from the October Revolution, this upheaval accomplished the same historical tasks.

Political power was snatched from the hands of the bourgeoisie and passed into the hands of the working class and the working peasantry. Large and medium industry, banks and transport became the property of the state, and the landowners were expropriated. The People's Democracies left the capitalist world and ceased to be subject to capitalism's laws of development, which gave them the possibility of entering the road of Socialism.

Thus, both in respect to the fulfilled historical tasks and in respect to the class driving forces, the Socialist upheaval accomplished in the People's Democracies is of the same type as the October Revolution, and possesses all

the traits of the proletarian Socialist revolution.

The fact that the social upheaval in the People's Democracies decided and solved a number of the tasks of the bourgeois-democratic revolution (for example—the liquidation of feudal survivals in agriculture) does not in any case change its character of a Socialist revolution, for the Great October Socialist Revolution also resolved, "in passing," a number of tasks of this type.

There is no doubt that the point of departure for the formation of Right-wing and nationalist deviations in the Communist and Workers' parties is precisely the denial of the fact that the great social upheaval that has been accomplished in the People's Democracies has the character of a Socialist revolution. The Right-wing and nationalist deviationists do not wish to see the fundamental, revolutionary, Socialist content of this upheaval—they bring to the forefront only the fact that the upheaval was closely connected with the war of national liberation. This is the source of opportunism in the treatment of the question of the national front. Comrade Bierut, in unmasking the opportunist, Right-wing and nationalist stand of Comrade Gomułka, characterized this opportunism as follows:\*

"What does opportunism in the question of the national front consist of? In the fact that it loses sight of the hegemony of the working class. Herein lay the error, the actual stand of opportunism.

"Similarly to all the revolutionary

\* Boleslaw Bierut, Closing Speech at the Third Plenary Session of the Central Committee, Polish United Workers' Party, November 13, 1949, as printed in condensed text, *Political Affairs*, March 1950, p. 92.—Ed.

parties in the whole world, we have never put forth the slogan of the national front as anything else but a front in which the working class and the workers' party is the guide, leader and chief. Any other way of comprehending the national front must be opportunist. This opportunism lay in the stand of a certain part of the comrades who later erred in a Right-wing, opportunist and nationalist deviation on a number of other sectors of work. In their position the false approach to the national front was that trait which led them to errors."

The negating of the hegemony of the proletariat and of its Socialist aims in the national front is closely connected in the stand of the Right-wing and nationalist deviationists with a narrowing of the tasks of the working class solely to the tasks of the war of liberation, of the bourgeois-democratic revolution—it is closely connected with the negation of the fact that the upheaval which took place in the People's Democracies is of the same class type as the Great October Socialist Revolution.

It is connected with the counterposing of the road of the People's Democracies to the Soviet road, with acting against the deepening of the upheaval, the extension of the front of class struggle to embrace the kulaks and the decisive entry upon the road of Socialist construction in town and country. Finally, it is connected with the creation of radically false, petty theories regarding the system of People's Democracy as a third, intermediary road between the capitalist and the Soviet roads.

The states of People's Democracy which arose as a result of a Socialist

revolution, and have crystalized into an instrument of the dictatorship of the proletariat in the span of a long and difficult process, are states which set for themselves the task of building a classless Socialist society.

Therefore, although capitalist elements are still strong in many fields of the economy of these countries and the small-production economy, which is still dominant in the villages, is the foundation for the formation of these elements; although elements of the old bourgeois apparatus still rest in many of the sectors of the state apparatus of these states and the terrain has not yet been completely cleared of the remnants of the broken bourgeois state apparatus and the remnants of broken bourgeois political formations — the states of the People's Democracy are states of a Socialist type.

Lenin wrote in 1918 as follows:\*

"There has been no one as yet, who, if he asked himself a question regarding Russia's economy, would deny that this economy is of a transitory nature. No Communist would deny, it seems, also the fact that the expression—Socialist Soviet Republic—signifies that the Soviet Power is determined to carry out the transition to Socialism, and that it does not in the least signify a recognition of the new economic order as a Socialist order."

At the Third All-Union Congress of Soviets, Lenin said:\*\*

"We have never erred in this matter and we know how difficult is the road leading from capitalism to Socialism—but we are bound to state that our Soviet Republic is Socialist because

\* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Third Russian Edition, Vol. XXII, p. 513.

\*\* *Ibid.*, p. 213.

we have entered this road and these words will not be empty words."

