

political affairs

NOVEMBER 1953 • 25 CENTS

WILLIAM Z. FOSTER

[1] Marxism and the American
Working Class

BETTY GANNETT

[20] Towards a Society of Abundance

PETER COLTON

[36] The Eisenhower Congress
and the 1954 Elections

HUGH BRADLEY

[54] The N.A.A.C.P. Convention

V. I. LENIN

[61] Preface to "Letters to Sorge"

The Fascist Assault Upon Robert Thompson

The National Committee and the New York State Committee of the Communist Party, on October 25, 1953, sent the following telegram to President Eisenhower concerning the assault against Robert Thompson in the Federal prison in New York:

Robert Thompson, winner of the Distinguished Service Cross, member of the National Committee of the Communist Party, chairman of the New York Communist Party, lies at death's door at Bellevue prison ward, a victim of an unprovoked murderous assault while in Federal custody.

Responsibility for this murderous attack lies squarely at the door of your Cabinet appointee, Attorney General Herbert Brownell, head of the Department of Justice and thus overall chief of the FBI and the Federal Bureau of Prisons.

In a larger sense, responsibility rests with the anti-Communist, anti-labor, anti-democratic atmosphere intensified under your Administration by Senator McCarthy, State Secretary Dulles, Attorney General Brownell and FBI Director Hoover. McCarthyism, aided and abetted by the Brownell-Hoover political prosecutions, has sought to create an open season on Communists, progressives, trade unionists and New Dealers. Anyone who in any way stands for peace and basic constitutional liberties or questions McCarthyism, has been the target of unrestrained abuse.

The original Smith Act prosecutions, which were political trials in the guise of criminal proceedings, were directed against Robert Thompson and his colleagues primarily because they fought for policies of peace, democracy and economic security. These political prosecutions created the "legal" framework behind which McCarthyism has carried on its un-American activity.

It was in such an atmosphere that a fascist and convicted thief could feel that he might with impunity select a Communist for his murder attempt. Fascist Pavlovich obviously believed that in the atmosphere of McCarthyism the killing of a Communist would guarantee his American naturalization papers.

The attempt to kill Thompson while a prisoner raises in a new way the question of the safety of all American political prisoners—Eugene Dennis, Benjamin J. Davis and the rest—now in Federal penitentiaries. Elementary humanity requires prompt Presidential amnesty of all Smith Act prisoners and an end to all current and contemplated Smith Act prosecutions.

(Continued on inside back cover)

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 postage extra, \$3.00 a year. Single copies 25 cents.

Vol. XXXII, No. 10

NOVEMBER, 1953

political affairs

A Theoretical and Political Magazine of Scientific Socialism

Editor: V. J. Jerome

Marxism and the American Working Class

By William Z. Foster

IN EXAMINING the achievements, status, and perspectives of Marxism (or more properly, in our times, Marxism-Leninism) in the American trade-union movement, one of the most outstanding realities that strikes the eye is the marked decline in the acceptance and advocacy of Socialism in the trade unions that has taken place within recent decades. Formerly many labor unions freely accepted Socialism as the ultimate goal of the working class, and the propagation of Socialist principles and policies, although not the dominant note in the labor movement, was to be found pretty generally throughout the ranks of organized labor. Nowadays, however, such advocacy of Socialism is rarely—in fact, almost never—to be heard in the trade unions.

From the time of the Civil War, and even in the decade before it, Marxists openly and actively advocated Socialism, and their words found friendly ears among the workers. The Socialist Labor Party was formed in 1876, much earlier than

the Socialist Parties of many European countries. The Marxists were an important factor in the development of the National Labor Union, the Knights of Labor, and the American Federation of Labor, playing active parts in the many bitter strikes and other struggles led by these organizations. And a militant advocacy of Socialism accompanied all their work. As early as 1893, they succeeded, temporarily at least, in committing the A.F. of L. to a policy of "the collective ownership by the people of all the means of production and distribution."

On the eve of World War I the sentiment for Socialism was relatively strong in the American labor movement. Numerous A.F. of L. unions had avowed Socialist leaders, and in nearly all the organizations strong minorities were actively propagating the principles of Marxism as they understood them. Socialist sentiment was particularly vigorous among the coal and metal miners, the needle trades, painters, printers, brewery workers, machinists, and

many other groups. There were also active such union organizations as the Industrial Workers of the World and the Syndicalist League of North America, propagating their special versions of Socialism. In the 1912 convention of the A.F. of L., the Socialist Party minority, which openly spoke out for a Socialist perspective—however confusedly and opportunistically—polled 5073 votes for their candidate for A.F. of L. president, Max Hayes, as against 11,974 for Gompers.

Since those times, however, the advocacy of Socialism in the trade unions has just about vanished. It is not an exaggeration to say that today there is not an outstanding trade-union leader in the whole country who speaks up for a Socialist perspective for the workers. This is true not only in the A.F. of L., C.I.O., Miners, and Railroad Brotherhoods, but also in the independent progressive industrial unions. It may be remarked that during the same years of the decline of Socialist sentiment in the trade unions the Socialist Party, a vigorous and flourishing organization on the eve of World War II, has just about become extinct, and the Communist Party, its successor, has by no means achieved the growth made by Communist Parties in other major capitalist countries.

The decline of conscious Socialist sentiment in the trade unions during recent decades is a very important phenomenon, one which Marxists cannot afford to ignore—especially

as the workers' enemies, in the raucous spirit of American exceptionalism, interpret it as proof positive that Marxism is alien to the American working class and that there is no basis for Socialism in this country.

In dealing with the question of the status of the maximum program of the Marxists, which in our country is chiefly in the stage of educating the masses in Socialist principles, it will be well to start with what has happened over the years, particularly since World War I, with the minimum program of the Marxists—that is, with their immediate policies in the daily struggle for the strengthening of the workers' organizations and the improvement of their conditions. Here, in contrast to the scant results achieved in the advocacy of Socialism, real and solid accomplishments are to be found and the Marxists stand forth historically as a powerful and constructive force in the developing trade-union movement.

PROGRESS OF THE LABOR MOVEMENT

During the past generation the trade unions have made very considerable progress organizationally, and to some extent ideologically. They have also won many important concessions on wages, hours, and working conditions. Every struggle of the workers for almost a century has found Marxists in the front line setting the best example to the rest. Nor were their efforts in vain. Almost without exception this progress has followed lines actively advanced by

the Marxists in their minimum program of immediate work. Especially important has been the success achieved in the organization of the unorganized. For many decades the Left wing kept this basic question in the forefront of their immediate program, their fight always being for the unionization of the great masses of the working class, as against the narrow craft concepts of conservative trade-union officials. Since World War I, the number of organized workers has leaped up from 3,000,000 to 16,000,000, and major credit therefor must be given to the Marxists, especially to the Communists for their decisive role in the historic organizing campaigns of the C.I.O. during the 1930's and 1940's.

Another important plank in the immediate program of the Marxists that has been substantially realized by the trade unions is that of establishing the industrial type of labor unions. For at least forty years Marxists fought tirelessly for industrial unionism against traditional narrow and destructive craft union prejudices and interests. Their decisive victory in this issue came with the formation of the C.I.O. and the building of its industrial organizations. Steel, auto, and other mass production and trustified industries could not have been organized, except upon an industrial union basis. Along with industrial unionism came the "sit-down" strike, mass picketing, and other Left-wing tactics. Industrial unionism, for decades the issue of the Marxists, made pos-

sible this greatest stride forward in American labor history.

A great advance, too, of organized labor, especially during the past two decades, has been the development of the Negro-white-labor alliance. This is the closer cooperation that has taken place between Negro and white workers. It is marked not only by a growing fight against all forms of persecution and discrimination against the Negro people, but by a gradual opening of the trade unions and the industries to Negro workers. There are now over a million Negroes in the trade unions and the rank-and-file pressure is constantly growing in organized labor to make every union official post and industrial calling available to Negro workers. This long step forward has been taken in the face of the stubborn and pronounced white chauvinism of most, if not all, of the top trade union leadership. In helping vigorously to achieve this historic advance, the Communist Party has made one of its most basic contributions to the labor movement and the Negro people.

Then there are the advances made in the matter of government social insurance—against unemployment, sickness, old age, etc. A generation ago the controlling trade-union conservatives were waging war against the idea of the state developing such insurance, holding that it infringed upon the benefit systems of the craft unions. Even during the Great Economic Crisis of 1929-33, the A. F. of L. opposed unemployment insurance

on the absurd grounds that it was the "dole," that it would destroy the labor movement, and that it was against "the American way of life." But such bourgeois-inspired conceptions are now practically a thing of the past. Today the unions, besides developing their own benefit features, freely demand insurance from the state and the employers. Another long-fought-for plank of the Marxists has thus been realized. The fight of the Communist Party for unemployment insurance during the great crisis, which broke the backbone of resistance on this whole question, was one of the key fights in the history of the American labor movement.

Another long struggle by the Marxists, especially since the birth of the Communist Party, has been for trade-union democracy and an honest labor leadership. For a full half-century, from the 1890's to the 1940's, the American trade-union leadership was saturated with personal corruption, gangsterism, strike-peddling, and gunman control of the most blatant character. In this respect, the unions in this country stood forth as a horrible example to the labor movement of the world. To eliminate this corruption and autocratic control has always been a Left objective, again particularly since the Communist Party appeared upon the labor scene. This work, plus the great expansion of the trade unions during the past two decades, dealt a blow to the whole rotten leadership system. Democratic

and personally honest (not to mention politically upright) leadership have by no means been established; the top trade-union leaders still remain tools of the capitalist class, but obviously considerable progress has been made in removing the most flagrant forms of crookedness. The days of the gunman-racketeer controls by the Parks, O'Donnells, Murphys, Boyles, Brindells, and the innumerable other crooks and grafters, are definitely on the wane. A symbol of this new trend is the forced expulsion of the International Association of Longshoremen from the A. F. of L., on the specified grounds of its having a corrupt and rotten leadership. This action, taken under the pressure of the government and public opinion, could not possibly have happened twenty years ago in the A. F. of L., which then openly tolerated the most corrupt types of labor crooks in the world.