These words of Lenin can be applied in full to the states of the People's Democracy. These are states in which Socialism has not yet conquered ultimately, but in spite of this, these are states which have set for themselves the decided task of building a Socialist society and the successful course of this construction indicates in full that this decision is not based on empty words. Thus, they are Socialist states, in their class nature of the same type as was the Soviet state in that phase of its development when the antagonistic social classes still existed in it. Thus, they are states of Socialism under construction, as was the U.S.S.R. in its first phase of development (before it became the state of victorious Socialism).

In the Socialist states of People's Democracy, derived from a Socialist revolution, the dictatorship of the proletariat is exercised, as a result of different historical conditions, in a different form than the Soviet form.

"At the foundations of our difference from the Soviet road," Comrade Bierut stated,\* "lies the all-sided aid of the Soviet Union and support on the experiences and achievements of the victorious dictatorship of the proletariat in the U.S.S.R."

Regardless of this difference, the People's Democracy form of the dictatorship of the proletariat fulfills the same functions as the Soviet state in the first phase of its development. These functions include, primarily, the forcible suppression of the resistance of the overthrown classes of exploiters within

the country. This suppression of the exploiters' resistance often takes place in our country in different forms than in the Soviet Union during the first phase of its development. As is known, the bourgeoisie and other classes of exploiters were at that time deprived of the right to participate in the elections to the Soviets, which is not the case in the People's Democracies, where the universal right to vote exists. Lenin did not consider the limitation of the electoral rights of the bourgeoisie as an indispensable condition of the dictatorship of the proletariat. On the contrary, Lenin considered that these limitations arose in the setting of the specific conditions of the Russian Revolution and wrote that this limitation

"... is not *absolutely necessary* for the exercise of the dictatorship, it is not an essential earmark of the logical concept 'dictatorship,' it does not enter as an *essential* condition in the historical and class concept 'dictatorship.'

"The necessary earmark, the essential condition of dictatorship, is the *forcible* suppression of the exploiters as a class. . . ."

In his article "Lenin and Stalin on the State Form of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat," D. I. Chesnokov correctly writes:

"On the one hand, the peculiarities of the country's internal development, the relation of class forces and tension of class conflicts; on the other hand, the specific nature of the international situation—determine the form, methods and scale of the force employed by the

\* Boleslaw Bierut, Report delivered at the Unity Congress . . . , *op. cit.*, reprinted in condensed text, *Political Affairs*, March 1949, p. 67.—Ed.

\* V. I. Lenin, "The Proletarian Revolution and the Renegade Kautsky," *Collected Works*, Vol. XXIII, p. 372.—Ed.

prolet  
the w  
but  
resista  
solidat  
gree'  
the 'd  
ance a  
the pr  
in gen  
Hist  
dictato  
ized i  
differ  
form  
and m  
these  
most s  
Sociali  
One  
of the  
tageous  
has als  
and da  
dictator  
Soviet  
frontal  
led by  
exploiters  
it sweep  
radicall  
state,  
bourgeo  
the pri  
hierarch  
In h  
Lenin's  
emphas  
Lenin a  
"The  
alone is  
actively  
ing the  
\* Probl  
1948.

proletariat against the exploiters. For the working class, force is not the goal, but solely the means for suppressing the resistance of the bourgeoisie and consolidating the workers' state. The 'degree' of force is determined mainly by the 'degree' of the bourgeoisie's resistance and its 'fury' in the struggle with the proletariat and the working classes in general."\*

Historical conditions have caused the dictatorship of the proletariat to be realized in the People's Democracies in a different form than the Soviet. This form is the most advantageous, best and most adapted to the conditions of these countries, and is for them the most suitable road for the transition to Socialism.

One must, however, be fully aware of the fact that this form, most advantageous in given historical conditions, has also a number of negative aspects and dangers connected with it. The dictatorship of the proletariat in the Soviet form arose as a result of the frontal attack of the working masses, led by the working class, on the exploiters' class and its state apparatus. It swept away and shattered rapidly and radically the machine of the bourgeois state, bourgeois political formations, bourgeois norms and legal regulations, the privileged positions of the church hierarchy, etc., etc.

In his work, *The Foundations of Leninism*, Comrade Stalin particularly emphasizes Lenin's statement in which Lenin affirms that:

"The Soviet organization of the state alone is capable of *immediately* and *effectively* smashing and *finally* destroying the old, *i.e.*, the bourgeois, bureau-

cratic and judicial apparatus." (My italics—H.M.)\*

It is clear that the People's Democracy form of the dictatorship of the proletariat, due to the circumstances of its development and formation, cannot accomplish "immediately" and "finally" these tasks of clearing the terrain for Socialist construction with the same sweep and consistency.

Therefore, even at present, after years of a long and difficult process of crystallization of the state of People's Democracy as a variant of the dictatorship of the proletariat which retains the fundamental levers of power—the People's Democracies still trail behind themselves long "tails," made up of obsolete institutions and norms of the past period, and at times even of particular elements of the old bourgeois state apparatus which have not been subjected to revolutionary transformation. This hampers the development of Socialist construction and creates certain dangers, for, in definite circumstances, the "tails" from the preceding period remain advantageous points of entrenchment for the class enemy. In connection with this one should keep in mind that historical survivals of this type should not only not be preserved and prolonged but, on the contrary, should be liquidated most rapidly at a rate conforming to the specific conditions and relations of class forces of each country.

Historical development has shown, in accord with the science of Marxism-Leninism, that the existence of two forms of the dictatorship of the proletariat—the Soviet and People's Democracy forms—is possible.

\* *Problems of Philosophy*, Moscow, Nov. 3, 1948.

\* J. Stalin, *Foundations of Leninism*, International Publishers, 1939, p. 60.—Ed.

The People's Democracy form has proved itself, in the special historical conditions which arose in a number of countries after the Second World War, to be vital and effective.

This proves once again the brilliance of Stalinist thought, which, on the basis of the generalization of new historical experience, was able to resolve creatively the problem of the essence of the new state form—the People's Democracy.

It is a fact that a new chapter, rich in content, on the People's Democracy has been contributed to the Marxist-Leninist teachings on the state, the Socialist revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat. It is a fact that this new chapter has been contributed on the basis of Stalin's teachings and under his direct ideological influence and leadership.

*[To Be Continued]*

## RECENT BOOKS AND PUBLICATIONS

---

NAZIS PREFERRED, <i>by Moses Miller</i> .....	\$ .10
EITHER THE CONSTITUTION OR THE MUNDT BILL, <i>by Simon W. Gerson</i> .....	.03
THE PLOT TO GAG AMERICA, <i>by Elizabeth Gurley Flynn</i> .....	.03
COLD WAR IN THE CLASSROOM, <i>by Samuel Sillen</i> .....	.10
THE C.I.O. TODAY, <i>by George Morris</i> .....	.10
AFRICA FIGHTS FOR FREEDOM, <i>by Alphaeus Hunton</i> ....	.05
WORKING CLASS UNITY FOR PEACE, <i>by M. Suslov, P. Togliatti, and Gh. Gheorghiu Dej.</i> .....	.25
F.E.P.C., <i>by Rob Fowler Hall</i> .....	.03
THEORY AND PRACTICE OF THE C.P., PART I ( <i>Revised</i> )...	.15
THE NEGRO PEOPLE AND THE SOVIET UNION, <i>by Paul Robeson</i> .....	.02
THE STORY OF THE TRENTON SIX, <i>by Elwood Dean</i> .....	.05
MUST WE PERISH, <i>by Hershel D. Meyer</i> .....	1.00
THE COMMUNIST TRIAL, <i>by George Marion</i> .....	.50
ECONOMIC CRISIS AND THE COLD WAR, <i>edited by James S. Allen and Doxey Wilkerson</i> .....	1.00

---

NEW CENTURY PUBLISHERS • 832 Broadway, New York 3



JUL 28 1950

A Book Written Out of  
the History of Our Epoch . . .

LIBRARY.

# IDEAS THEY CANNOT JAIL

By EUGENE DENNIS

---

Eugene Dennis, General Secretary of the Communist Party, is in prison, but his ideas—his socialist principles, Marxist philosophy, world outlook, and proletarian internationalism—for which he and his Party have been convicted by the capitalist courts, are moving triumphantly forward in step with the forward march of history.

This book embodies the ideas of the Communist leader, Eugene Dennis. In this compilation of writings, speeches, reports, covering a period of the past several years, will be found the fundamental principles which express mankind's aspirations for a world without hunger, exploitation, oppression and war.

With an introduction by William Z. Foster, the book is divided into six parts, as follows: I. This Committee Is in Contempt; II. Patriots and Traitors; III. With All the Strength of Our Unity; IV. World Camp of Peace and Socialism; V. In Foley Square; VI. Forward to Victory.

This book, scheduled by International Publishers for publication in July, is a powerful weapon not only for the freedom of Eugene Dennis, but for peace, since it places the struggle against the warmongers and atomaniacs as the most crucial issue of our time.

The first printing of this book is 50,000 copies.

Price \$.50

*Order it in your club—one for yourself, one for a friend*

**NEW CENTURY PUBLISHERS**

832 BROADWAY • NEW YORK CITY 3

LEGE

AIL

Party,  
Marxist  
alism—  
e capi-  
o with

leader,  
eches,  
will be  
kind's  
ppres-

ook is  
Is in  
rength  
ialism;

r pub-  
edom  
ruggle  
crucial

e \$.50

riend