Other major advances of the trade unions could be cited, but let us conclude our analysis with the question of the trade union advance in political action. The American trade-union movement, which still has not developed a strong mass political party of its own, is in this general respect the most undeveloped of any important labor movement in the world. It is still following the political leadership of the parties of militant American imperialism. But even with regard to political action, under decades of hammering by Marxists and by the pressure of the general course of the political strug-

gle, there has been some progress, although its tempo is of a glacier-like slowness in labor's ranks. At least, there is no longer to be heard the primitive and once widespread cry of "No politics in the Union." Today, even though their official political thinking has not broken from bourgeois controls, the trade unions in general are far more politically-minded than they were a generation ago. Indeed, it can be said that there is now hardly a "pure and simple" trade union in this country. The A.F. of L.'s Labor League for Political Education and the C.I.O.'s Political Action Committee, both in their policies and structure, are still tied to the bourgeois parties and therefore are very far from constituting independent working-class political action, but they nevertheless represent a step forward in the political advance of the workers.

WHY THE LAG IN SOCIALIST CONSCIOUSNESS?

The above-mentioned measures (to which others might be added) represent definite progress of the trade-union movement. And it is important to observe that this progress has been along the lines of Marxist policy and analysis—looking towards a constantly more powerful labor movement—to meet the exigencies of an ever sharpening class struggle. Why, then, as we have remarked at the outset, has there been such a retardation in the acceptance of a perspective of Socialism on the part of the American working class, es-

pecially in contrast to the workers of many other countries?

In answering this question, before turning to the principal objective reason, it is necessary to bear in mind that the top leadership of the trade unions, who rule the unions autocratically and are active defenders of the capitalist system, constitute a powerful factor against trade-union progress. The history of the labor movement in this country, particularly in the past forty years, shows that the only way labor can take a major step ahead is for the more progressive-minded masses of workers to break down the opposition of their essentially boss-controlled, conservative leadership. The dominant Green-Hutcheson-Woll A.F. of L. clique, after many years of stubborn resistance, went even so far as to split the labor movement in 1936 in a vain effort to prevent the establishment of industrial unionism and the organization of the semi-skilled and unskilled masses in the basic industries. These leaders, too, have sabotaged for decades the struggles of Negro workers to secure even the most elementary justice. It also took the heavy mass pressures of the great economic crisis period to break down the traditional A.F. of L. top leadership's opposition to state social insurance. And every step towards independent political action by the working class has only been achieved in the face of the strongest opposition of the big trade-union leaders, with their roots in the two capitalist parties.

By the same token, this capitalist-minded labor leadership, controlling the unions and the labor press, has always made it one of their main points of policy to stifle and hinder the development of a Socialist consciousness upon the part of the working class. In this respect they have hardly been outdone by the capitalists themselves. Nor, to this general end, have they hesitated to develop the most active cooperation with the bourgeois state and the employers. Characteristic examples of this violent and ruthless anti-Socialism among the top trade-union leaders has been their ceaseless slander and vilification of the Soviet Union ever since that Government was founded, their complete acceptance of the vicious anti-Communist oath in the Taft-Hartley law, and their support of the present attempt of the Government to outlaw or destroy the Communist Party.

The traditional anti-Marxist, pro-capitalist attitude of the dominant trade-union leadership has thus undoubtedly constituted a powerful factor against the development of Socialist consciousness among the workers, but it is not the main reason for the lag in this general respect. The decisive reasons are to be found in the consequences to the workers of the rise of American imperialism as a world power, especially since the period of World War I. This development has produced economic and political effects which have definitely checked the growth of Socialist perspectives for

the working class.

The historical trend of working-class ideology in all capitalist countries is upward and onward—toward the development of a perspective of Socialism. But this development in class consciousness does not proceed in a steady, straight line. Instead, it advances in widely varying tempos and zigzags. Sometimes, in periods of relative calm in the class struggle, it may go ahead in a slow, evolutionary manner; then, during sharp political crisis, it may make mutations, great leaps forward; or, during times of unusual capitalist "prosperity" and imperialist upswing, it may even experience temporary periods of setbacks and retrogression.

The history of the world labor movement presents many examples, demonstrating the truth of these statements. Thus, the English trade-union movement went through a period of extreme militancy and radicalism during the 1830's-40's in the great Chartist movement; during the next several decades, however, under the influence of an expanding capitalist system and the development of British imperialism, this radicalism and militancy almost completely evaporated. This was because of somewhat improved conditions for the workers, including especially considerable concessions from the employers to the skilled workers. The period from 1850 to 1890 was what Engels called "the forty years 'winter sleep' of the English proletariat." Theories and practices of class collaboration became

the order of the day in the ranks of labor's leadership and thoughts of Socialism faded. This development Engels also called "the bourgeoisification of the working class."

Speaking of this period of ideological retrogression, Rothstein says, "There were new leaders, new methods, new interests, and new aims, and the traces of the old vanished so quickly that its very memory was all but obliterated in the next generation, and the few survivors [of the Chartist leadership] like O'Brien, Harney and Earnest Jones, seemed anachronisms, almost curiosities."¹ A few decades later, however, the erstwhile relatively quiescent British working class, under the pressure of the developing general crisis of world capitalism which gripped British imperialism suddenly awoke. In 1926 it carried through the national general strike of five million workers and two decades later resumed its forward march, and elected by a heavy majority a Labour government for Britain, in the expectation that this would establish Socialism in that country.

The experience of the German labor movement has been broadly similar. The rapid upswing of German imperialism during the closing decades of the 19th century and in the early years of the 20th century, with the consequent easing of the workers' general conditions of life and the corruption of the labor aristocracy by the employers, weakened the earlier militancy and revolution-

ary spirit of the movement, and filled the leadership with illusions of class collaboration, revisionism, and of evolutionary advances to "Socialism." This political degeneration led to the great debacle of 1914, when the Social Democracy, betraying its Marxist past, supported the German imperialist bourgeoisie in the war. In 1918, however, major sections of the same German working masses, under the impact of the October Russian Revolution and of the world war's devastation, quickly became revolutionary, chased the Kaiser out of Germany, set up Soviets all over the country, and would have carried through the potentially Socialist revolution had they not been betrayed to defeat by their treacherous, Social-Democratic leaders hopelessly corrupted by capitalist influences. The decisive shortcoming of the German working class was its lack of a powerful Communist Party able to defeat Social-Democratic treachery.

AMERICAN IMPERIALISM AND THE WORKING CLASS

The labor movement in the United States, due to the strong upswing of American imperialism during the past generation, is now also passing through one of the periods of slowing up of the development of its revolutionary perspective, such as we have remarked above in the case of Great Britain and Germany. This is because this imperialist expansion has been accompanied by the familiar pattern of certain improvements in the living standards of the masses,

¹ Theodore Rothstein, *From Chartism to Labourism*, London, 1930, p. 194.

material corruption of the labor aristocracy, and the growth of powerful currents of opportunist thinking in the trade-union movement as a whole, especially among the top leadership. Specific differences with regard to the United States in this general development are that in this country the imperialist upswing has been higher and longer, wage improvements have been more widespread, and the ideological corruption of the labor leadership deeper than was the case in either Great Britain or Germany.

By 1894, the United States, which was then becoming an imperialist country of great trusts and monopolies, was already industrially the strongest nation in the world, producing one-third of the total manufactured goods—its production, then worth \$9.5 billion, being more than double that of its nearest competitor, Great Britain.² Since then, by the operation of the law of the uneven development of capitalism, the United States has even further outstripped its capitalist rivals, until now it turns out two-thirds of all the industrial production of the capitalist world; its economic system has prospered greatly in the two world wars, its national income is far beyond that of any other country, it exports more capital than all the other capitalist countries combined, and every important capitalist nation in the world is on its dole.

The United States has become a

2. J. Kuczynski, *A Short History of Labor Conditions in the United States*, p. 63.

monster imperialist power, by far the richest ever created by the workings of world capitalism. Its fabulously wealthy capitalists are not only vigorously exploiting the American people, but also other peoples all over the world, the colonial and semi-colonial peoples and also those of big capitalist empires. Cannibalistically, American capitalism has grown rich on the woes of the rest of the capitalist world—from the great wars that have changed the world during the past generations, from the repairing of the vast damages done in these wars, from the huge preparations for new wars, and overall from the advantages which its tremendous imperialist machine gives it in the world markets and in capitalist exploitation generally. As the strongest capitalist power and true to the predatory character of imperialism, the United States, which has managed to set up a very shaky hegemony over the capitalist world, is now steering an ill-fated, disaster-laden course for world domination which Wall Street vainly hopes to achieve through a great world war against the Soviet Union, People's China, and the East European People's Democracies.

As in the cases of the imperialist upswing of Great Britain and Germany remarked above, there have been some improvements in the economic conditions of the workers in the United States during its period of greatest imperialist expansion. The workers, not so heavily plagued by unemployment during long

stretches of this generation (the past dozen years for example), have been more able to insist upon consideration of their demands for better working and living conditions. The United States (for specific reasons—not necessary to go into here) has historically been a country of higher wage standards than those prevailing in Europe and elsewhere, and the self-righteous capitalists of this country have never let the world forget the fact. Nowadays, however, in their attempts to picture the United States as a land of milk and honey, they have redoubled their boasting all over the world, taking undue credit to themselves and their capitalist system that American workers are the highest paid in the capitalist world. In the "cold war" the question of American living standards has become an issue of international propaganda importance.

Naturally, the American capitalists and their government agents, seeking to score a point in the "cold war," have greatly exaggerated such economic improvements in living and working conditions as have taken place during the long "boom" of American imperialism. Characteristic are the pollyanna statements issued by the Department of Labor, which, in a recent booklet, maintains that, "The wages of today buy more than twice as much as they did forty years ago."³ Far more realistic and accurate, however, is the analysis of the Labor Research Association, which puts the increase in average

3. U.S. Department of Labor, *The Workers' Story* (1953), p. 27.

real annual earnings of employed workers in American manufacturing roughly at 60% between 1914 and 1946—that is, rising from a base of 100 to 161.⁴ The A.F. of L., at its 1953 convention, basing itself on the government's figures released by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, states that from 1939 to June, 1953, "the actual buying power of the weekly wage earned by the average factory worker with three dependents rose by \$11.05 or 47%."⁵ There has been, of course, a substantial increase, but that is has created no utopia for American workers is made dramatically clear even by the conservative estimates on the price of family budgetary figures of the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. In this respect, the Labor Research Association says: "Even this inadequate B.L.S. budget, calling for about \$4,160 a year in most cities, is beyond the reach of the 33.9 million families (65% of all) who in 1951 received less than \$4,000 income."⁶

There are many other flies in the ointment of the capitalists' glowing story of high American working-class living standards. First, there is the fact that such economic advances as they have made in no sense correspond to the enormously increased productivity of the workers in the same period. Thus, the L.R.A., contrasting the increased productivity of the workers against their increased

4. Labor Research Association, *Trends in American Capitalism* (International Publishers, 1948), p. 98.

5. *Report of the Executive Council of the A.F. of L. to the 72nd Convention*, p. 261.

6. *Labor Fact Book No. 11*, p. 36.

real wages, from 1899 to 1946, shows that the general position of the employed worker in manufacturing has fallen from point 100 to point 75 during this period.⁷

The situation has continued to deteriorate since the end of World War II. The L.R.A. has estimated recently that the "relative position" of the average factory worker has declined still further to around 55, as compared with the base of 100 in 1899.⁸ This is a drop of around 65% in the overall position (productivity related to real wages) in the 54-year period since the end of the 19th century. (In the postwar years the decline was accentuated by the fact that the L.R.A. used the more realistic cost of living estimates of the United Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers of America.)

Similar methods were used by Kuczynski for an entirely different period, from 1868-78 to 1922-23, when he estimated that the "relative position" had declined from an index of 87 to 71.⁹

Besides, the wage improvements achieved are not spread equitably over the entire working class. The skilled workers, in line with the employers' policy of favoring them in order to use them against the bulk of the working class, have received by far the best of the real wage increases. In this respect the unskilled and unorganized, and especially the Negroes, have suffered. "The median wage or salary of white workers in

1950 was \$2,481, while the median for non-white was \$1,295, only about 52 percent of the white median."¹⁰ Characteristically, Douglas shows that whereas, for example, "the anthracite miners could purchase with a full week's work [in 1926] 71 per cent more than in 1914," "the clerical and salaried workers [unorganized] in manufacturing and railroading could purchase . . . in 1926 . . . [only] 6 per cent more than in 1914." And "unskilled labor . . . by 1926 was back only to where it was in 1919, and was actually slightly below its 1918 figure."¹¹ At the 1953 convention, the Executive Council of the A.F. of L. pointed out that "large groups" of unorganized workers "did not share fully" in wage increases. It states, for example, that the pay of laundry workers was only 56% of the average pay in manufacturing, and workers in retail merchandizing received only 53% of the average wage in manufacturing.

During recent years, since the rise of the C.I.O. and independent industrial unions, there had been some tendencies to narrow the wide gap, percentage-wise, between skilled and unskilled workers. This is in line with the diminished role of skilled workers in mass production industries and also in their leadership of the labor movement. The wage gap between organized and unorganized workers, however, continues to widen.

Finally, and most important of

7. Labor Research Association, *Trends in American Capitalism*, (1948), p. 98.

8. *Labor Fact Book No. 11*, p. 33.

9. J. Kuczynski, *A Short History of Labor Conditions in the United States*, p. 172.

10. *Labor Fact Book No. 11*, p. 33.

11. P. H. Douglas, *Real Wages in the U.S.*, Boston, 1930, pp. 583, 586.

all considerations regarding real wages, there is the precariousness of the workers' economic conditions generally in the face of recurring economic crises. Douglas says that real wages of workers in American manufactures increased by 30 per cent during the period from 1914 to 1926. But these increases were more than wiped out by the devastating economic crisis of 1929-33 and huge sections of the working class were reduced to near starvation conditions. By the same token, another big economic crisis (and one is beginning to shape up) could obliterate completely the present economic gains of the workers, which the capitalists are now so vociferously boasting about all over the world. Present American living standards are highly unstable and are under constant threat.

In the light of all this the contentions of the apologists of capitalism and of opportunists that the Marxist law of absolute and relative impoverishment does not apply to the U. S. are untenable. The American working class is historically travelling the same general path in this respect as are the working classes of England, France, Italy, Japan, etc.

GROWTH OF BOURGEOIS ILLUSIONS IN LABOR MOVEMENT

The increases in real wages among the workers during the past generation, despite the many negative features offsetting these increases, have slowed up the growth of Socialist consciousness among the workers

and favored the development of various bourgeois illusions as to the present and future of capitalism. Such illusions are, of course, assiduously cultivated by all the agencies of capitalism, especially the conservative union leadership. These dampening effects, however, while checking the growth of Socialist consciousness have not been sufficient, as we have seen, to prevent the labor movement from conducting innumerable, hard-fought battles and from realizing many advances in its structure and policy. Such improvements as the mass of the workers have achieved economically have not been automatic, but directly related to the workers' fighting spirit and the power of their trade unions.

The 1920's, in the upswing period of American imperialism after World War I, produced a luxuriant growth of bourgeois economic and political illusions in the labor movement. The capitalists, in the midst of a war-born industrial activity marked especially by a widespread introduction of new mass production methods and the speeding up of the workers, shouted to the world that American capitalism had "come of age," that poverty was being abolished, that economic crises were a thing of the past, that the class struggle was finished, and that Ford had defeated Marx. Prof. Carver put the froth upon this capitalist ideological stew which was the result of the industrial "boom," by asserting that American workers

were actually bringing about an economic revolution through the purchase of industrial stocks with their ample savings. He figured that in about a decade they would in this way come to own the bulk of American industry. The capitalist world stood spellbound at the "wonders" of this industrial system.

The capitalist-minded leadership of the A.F. of L. readily promoted these "prosperity illusions" hook, line and sinker, and so did the Right-wing Socialists, and Progressives of the period. Only the Communists stood firm and pointed out the nonsense and danger of this deluge of bourgeois ideology. The A.F. of L. adopted a "New Wage Policy," according to which, by the unions joining with the employers to speed up the workers, unemployment would be finally abolished and the workers placed upon a spiral of automatically improving economic conditions. The A.F. of L.'s "Higher Strategy of Labor" proclaimed that strikes were no longer necessary, various unions hired engineers to help the bosses to speed production, and over-financed and mismanaged labor banks became the order of the day. Never before had organized labor sunk so deeply into class collaboration and bourgeois ideological confusion.

The great economic smashup of 1929 dealt a shattering blow to this whole dizzy structure of bourgeois "prosperity drunkenness." With 17,000,000 workers eventually unemployed and probably as many more

working part-time the erstwhile extravagant glorification of capitalism came to a sudden halt. The radicalism of the workers was aroused, and fears of revolution from the outraged and enraged workers plagued the erstwhile high-riding capitalists. The whole "New Wage Policy"—"Higher Strategy of Labor" program of the A.F. of L. bureaucrats was swept away overnight, and they have never since been able to resurrect it. To have foreseen the economic crisis of 1929-33 in the midst of the prevailing ideological confusion, as the Communist Party did, was a theoretical justification of major proportions for Marxism-Leninism.

This wave of radicalization led to the organization of the workers in the basic industries and the formation of the C.I.O. It was the driving force behind all the reforms secured by the workers in the New Deal period. It was the mainspring of the fight against the fascist Axis in World War II.

Since the end of the war the American economy has again been on a high incline in its general upswing over the broad period since the outbreak of World War I. And once more "prosperity illusions" grow apace in the labor movement. The workers, lacking a mass class consciousness and a mass Communist Party, again fell victim to these illusions. The word is bellowed everywhere by capitalist forces of every description that all is well with capitalism and that only idle dreamers still look forward to a time when

there will be Socialism in the United States. But nowadays the bourgeois illusions being spread among the people and particularly in the labor movement by the capitalists and their labor agents are far more subtle and dangerous than were the ideological crudities of the "boom" period of the 1920's.

At the present time the labor movement is enmeshed in class collaboration with the employers on the basis of support for the latter's foreign policy of imperialist aggression. In some respects the top trade-union leaders, for a generation the most inveterate enemies of the Soviet Union, are even more warlike than the capitalists themselves. This pro-war united front (disguised under slogans of defense) between the Wall Street monopolists and the ruling labor bureaucrats, is made all the more dangerous to the workers because of the current growth of present "prosperity-bred" bourgeois illusions among the masses. These serve, in a fashion, as delusive working-class paths and thus tend strongly to prevent the development of Marxist perspectives of Socialism.

THE "WELFARE STATE" AND THE "MANAGED ECONOMY"

One of the major current class collaborationist "prosperity illusions" is that of the so-called "Welfare State." This theory, based on the fact that during the past few years the workers in some capitalist countries have been able to wring a few wage and hour concessions from the employers and some labor reforms from

the state (social insurance, minor tax readjustments, etc.) holds that the state has lost its former class character as an oppressive weapon of the employers, has come to stand above classes as such, and devotes itself to cultivating the welfare of the masses, particularly those of the working class. The argument goes further, to the effect that under the benign workings of the "Welfare State" there is taking place a radical redistribution of the national income in favor of the toiling masses. That is, "the rich are becoming poorer and the poor richer." This process, it is claimed, has already gone so far that the very nature of capitalism has changed and exploitation of the workers by the employers is rapidly becoming a thing of the past.

The quiet, "unseen revolution" is supposedly taking place, at varying tempos, in all the western capitalist countries. The most shining examples of the development, it is claimed, are the United States, Great Britain, and the Scandinavian and Benelux countries. The theory of the "Welfare State" has now become standard Right-wing Socialist doctrine all over the world, including the A.F. of L. and C.I.O. in this country. It is the latest variation of the general conception of "evolutionary Socialism." The theory is also accepted, more or less, by other brands of more outspoken petty-bourgeois reformers.

Reformist literature of all kinds fairly reeks with the general concept of the "Welfare State." Two char-

acteristic expressions of it are the recent books, *New Fabian Essays*, by R.H.S. Crossman, John Strachey, and others, well-known Right-wing Social-Democratic leaders of the British Labor Party, and *The Share of Upper Income Groups in Income and Savings*, by Simon Kuznets, an American economist.

The "Welfare State" theory is nothing more than characteristic opportunist nonsense generated by the synthetic "munitions prosperity" of the post-war period. Its various postulates cannot stand the test of Marxist-Leninist analysis. This is especially made clear, among other Marxist writings, in the book, *The Economics of War and Peace*, (International Publishers, 1952) by the British economist, John Eaton, and by a soon to be published study of Victor Perlo's in this country.

The simple fact of the situation is that the so-called revolutionary redistribution of the national income has not taken place. The capitalists are reaping greater and greater profits and they are ever more swiftly monopolizing their hold upon the productive forces of the country, while the toilers are getting progressively a smaller percentage of what they produce. The state also, in all the capitalist countries, remains in the control of the capitalists and is used by them to further their own class interests. This is true not only of the United States under the Roosevelt and Truman Administrations (supposed shining examples of the "Welfare State,") but also under

the regime of the Labor Party in Great Britain and of the Social-Democratic parties in the Scandinavian countries. During the Labor Party's Administration in Britain, for example, under the "Welfare State", the industries remained the property of the capitalists (80% privately and 20% through government bonds); the whole British industrial system, both "free enterprise" and state-owned, was operated by capitalist managers; the armed forces, the press, the educational system, the foreign service, and the various other key political and social institutions remained in the hands of the capitalists and their agents, and the employers made record-breaking profits. As for the Labor Government itself—dominated by the Attlees, Morrisons, and Stracheys—it was also led by men who are faithful supporters of capitalism and who have no whit of Socialism in their whole beings. The much bragged about "Welfare State" is a myth.

In the United States, during the "New Deal" period, beginning about 1935, the labor movement, including even the Left under Browder's leadership, tended to abandon propagation of the idea of Socialism, to accept the picture of the State as a beneficent instrument, and to accept uncritically the so-called Welfare State as the answer to the needs of the people generally and the working class particularly. Reformist illusions, thus stimulated, were further accentuated during the years of

American participation in World War II. The Communist Party since then has readopted a Marxist-Leninist position and advocates Socialism, but the propagation of Socialism still is not being carried on even by Communist militants in the independent progressive trade unions.

Another major element in the current luxuriant growth of opportunist illusions—and a seemingly plausible substitute for Socialism—is the so-called "Managed Economy." Like its twin brother, the "Welfare State," the "Managed Economy" harks back directly to the writings of the late Sir John Maynard Keynes, the noted British capitalist-economist. The whole system of opportunist thinking falls under the general bourgeois-reformist category of "Progressive Capitalism." Just as the Social Democrats and other reformers, in their deep intoxication with "prosperity illusions" during the 1920's declared that "Ford has defeated Marx," so now they are saying that Keynes has done the job. Keynes is their new Messiah.

The so-called managed capitalist economy (which in theory and practice is fundamentally different from Socialist planned economy) is supposed to assure continued and increasing high production and to prevent the development of mass unemployment. Its advocates claim that it is the solution to the harrowing problem of recurring devastating cyclical economic crises. This miracle is performed, they claim, primarily by the simple device of the Govern-

ment systematically stimulating industry through various means—by manipulating the interest rate, placing big government orders with industry, raising the purchasing power of the masses, etc.—when the normal operation of the capitalist economy cannot keep it in adequate operation. Thus, by "eliminating" economic crises and mass unemployment, and by keeping the economy upon a rising spiral of development, the "Managed Economy" is supposed to cure the basic weaknesses of the capitalist system and thereby to do away with the need or prospect for Socialism. All of which is crassest illusion.

The United States has had an extensive experience with the so-called "Managed Economy," which was not a managed economy at all. This was the substance of the economic policies of the Roosevelt regime, with its expenditure of some 35 billion dollars in "pump-priming." It was an attempt to pull this country out of the great economic crisis of the "thirties" by the stimulation of industry through direct government intervention. Great Britain, Nazi Germany, and various other capitalist countries had similar experiences to a greater or lesser extent. Keynes theorized this development in his well-known book, *The General Theory of Employment, Interest, and Money*, published in 1935. He did not "invent" the "Managed Economy" but merely presented it in the theoretical form known generally as "Keynesism."

Keynesism is the capitalist economics of the period of the decline of world capitalism. Its "Managed Economy" is the scheme by which the monopolists hope to overcome the ever-worsening cyclical crises. The big capitalists would doubtless like to have minor economic crises "to take labor down a peg or two," but they are mortally afraid that another such crisis as that of 1929-33 (or possibly one even worse) might well wreck the world capitalist system. Hence the decisive elements among them turn to the Keynesian "Managed Economy" in the vain hope that it offers the means whereby in the future such crises, if they cannot be completely eliminated, can at least be decisively eased. Accordingly, all the major capitalist countries now have Keynesian policies in mind in order to "combat" economic depressions of the future.

The Truman Administration was frankly committed to Keynesian measures of state intervention to counter economic crises, and so also is the Eisenhower Administration, despite all its blather about "free enterprise" and "no interference by the Government in industry." Eisenhower himself has announced that "Never again shall we allow a depression in the United States. The full power of private industry, of municipal government, of state government, of the Federal Government will be mobilized to see that this does not happen." Both parties voted in the main for the enactment of the Employment Act of 1946, the sub-

stance of which is Keynesian government intervention to forestall economic crisis.

Speaking of government economic policy, Robert S. Allen says, "If worst comes to worst and a business upset does occur, the powerful Joint Congressional Committee on the Economic Report has a plan all ready and waiting to restore stability and prosperity."¹² And Stewart Alsop adds, along the same line, "The Administration has no intention whatsoever of standing idly by, if the disaster of a depression threatens."¹³ Capitalist economists no longer accept economic crises as unavoidable as "acts of God." In line with Keynes, they now hold that these disasters can be prevented or at least greatly minimized.

The United Nations, expressing the policies of monopoly capitalism in this period, also proceeds upon the Keynesian theory. Its pamphlet, *Maintenance of Full Employment*, published in 1949, in referring to studies made of the economic policies of 26 affiliated governments, says, "All of them have in common the approach that they will attempt to counter depression by government program aimed at increasing effective demand." And, "In general the governments in this group [capitalist] declare in their replies that they will not be satisfied with reliance upon automatic stabilizers but that they will take active counter-depression measures."

12. N. Y. Post, October 4, 1953.

13. N. Y. Herald Tribune, October 4, 1953.

There is a strong Keynesian element, too, in the present huge production of war munitions in the United States and other capitalist countries. The foundation basis of this American arms race, of course, is the determination of the Wall Street monopolists to overrun and master the world through a great anti-Soviet war. They also find huge, immediate profits in such production. But there is present, in addition, the dangerous Keynesian conception that such production is necessary in order to keep the industries in strong operation. Generally capitalist opinion—of economists as well as of employers—is that if munitions production were seriously cut this would at once provoke a profound American and world economic crisis.

The Right Social-Democrats of the world, including the heads of the A.F. of L., C.I.O., Railroad Unions, and Miners, accept and endorse the Keynesian concept of the "Managed Economy," even as they do that of the "Welfare State." This is not to be wondered at as these people, who are either openly or covertly supporters of the capitalist system, naturally follow in the wake of the latter's ideologists and political leaders. Indeed, Social-Democrats have done some pioneering themselves in this general direction, with the theories of Kautsky, Hilferding, Bukharin, and others regarding "organized capitalism" and "ultra-imperialism." Monster munitions production is the major expression today of Keynesism regarding Government stimu-

lation of industry. This deadly line is supported not only by the big monopolists, but also by the labor bureaucrats. It is a tragedy of the present situation to find union leaders, many of whom pretend to be progressives, eager to "provide jobs for the workers" through munitions-making, and violently criticizing the Wall Street-Eisenhower government for cutting off a few billions from its gigantic military appropriations.

The "Managed Economy" of the Keynesians, like their "Welfare State," is a falsehood and a delusion, as Marxist economists—Eaton, Allen, Strack, Perlo, and others—have repeatedly pointed out. The capitalist economy cannot be "managed," i.e., stabilized, by the measures proposed by the Truman and Eisenhower (or any other) capitalist governments, nor can cyclical crises be averted. Keynesism cannot overcome the inner contradictions of capitalism, nor do the capitalist governments seriously try to. They are too much torn by conflicting class and group interests to do so. In the long run, the Keynesian policies can only increase the chaos of capitalist production and render the cyclical crises deeper and more devastating. Notoriously, President Roosevelt's pump-priming, while it somewhat eased the economic situation temporarily, could not overcome the long slump following the great breakdown of 1929-33—it was not until World War II began that American industry really got under way again. Nor can the present huge munitions pro-

duction, which operates as "pump-priming" on a greatly enlarged scale, provide permanent prosperity and full employment in the United States. Signs multiply on all sides—the big drop in farm prices, the increase in inventories in industry and trade, the spread of unemployment in various industries, the decline in foreign trade, etc.—that an economic crisis is in the making in the United States. The danger is that the ruling monopolists, may, with their munitions program, succeed in pushing the country into war in their desperate efforts to advance their insane program of world domination.

THE FIGHT FOR A MARXIST-LENINIST PROGRAM

Our analysis has shown that the Marxist conceptions have played, and continue to play, a most important role in the developing American labor movement. Their role has been, as we have seen, particularly effective with regard to the workers' immediate demands, and especially in the strengthening structurally of the labor movement—in the organization of the unorganized, the establishment of industrial unionism, the creation of the Negro-white labor alliance, the adoption of better fighting tactics, etc. The big shortcoming of the labor movement has been with respect to the development among the workers of an understanding and resolution for Socialism as such.

The changes now taking place in the American and world situation are making definitely for a sharpen-

ing of the class struggle, for a strengthening of the labor movement organically, and eventually for the awakening of a Socialist perspective among the workers. The top trade-union leadership has been going along in class collaboration with the big employers on the basis of an active support of their aggressive anti-Soviet foreign policy, of wage concessions to broad categories of organized workers, and upon the perspective of a long-time prosperity based upon the production of munitions and the building of a great world capitalist military machine. But the course of domestic and world events is undermining the foundations from beneath this whole structure of class collaboration, which has been so poisonous to the struggle and ideology of the American working class. American foreign policy has been running into one snag after another and is now facing the imperative of talking peace with the Russians or of finding itself increasingly repudiated by the world's peoples; the election of Eisenhower has brought to the fore the most violent enemies of the workers and has awakened grave and justified alarms throughout the labor movement and a strong political labor opposition to Eisenhower is in the making. The economic situation, hitherto experiencing a several years "boom" on the basis of gigantic munitions production, is now showing many signs of a growing economic crisis, and increasing masses of workers are becoming disillusioned with

the arms economy. The "managed capitalist economy" is showing itself to be quite "unmanageable" by Wall Street. All of which developments will imperatively call forth from the workers a big stepping up of their struggle against the employers with their program of fascism and war. All this is bound to produce a sharp radicalization of the workers' ideology.

It is not necessary that American workers be reduced to European wage levels before they become Socialist-minded. A heavy attack upon their present living standards will shatter current bourgeois illusions among them, and this attack is clearly in the perspective. Still fresh in mind is the tremendous organizational and ideological awakening of the American working class that took place during and after the big economic crisis of 1929-33. This period, and the succeeding years of the New Deal, marked the swiftest progress ever made by the working class, which became largely disillusioned with the intense class collaborationism which had drugged and paralyzed it during the 1920's. Organized labor is now moving toward a period of even more profound political awakening, class struggle and permanent ideological advance along independent class lines. The continued decline of world capitalism and the growing debacle of Wall Street's foreign and domestic policies will inevitably, and in the near future, confront organized labor in this country with the gravest

economic and political problems, and struggles. Already these are beginning to loom upon the horizon, and they will have profound ideological effects upon the labor movement.

Communists, of course, while recognizing the decisive importance of a changed objective situation in shaping the workers' ideology and sharpening the class struggle, do not stand around and wait, in the hope that this will of itself bring about spontaneously a great advance in the organization, struggle, and general social outlook of the working class. Our task in the present situation is to redouble our efforts to prepare the workers for the storms that are ahead, to teach them, to draw the full political and ideological conclusions for them. This means to fight more energetically than ever against the warmakers and fascists, along the lines of our established program of demands. It also requires a greatly stepped up fight against Keynesism and the associated bourgeois illusions now crippling the fighting spirit of the working class. The propaganda in the trade unions for Socialism must be resumed vigorously. The hitherto negative attitude of Marxist-Leninists in the face of the aggressive opportunist labor bureaucratic spokesmen for capitalism is unpardonable. The American working class is now on the eve of tremendous advances ideologically and organizationally, and Marxist-Leninists must be prepared to play their vanguard role in this development.

Towards a Society of Abundance

ON THE 36TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE GREAT
OCTOBER SOCIALIST REVOLUTION

By Betty Gannett

THE ANTI-SOVIET MILL keeps grinding: "Unrest inside Russia" has "forced changes." "Industrial workers can't get enough to eat." "Hungry workers make shoddy goods." "Sullen Russian peasants let crops rot in fields."

This is the "truth" of Soviet life fed an uninformed American public as the first Land of Socialism celebrates the 36th anniversary of its founding. For U.S. imperialism, bent on preventing a peaceful settlement of international tensions, must at all costs maintain the Big Lie of the "Soviet menace of aggression."

What better way to do this than to present the Soviet Union as a land torn with strife and enmity, its people living in poverty and under tyrannical oppression, its government in a "precarious position," rent by an "inner-power" struggle and threatened with "revolt"? The determined Soviet effort for peaceful negotiations of all disputed international questions can then be distorted into its opposite. Its aim of easing world tensions, of safeguarding world peace, can thus be made to appear as an attempt of the Soviet leaders, "bargaining from weakness," to secure a

breathing-space in order to overcome "internal difficulties." Such distortions can also be used to bludgeon recalcitrant allies into line, allies whose peoples, however, are not overawed by the myth of "Soviet aggression."

REALITIES OF THE USSR

The Soviet Union, despite the devastation caused by German occupation, has in the span of but a few years made gigantic economic advances. Industrial and agricultural production was restored to pre-war level by 1948, three years after the end of the war. This, notwithstanding the fact that the fascist invaders had completely or partly ruined and burned 1,710 towns and over 70,000 villages, wrecked 31,850 industrial enterprises, and destroyed nearly 100,000 collective and state farms, as well as 2,890 machine and tractor stations. They had put out of action iron and steel mills with a total annual production of 11,000,000 tons of pig iron, 10,000,000 tons of steel, and 8,000,000 tons of rolled metal. In the coal fields of the Donetz Basin and Moscow they had de-

stroyed mines with an annual capacity of 100,000,000 tons of coal. In the very process of liberating the occupied territories, cities, homes, factories and farms were reconstructed and set into operation.

This rapid restoration of the economy to the pre-war level, the reconversion to peace-time production, and the further expansion of industry and agriculture marked a leap ahead at a speed unknown in the capitalist world, even in the United States. Thus the XIX Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union was able to show that by 1951 the gross volume of industrial production was more than double the 1940 output. And in the twenty-eight years since the Fourteenth Congress, industrial output has increased twenty-nine times! No country in the world has been able even to approach such expansion.

This phenomenal industrial development has been accompanied by a steady rise in the living standards of the people, in a great cultural advance which has transformed the most backward villages in the remotest corners of the Soviet land.

The national income which attests to the growing well-to-do life of the people is today eleven times that of pre-revolutionary Russia. Almost 75% of this income goes directly to the working people for the satisfaction of their material and cultural requirements, while less than 30% remains in possession of the state, the collective farms and cooperative organizations for the ex-

pansion of the national economy and for other national and social needs—a sharp contrast to the situation in the capitalist countries where the major share of the national income flows into the coffers of the exploiting few on top.

In the post-war period the living costs of the Soviet masses have been cut in half as a result of five price reductions. With the nominal wages of the workers and the cash incomes of the farmers continuing upward, the real wages and real income of the farmers have increased by about 60 percent in the same period. The rapid rise in the purchasing power is shown in the increase by 29 percent since 1940 of retail sales in state and cooperative organizations.

Of course, as is known everywhere, the Land of Socialism has not experienced unemployment since 1932. The working class, showing a steady growth from year to year, has increased to 42,000,000. (In 1928 the figure was approximately 11,000,000.) The dread of unemployment has been eliminated forever, and everyone can find immediate employment.

The earnings of the working people, supplemented by various grants and benefits from state funds, include social insurance of a wide range, old age and disability pensions, free or reduced rates at rest homes, maternity aid, free medical service, free tuition in all educational institutions, free facilities for learning higher skills, etc.

Illiteracy, the plague of oppression, has long ago been wiped out, and the

peoples of the Soviet Union have attained a rich, cultured life. Schools and universities built in the tens of thousands now have a student body of 57,000,000. Millions study in the universities, colleges and specialized technical schools. Cultural-educational institutions, such as recreation clubs, cinemas, theaters, opera houses, libraries, sport centers, and book marts dot the whole country.

Thus, the welfare of the people, always the central concern of a socialist society, is assured by the continuous rise and improvement in the material and cultural standards.

On the international arena, the Soviet Union has greatly strengthened its position. Standing at the head of the entire socialist and democratic camp, the Soviet Union has evoked the admiration and support of millions everywhere for its consistent fight to prevent the outbreak of a new world slaughter.

The new Soviet peace offensive, initiated and extended in the past six months, arises not from weakness, but from the great strength of the camp of peace and democracy—a strength powerful enough to impose the peoples' will for peace upon those who would unleash a new world war. Its objective is to defeat the war plots against the Soviet Union and the countries of People's Democracy; to thwart the imperialist plans to crush in blood the rising colonial-liberation movements; to prevent the rise of a re-Nazified and re-militarized Germany as a new world threat; and to compel peaceful negotiations

of all disputed and undecided questions as the only path to world peace. For world peace, not war, is in the interests of the Soviet people as it is of the people in our country and everywhere. The Soviet Union, striving to realize the principle of co-existence of the socialist and capitalist states, thereby defends not only the interests of its people, but those of all humanity.

It is with the firm confidence that peace can be won, that the Soviet people on this anniversary of the Great October Revolution, advance on the historic path of the gradual transition to a Communist society.

* * *

The victory of the October Revolution, and the establishment of the Soviet form of government, represented the rise for the first time in history of a new social system qualitatively different from all exploiting systems of the past. The great bourgeois revolutions of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries which overthrew the system of feudalism and won a dominating position for capitalism, marked an important advance in human progress.

But the rise of capitalism replaced one form of exploitation with another—the exploitation of the serfs by the feudal landowners with the exploitation of the wage workers by the capitalist owners of the means of production. While rapidly expanding the productive forces of society, opening the perspective for the mass production of goods to satisfy human

needs, only a handful reaped the harvest of that expanded production. The overwhelming majority of mankind—the laboring millions—remained an exploited, destitute and oppressed mass of humanity. For capitalism did not eliminate class oppression and class antagonisms. It gave rise to bitter class warfare between the capitalists and the workers.

The historic political ascendancy of the bourgeoisie was accompanied by the rise and consolidation of the nation as we know it. In that progressive epoch of its existence it championed national sovereignty and independence. But by its very nature capitalism could not achieve the fraternal cooperation and friendship of nations. Instead, it steadily deepened the gulf between nations, creating new conflicts which finally called forth world slaughters—wars for conquest and plunder of other peoples and nations.

The new workers' state had the task of creating a new type of society—a socialist society, in which all forms of class and national exploitation and oppression would be abolished; in which the conditions would at last be realized for the elimination of all classes; in which the different peoples and nations would live in harmony, free and equal; and in which the producers, for the first time, would become masters of their destiny, creating a life of abundance for all.

A true and intimate understanding of this Land of Socialism, of the

heroic creative labor of its people, will help Americans to see through the Big Lie. It will help them to understand why that working class and peasantry, once freed of capitalist and landlord exploitation, could, in three-and-a-half decades, despite capitalist encirclement, overcome the age-old backwardness of Tzarist industry and agriculture and build a mighty industrial nation, second only to the United States. It will help them to understand why a socialist society seeks no imperialist expansion, and abhors aggression. It will help them to fight more vigorously to achieve that friendship and collaboration between the Soviet Union and the United States which is the cornerstone of world peace today.

Our Party, as the Main Report to the recent National Conference points out, "has the responsibility for developing a mass ideological struggle against the influence of the Big Lie." Fundamental in this task is the popularization of what is happening in the Soviet Union, and the truth about its policy of peace.

THE REPORTS OF MALENKOV AND KHRUSHCHEV

The full significance of the new vistas opening up for the peoples of the Soviet Union can best be understood by studying the new tasks outlined in the speech of Premier Malenkov to the meeting of the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. on August 8 of this year, and in that

of N. S. Khrushchev to the September Plenum of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union on "Measures for the Further Development of Agriculture."

In the next two or three years, the target is set for a sharp increase in the supply of articles of consumption and agricultural products. The Soviet Government and the Communist Party point out that this task is in the interest of bringing about a rapid rise in the material and cultural standards of all members of Soviet society, substantially higher than was foreseen in the second post-war Five Year Plan projected at the Party's XIX Congress, October, 1952. This task can be achieved by the Soviet people through overcoming the disproportionate lag in the output of consumption goods and in a number of branches of agriculture as compared to the rate of development of heavy industry.

"But if the production of articles of popular consumption is to be sharply advanced," Malenkov states, "we must first of all see to the further development and advancement of agriculture which supplies food for the population and raw materials for the light industries."

With trenchant self-criticism the reports of Malenkov and Khrushchev focus attention on the weaknesses to be eradicated in agriculture in order to bring about the necessary spurt in production required to fulfill this objective.

The further expansion of Soviet

food and light industries which today employ up-to-date methods of production, depends in the first place on a vastly increased supply of agricultural products. This cannot be achieved without a substantial improvement in all branches of agricultural production, precisely in those which have shown a lag. That is why the report of Malenkov, and particularly that of Khrushchev, in detail, chart the course for the immediate period ahead, to raise the agricultural production to the possible and necessary level, with special emphasis on livestock, and potato and vegetable crops.

But, no sooner were these reports published than speculation ran wild in the bourgeois press. The sober words of Malenkov and Khrushchev, and the great tasks outlined, underwent more than usual distortion.

Thus, columnist Anne O'Hare McCormick in the *New York Times* of September 23 wrote:

It is clear from Khrushchev's damning report that even the Russian peasants have never accepted the revolution. In their collective farms they have failed to produce enough to feed the growing industrial population. . . . The Soviet leaders have come to the conclusion that they have to increase the "material interestedness" of the people on whom their regime is based.

The *U.S. News & World Report* of August 21, in slick advertising style commented under the caption, "Farmers loaf, workers hungry, buyers kick":

It obviously is the people who now worry Premier Malenkov. It is to influence them that he holds out the hope, in his latest speech, of better things for the future—new bicycles, more-durable shoes, more potatoes, better-quality clothes, more consumer goods. . . . To bolster that promise, the Soviet Government has suddenly turned up in world markets as a buyer of food and clothing. . . .

Every stage of development of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics has witnessed vilifications, slanders and distortions at the hands of the bourgeois and Social-Democratic apologists of imperialism. The present is no exception.

The *leit-motif* of the anti-Soviet arguments of which the above are typical is that the Soviet economy, launched by the great Five-Year Plans, has failed, both in industry and agriculture, that misery is on the increase and life is unbearable, that the workers and collective farmers are near revolt, and that the Government finds itself compelled to throw sops to the people. That such a conception of the relationship of government to people should be born of home experience on the part of bourgeois writers and commentators is quite understandable. What must be challenged, however, is the attempt to apply that experience to the Land of Socialism. Likewise, the systematic policy of the capitalist class and its government to cover up failure and unkept promises to fulfill the needs of the people must indeed make for a cynical view as re-

gards self-criticism. This too is understandable. What must be challenged, however, is the attempt to direct the cynical view to the self-criticism of a Socialist government. For the system of Socialism, which is based on historically new principles and which has ushered in the highest type of democracy, depends for its every advance on the application of the weapon of self-criticism.

SOVIET AGRICULTURE

No, there is no "crisis" in Soviet agriculture. What the Soviet Union is aiming to reach, in the next two or three years, is, in Malenkov's words, "the creation . . . of an abundance of food for the population and of raw materials for the light industries." That is the grand and realizable objective of Soviet agriculture.

Soviet agriculture today is the most mechanized in the world, having at its disposal the most up-to-date machinery and scientific methods of farm cultivation. Instead of 25,000,000 peasant households in 1924-25 there are today 94,000 huge collective farms and 4,700 state farms employing 969,000 tractors and 255,000 combines. On the eve of the First Five-Year Plan 45% of the grain crop was reaped with scythe and sickle, 70% of the sowing was done by hand, and 40% of the harvest was threshed by flails and other hand implements. Today, as Khrushchev points out, 87% of the grain sowing, 98% of cotton planting, 96% of ploughing, and 70% of grain harvest-

ing are mechanized. Electrification of farm implements is being widely introduced, easing the most laborious farm tasks.

As a result, agriculture has greatly increased its output, and the people as well as industry, have received each year larger quantities of food products and raw materials. Grain production, which was the most serious problem confronting the Soviet Union from the very first days, and to which the country gave primary attention, has been solved once and for all. The country has plenty of grain, producing 40.4 million tons today as against 10.3 million tons in 1926-27. The people and industry have also received increased amounts of food products and raw material, without which the vast industrial expansion of the country could not have been achieved. Thus, potato production has shown an increase from 3 million to 12.5 million tons; meat (on the hoof) from 2.4 million to 5 million tons; and milk from 4.3 million to 13.2 million tons. Particularly rapid has been the increase in sugar beet and cotton production, and the postwar years have witnessed an increase in the production of flax, vegetables, melon and other crops.

Added significance is given to these data, when it is borne in mind that since 1925 the production of consumer goods has increased twelve-fold, guaranteeing a constantly rising supply of these goods to the Soviet population. In the post-war period alone output of articles of consumption increased 72%.

There is more of everything for the Soviet people—more cotton cloth, woolen cloth and silk fabrics; more shoes and clothing; more sugar, butter, meat and milk; more refrigerators, automobiles and television sets.

At the XIX Party Congress, Malenkov emphasized: "Now that the grain problem has been successfully solved, the results attained in agriculture can no longer be gauged in the old way, solely by the amount of grain produced." The task before the Soviet Union today is to record a similar advance in other branches of agriculture, especially in animal husbandry, fruit and vegetable production.

The aim now, having solved the problem of grain, is to introduce in vast quantity for universal, mass consumption, meat and meat products, milk and milk products, and varied vegetables and fruits. Dealing with this tremendous program for transforming the food habits of hundreds of millions of people, Khrushchev said:

With the rise in the material well-being of the working people the demand of the population shifts more and more from bread to meat and milk products, vegetables, fruit, etc.

And, again:

We should set ourselves the task of attaining a level of food consumption which should proceed from scientifically-based standards of a diet required for all-round harmonious development of healthy people. In this connection a vital task is to improve the composition of consumption by increasing

chiefly the output of livestock products and vegetables.

The Communist Party holds that the level of output does not correspond to the possibilities inherent in the collective farm system, with its powerful machine-tractor technical base. The Communist Party holds that the level of output of agriculture does not meet the growing demands of the population for food and industry for raw materials. A further rapid improvement in agricultural production becomes the prime task.

THE ECONOMICS OF SOCIALISM

The basic economic law of Socialism, brilliantly outlined by Stalin in *Economic Problems of the U.S.S.R.*, is "the securing of the maximum satisfaction of the constantly rising material and cultural requirements of the whole of society through the continuous expansion and perfection of socialist production on the basis of higher techniques" (p. 33).

But "the *maximum* satisfaction of the *constantly* rising material and cultural requirements of the *whole* of society," can be realized only when the country has created the material economic foundation for the production of plenty, an economic foundation which can assure an "unbroken expansion of production" (*ibid*).

In 1935, Stalin, speaking to the First All Union Conference of Stakhanovites, those glorious men and women who broke all technical standards of production, explained:

Why was it that capitalism smashed and defeated feudalism? Because it created higher standards of productivity of labor, it enabled society to procure an incomparably greater quantity than was the case under the feudal system. Because it made society richer. Why is it that Socialism can, should, and certainly will defeat the capitalist system of economy? Because it can furnish higher models of labor, a higher productivity of labor than the capitalist system of economy. Because it can give society more products and can make society richer than the capitalist system of economy can.

At the time of the October Revolution, Russia was an incredibly backward and poverty-stricken country, whose equipment in modern instruments of production lagged far behind those of the advanced capitalist powers. Its agriculture not only employed the most antiquated methods, but its peasantry was reduced to the level of paupers by the semi-feudal bondage on the countryside. The First World War, the imperialist intervention and civil war which followed the birth of Soviet power, further destroyed the productive forces of the country, bringing in its wake famine, suffering and mass privation. It required super-human efforts, the enthusiastic labor of the vast millions, to overcome the Tsarist heritage of backwardness, ignorance and destruction.

The backward industry and small peasant economy were incapable of eliminating poverty, incapable of creating a society of abundance to satisfy the constantly rising needs of

the population. Continuation of that technological backwardness would have doomed the Soviet land to imperialist bondage and led to the inevitable restoration of capitalism.

"Communism," Lenin stated in 1920, "is the Soviet power plus the electrification of the whole country . . . only when the country has been electrified, when industry, agriculture and transport have been placed on the technical basis of modern large-scale industry, only then shall we be finally victorious."

To industrialize the country—to place agriculture on the rails of large-scale mechanized production—was the primary task of the new Soviet Republic, if it was not to perish. It was able to approach this task in a major way not till ten years after the Revolution when it had re-attained the pre-Revolution level of production.

The First Five-Year Plan for the industrialization of the country and the collectivization of agriculture (1928-33) placed the Soviet Union firmly on the path of modern industrial development, freeing the Soviet Union from dependence on the capitalist world, and enabling it to develop rapidly along socialist lines.

The essential task of industrialization was the development of heavy industry, producing the means of production for industry and agriculture, as the necessary precondition for the advance to Socialism. Only heavy industry ensures social reproduction on an extended scale, and

creates the necessary foundation for mass production of consumer goods and for the application of scientific methods to agricultural production. It, furthermore, furnishes the necessary basis for the defense of the workers' state.

As Malenkov emphasized, "We must never forget that heavy industry is the foundation of the foundations of our socialist economy."

Since the Fourteenth Party Congress, while industrial output increased 29 times, the output of means of production increased approximately 55 times, changing the face of the entire country.

In 1924-25 the Soviet Union smelted only 1,868 tons of steel while in 1953 it will have produced 38 million tons. Actually a completely new metallurgical industry has arisen based on the most up-to-date scientific and technical discoveries, with a high degree of mechanization. Today, for example, 87% of all steel is smelted in open-hearth furnaces with automatic thermal regulators. This phenomenal advance has taken place despite the fact that the Hitler hordes occupied for a number of years the most powerful base of the metallurgical industry—the Ukraine—which accounted for 68% of the country's iron and 58% of its steel output.

In 1953 the Soviet Union will have produced over 320 million tons of coal as against 16,520,000 tons in 1924-25. At the beginning of the First Five-Year Plan, 85% of the

coal obtained was mined by manual labor; by 1950, the mechanization of cutting, stripping, removal and underground hauling of coal, had been completed. Over 1,500 coal combines and cutting machines, as well as 1,350 conveyor lines have been adapted for remote control. And the high concern for the human factor in production is evidenced in the exemplary safety and health measures introduced in all mines which have eliminated the mine disasters and industrial diseases that are considered as "natural" to coal and metal mining in the most advanced capitalist countries.

Pre-Revolutionary Russia trailed all capitalist powers in generating electricity. Yet electricity is the technical base of modern large-scale production. Today the Soviet Union is second only to the United States. This year the Soviet Union will have generated 133,000 million kilowatt hours of electricity as against 3,000 million in 1924-25. At the end of 1950, 68% of all hydroelectric plants had been fully automatized. New giant hydroelectric stations have risen all over the country, utilizing the mighty rivers as sources of energy, for the industrial and technical reconstruction of industry over a tremendous area. The two new Volga hydroelectric power stations now being constructed will be considerably more powerful than Grand Coulee or Boulder Dam, which up to now have held first place in the world.

Heavy industry has been developed

in all regions of the country. New industrial centers have been created in the Volga region, in the Urals, Siberia, the Far East, the Kazakh Republic, and in the republics of Central Asia and Transcaucasia.

The rate of industrial development in the areas of the formerly oppressed nations has overtaken the general rate of development, to speedily catch up with the more advanced nations. Thus, by 1952 the total volume of industrial output in these areas had trebled in comparison with 1940 (in the country as a whole industrial output had more than doubled). This rapid progress was made possible by the fraternal economic, political and cultural assistance of the more developed Soviet nations.

The significant transformation of the formerly backward oppressed nations into advanced socialist nations is recognized, if unwillingly, in a series of articles by Harrison E. Salisbury, foreign correspondent of the *New York Times*. Thus in an article published on September 29, he describes the changes brought about in Tashkent, "one of Asia's great metropolises." In part, he writes:

What is important about Tashkent, is that it exemplifies Soviet policy in Asia and that it is being seen by larger numbers of Asians from other lands each year . . . visitors receive a continuous impression of the speed with which the Soviet Union is bringing old Asia into the twentieth century.

It is easy to dismiss all this as "Soviet propaganda," but it is as dangerous as it is easy. It appears to be successful

propaganda because it is founded on a nucleus of fact. . . .

What is it that gives Asian visitors to Tashkent such impressions? It is the sight of a modern metropolis existing in typical Asian conditions—a huge Asian city with excellent health standards, education, sanitation, clean streets, rapidly improving housing, electric facilities, substantial if not fancy consumers' goods, an abundance of food, an abundance of work, a rapidly widening industrialization program and constantly improving agricultural productivity.

Along with this they see equality of races under the law and the participation of larger numbers of Uzbeks and other Central Asian peoples in government, industry and education.

The enormous investments in industry, a total of 638,000 million rubles in the period of the Five-Year Plans, have enabled the Soviet Union to build up, as Malenkov emphasized "a powerful and technically perfect heavy industry." This was accomplished in less than three decades, on the basis of the inner resources of the country through the application and mastery of the latest achievements in science. This was accomplished in the course of the resolute execution of the general line of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union defeating the wrecking and sabotage tactics of imperialism and its nefarious agents within the Soviet Union.

Thus, today, the Soviet Union is in a position to continue the development of heavy industry while at

the same time overcoming the lag in the rate of development of agriculture and light industry. With a powerful industrial base, with strong collective farms and with trained technicians and specialists in all areas of economic construction, the Land of Socialism now has all the conditions for a qualitative advance in supplying the population with an abundance of articles of consumption.

Not a "modest improvement" in the standard of living is being undertaken by the Soviet people. There have already been more than modest improvements in the 36 years of the existence of the Soviet republic. What is now envisaged is a qualitative leap forward, on the basis of the new and growing requirements of a people that have long left behind the conditions of insecurity, poverty and hunger. For Socialism means a constantly expanding inner market, a market no longer restricted by a purchasing power limited by exploitation. Socialism creates an inexhaustible market, determined by new requirements ever growing as the purchasing power increases with the expanding economy.

For Socialism, Marxian Socialism, means, not cutting down individual requirements, but developing them to the utmost, to full bloom; not the restriction of these requirements, or a refusal to satisfy them, but the full and all-round satisfaction of all the requirements of culturally developed working people.—Stalin, *Report to Seventeenth Congress, C.P.S.U.*

SOCIALIST INCENTIVE

The kept press has attempted to give its own twist to the emphasis on personal incentive contained in the report of Khrushchev, as though this were a new element in Soviet economy—in industry or agriculture: The emphasis on personal incentive, or "material interestedness" is not raised today because life in the Soviet Union "has evidently become unbearably hard," as Anne O'Hare McCormick would have the American people believe. It is stated with new emphasis, because concern for personal incentive is basic to a socialist society if it is to advance to Communism.

The apologists of capitalism have always foretold the inevitable collapse of the Soviet Union because "Socialism destroys all personal incentive."

But the fact remains that under capitalism it is not personal ability or initiative, but the ownership of property, which determines the position of the individual in society. Notorious is the robbery of the fruits of inventors' incentive by trustified capital. Those "who get on in the world" do so by exploiting others, by appropriating the labor of the mass of producers. "Every man for himself and the devil take the hindmost" is the morality of a capitalist society.

Socialism does destroy the capitalist incentive for expanding production—the profit-greed—and replaces it

with a powerful new incentive for raising production—the constantly rising material and cultural well-being of all. Socialist society, for the first time, gives the producers a real interest in the development of production.

While under capitalism every advance in labor productivity means enrichment of the few and at the same time increased exploitation, speedup and added job insecurity for the many, under Socialism, increase in labor productivity brings with it expanded social benefit through the easing of the labor and the increase in the material and cultural wealth for the entire people. The industrial worker and collective farmer of the Soviet Union knows that in expanding production, he is working at one and the same time for himself and for society. Only under Socialism does personal ability and personal initiative advance the position of the individual producer and improve the position of all producers. Collective cooperation has taken the place of cut-throat competition.

As far back as 1921, Lenin stated: "Every important branch of national economy must be built up on the principle of personal incentive." (*Selected Works*, Vol. IX, p. 265.)

This is the essence of the guiding principles of Socialist society, the first phase of Communism, that: "He who does not work neither shall he eat," and "from each according to his ability, to each according to his work." These principles combine the

individual interests and incentive of the producer with the public interests, and serve as the decisive levers for the development and expansion of industry and agriculture.

Social society, arising on the ruins of capitalism, still bears the imprints of the old society, where, as Lenin said, the workers "all their lives had been compelled by hunger and want to work by the threat of the stick." It is utopian, he emphasized, to think that the workers will overnight learn to work for society, learn to work voluntarily according to their ability, ridding themselves of the habits and concepts bred by capitalism. If idlers, parasites and swindlers, carrying over into the new society in construction the pernicious habits of life under capitalism, are not curbed; if there exists a formal equalitarian approach to labor, regardless of quantity and quality of work performed, and unequal amounts of work receive equal wage payments, then the stimulus to the development of production is destroyed. Society thus would not be able to create the material prerequisites for that higher stage of Communism where all will receive according to their needs.

That is why, under Socialism a system of wage payments exists which recognizes differences in skill, differences in heavy and light work, differences in quality and quantity of work performed. A higher productivity of labor is rewarded by higher wages; a skilled worker receives more than an unskilled work-

er; a technician receives more than the skilled worker.

These differences in wage payments exist not in order to maintain them forever, but as a stimulus to expanding production, to encourage the skilled worker to improve his skill further, and the unskilled worker to rise to the level of the skilled. This helps to introduce a new labor discipline, the elimination of loafing and the aimless shifting from job to job, and creates a respect for the dignity of work, not as a compulsion, but as a prime condition for human existence. This also contributes to the development of a socialist approach to labor, to the need for protecting socialist property, to the need for heightening labor productivity as the means for advancing the material and cultural standards of the individual and of the people as a whole.

Instead of the destructive capitalist competition which shoves aside everything in its way, there arises the movement of socialist emulation, where the force of example and mutual cooperation helps to unleash the creative enthusiasm and talents of the people to raise labor productivity to new heights. For the best examples of creative labor serve to convince the people that all can achieve a prosperous and cultured life by their own efforts.

That is why the movement of socialist emulation, which is revolutionizing the techniques and methods of production and sweeping aside

all old traditions and habits of work, is a genuine popular movement of the Soviet millions, attesting to the great energy, ability, and creative initiative of the broad masses.

In agriculture, too, the principle of personal incentive prevails. Here the very form of collective farm organization—the *artel*—combines the individual interests of the collective farmers with their public interests. In the *artel* the basic means of production—the land and the main instruments of production—are state or public property, while the individual farmer has a subsidiary personal husbandry, the size determined by each collective farm organization—a piece of land around personal dwelling, small instruments, poultry, cows, horses, pigs, a certain amount of grain, etc.

Payment for labor is determined also according to the quantity and quality of work performed, with the collective farmers receiving payment in cash and kind on basis of work-day units, according to the classification and norms set. Any violation of these *artel* principles tends to negate the incentive for increasing agricultural yields, just as equalitarianism in wages tends to retard industrial production. The individual incentive for increasing production on the commonly-owned enterprise, the collective farm, and the maintaining of a personal husbandry to satisfy certain personal needs of the family, must be maintained so long as "the commonly owned enterprise of the

collective farm is insufficiently developed and cannot satisfy in full measure both the common needs of the collective farm and the personal requirement of the collective farmers." (Khrushchev.)

The ignoring or violation of the principle of "material interestedness" in certain branches of agriculture such as animal husbandry, was one of the important factors for the lag behind other branches of agriculture. Thus when collective farmers realize from delivery and sale of cotton, for example, 17-36 rubles per work-day unit, and from animal husbandry, only 5 rubles, there is little incentive for the expansion of this vital branch of agriculture, for applying more scientific methods to increase herds of livestock, or to improve their quality.

The Soviet Government and the Central Committee of the Communist Party, in outlining the tasks to rapidly overcome the lag in animal husbandry, potatoes, vegetables, fodder crops, and to further improve the yields of other crops, as a prime condition for providing people with more food and industry with a greater supply of raw materials, based themselves on the fundamental principles of Socialism. That is why measures were introduced:

1. To raise the procurement prices for meat, milk, wool, potatoes and vegetables sold to the Government under the obligatory delivery system and to increase the purchasing price for surplus grain, vegetables,

potatoes, meat, milk, eggs and other produce, after obligatory deliveries have been completed. This had the objective of eliminating the disproportionately low incomes received by collective farmers in these branches of agriculture and thereby to stimulate the incentive for increasing and improving production.

2. To overcome in a number of collective farms and districts wrong attitudes and violations of the principle of the maintenance of a personal subsidiary husbandry; to reduce the obligatory deliveries levied on the personal subsidiary husbandry, and carry through a reduction in agricultural tax rates by approximately one-half. In this way, to help develop the personal subsidiary husbandry, which, though subordinate to the common enterprise, is vital for raising the well-being of the collective farmers and increasing the supply of agricultural products to industry and the urban population.

3. To assure more extensive mechanization and electrification of agriculture; to guarantee an increased supply of machines and tractors; to improve the efficiency and quality of the machine and tractor stations by creating a permanent staff of tractor drivers, machine operators and other specialists, and to extend agronomical and zootechnical assistance to the collective farms.

Through such measures, every effort will be exerted to utilize more effectively the mechanized base of Soviet agriculture and the achieve-

ments of science, to rapidly increase the yields of all crops, to increase the commonly owned livestock, thereby reaching a higher output of marketable agricultural and animal products.

The Soviet people, strong in their moral and political unity, will fulfill the new tasks set by the Government and the Communist Party—for the fulfillment of these tasks means to advance on the path toward accomplishing the maximum satisfaction of the constantly rising material and cultural requirements, the path toward the gradual transition to Communism.

* * *

The Great October Revolution was victorious because at the head of the working millions stood the indomitable Communist Party. For the working class can accomplish its historic task, emancipate itself together with all exploited and oppressed, from capitalist slavery, establish the dictatorship of the proletariat, and build the new socialist society, only if it is led by its own political party, the Communist Party.

Fulfilling its role of leader and guide of Soviet society, the Communist Party organized the creative enthusiasm and energies of the people for the carrying through of socialist industrialization and collectivization of agriculture. Applying consciously the economic laws of Socialism in the interests of society, the Communist Party successfully led the people in heroic labor to the transformation of

Russia's age-old backwardness, erecting in its place a mighty socialist industrial power.

In thirty-six years the Soviet state created all the material conditions for a society of abundance, for the uninterrupted expansion of production to satisfy the rising requirements of *all* the members of socialist society. It has thereby created all that is necessary to advance to a full Communist society.

In irreconcilable struggle against all enemies of the people, who conspired to turn back the clock of history, the Communist Party consolidated the firm alliance of the working class and the peasantry, as the granite foundation of the Soviet state. In this way it organized the force which, as Stalin said, "explains the secret why the Soviet government was able to smash the old forces of society, and why in our country the economic laws that the relations of production must necessarily conform with the character of the production forces remained in full scope" (*Economic Problems of Socialism*, p. 10).

The living, dynamic and transforming role of the great liberating science of Marxism-Leninism is confirmed in the practice of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. For in truth, the history of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union is the history of Marxism-Leninism in practice. Creatively applying to every

new stage of development this most advanced science of mankind, the Communist Party has set an example of creative, not dogmatic Marxism, of the great transforming force of the ideas of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin when intimately connected with life. In indissoluble unity with social practice the science of Marxism-Leninism was further enriched and developed by the new experiences of socialist construction and the advance to Communism. The study of the history of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union is an indispensable task in the mastery of Marxism-Leninism today.

The flunkies of imperialism may rant and rave. Their lying words have lost the power to deceive the millions in all parts of the world, if not yet in our own country. For the truth of Soviet achievements has broken through the barrage of slander and falsification. The force of example of the Soviet Union's advance to a life of plenty, charts the path to the abolition of poverty, ignorance and oppression. A prosperous life for all is attainable when the working people rid themselves of capitalist domination, and learn to administer the state, to organize production in their own interests without capitalists and landlords. This truth will continue to penetrate the minds and hearts of exploited humanity. This truth is invincible.

The Eisenhower Congress and the 1954 Elections

By Peter Colton

THE 1954 CONGRESSIONAL ELECTIONS will be the first national test of the reactionary, pro-war policies of the Eisenhower-Big-Business Congress and Administration. In this lies their crucial importance for labor and the people.

The major parties formally opened their campaigns at the Chicago meetings in September, more than a year in advance of election day. The most extreme reactionaries had begun preparing even earlier. Thus, the Senate Republican Campaign Committee back in August had already lined up the pro-fascist McCarthy, to campaign next year in the Illinois, Minnesota, and other key Senatorial races.

On the other hand, election preparations among the main organizations of labor and its principle allies, the Negro people and the working farmers, have lagged badly up to now. So little was done, for example, at the August 13 meeting of the A.F. of L. Labor League for Political Education (LLPE) that "no report was made to the press" (*N.Y. Times*, Aug. 16)—or as the *AFL News Reporter* (Aug. 21) puts it more delicately, "the Administrative Committee of the LLPE was

conducted so briskly that it wound up short of its allotted time."

If, then, 1954 is to register an electoral setback for Wall Street, this lag must be quickly overcome and a great mobilization of labor and its allies set in motion. Communists can have no more important task than to contribute their maximum to this mobilization.

This is all the more in order because, as the Main Report to the Communist Party National Conference* clearly establishes and recent events bear out, tremendous new opportunities are opening up to broaden and advance the struggle for peace and for the protection of the people's living standards and democratic rights. Conditions are maturing for achieving in 1954 "a big step forward in independent political action."

In the first place, the winning of a truce in Korea and the easing of international tensions—the fruits of recent Soviet peace initiatives launched in the midst of the growing crisis in the war policies of American imperialism—are begin-

* Andrew Stevens, *New Opportunities in the Fight for Peace and Democracy* (New Century Publishers, N. Y., 1953).

ning to unfreeze thinking in labor and political circles regarding the central overriding issue of peaceful negotiations as the method of resolving international differences. The Administration's desperate efforts to increase world tension and block peace in Korea, as in the forced exclusion of India from the Korean political conference, are further isolating the United States. This gives added impetus to the process of rethinking even in circles which hitherto fully supported the bi-partisan "cold war" program.

A major reflection of this is the Stevenson report on his six-month tour of Europe and Asia. Freshly confirmed as titular leader of the Democratic Party at the Chicago conference, Sept. 14-15, he told a national television and radio audience that on his trip he found "universal anxiety and impatience to ease the tensions, to explore every possibility of settlement and negotiation." He found, further, that "there is uncertainty abroad about America and our objective. Is our objective to discover through negotiations ways to relax tension, or is it intensification of the 'cold war'; is it co-existence or extermination of Communist power?"

Stevenson, to be sure, did not remove this uncertainty. Indeed, he specifically endorsed virtually the whole range of "cold war" measures, from intervention in Indo-China to the restoration of German militarism. Nonetheless, his slogan—"the

door to the conference room is the door to peace"—promptly brought charges of "softness to Communism" and "egg-head appeasement" from such leading Republican spokesmen as Governor Dewey and Senator Ferguson.

It is clear that the Stevenson speech opens up a limited but highly significant breach in the cold-war ranks. Whether this is further developed depends primarily upon the extent to which the labor movement and the forces around Stevenson rally in support of this qualified but unmistakable recognition of the people's demand for peaceful negotiations. If they do, this will greatly advance the struggle for peace in the next session of Congress and the '54 elections.

In the second place, growing signs of an approaching economic crisis are producing deep concern in the ranks of labor, as well as the farmers. Already certain advance effects are being felt; over-time is fast disappearing, the rate of hiring is declining and lay-offs are beginning to appear in basic steel, among other industries.

This is happening at a time when the mass of labor sees Big-Business taking full command in Washington. They begin to see a very real Wall-Street depression—and not a mythical Soviet "aggression"—looming ahead. And their fears are reflected in the more militant, anti-Big-Business tone of the Detroit and other Labor Day meetings, speeches and messages.

It is in this context that Durkin's resignation from the cabinet takes on added meaning. Not only is the last lingering labor fig-leaf stripped from the Eisenhower Administration. Not only is Eisenhower himself convicted by the A.F. of L. convention of double-crossing labor. Not only does the issue of labor's rights and the repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act take on new urgency. Durkin's exit must be seen as a general call to arms, bidding labor to take the offensive in Congress and at the polls in '54 against Wall Street's anti-labor crusade.

In the third place, rampant McCarthyism-McCarranism is encountering growing resistance. The understanding is beginning to develop that McCarthyism is more than inquisitions and character assassination. It is a conspiracy to blight the new prospects for peace, to cripple labor's fight for its living standards and rights, to stem the struggle for Negro rights and representation.

The anti-fascist masses of the world understand this. McCarthyism, Stevenson told his audience, had become a "world-wide word." Thus, world opinion adds to the growing demand that all democratic forces in the U.S. intensify their struggle in Congress and in 1954 against this menace.

Once conscious of these broad new opportunities, Communists will be able to shake off defeatist anti-parliamentary moods and neglect of

legislative and electoral struggles, and address themselves to the immediate tasks. Of these, the following need to be singled out for special emphasis:

(1) To help give labor and its allies a sharp, uncompromising estimate of the first session of the 83rd Congress; to show the great damage Big Business has done and the greater dangers that lie ahead; to show why it has so largely had its way and how the labor and people's movement can check the offensive.

(2) To help set in motion, on the basis of this estimate, a variety of movements of struggle—*now*, between sessions, and during the second session; movements which, projecting into Congress the main legislative issues arising out of the struggle against the Wall Street policies of war, crisis and fascism will lay the basis for effective electoral activity in '54.

(3) To plunge immediately into detailed electoral preparations, seeking above all to help labor and its allies to play a more important role in setting electoral objectives and policies and in shaping electoral coalitions, programs and candidacies.

I

In essence, the record of the first session of the 83rd Congress is the story of Big Business beginning to cash in on the results of the 1952 elections. The estimate current in labor, liberal, and Democratic Party circles of a "do-nothing," "do-little"

or "study-and-postpone" Congress obscures this basic fact and conceals from the masses the real import of the session.

It is true that the Eisenhower Congress did nothing to redeem the President's many campaign promises to labor and the people (other factors, as we shall see, compelled him to agree to a truce in Korea). It is true that such important matters as tax, farm and labor legislation were deliberately postponed to the next session. It is even true that relatively little legislation was passed altogether.

This is simply because the Big Business offensive took the overt form of legislation only in part. For the most part it took the more subtle form of budget-cuts, administrative actions, stacking of key commissions, etc. When viewed in this light, the record will show that a great deal was done—and even more prepared for the future. It will show that Big Business, having brought a Republican Congress and Administration into power for these express ends, undertook (as forecast in the Party's National Committee Draft Resolution of December, 1952):

(1) To try and stem the growing crisis in American imperialism's policies of aggression by going over to ever more aggressive measures, threats to spread hostilities in Asia, increased pressure on its "allies," expansion of atomic war preparations, etc.

(2) To position itself for the com-

ing economic crisis by destroying whatever New Deal social and labor legislation and machinery had survived the Truman regime, thus removing any legislative and administrative barriers to the drive for profits and ensuring that the full brunt of the coming crisis would be borne by the masses of labor, the Negro people and the farmers.

(3) To stimulate an orgy of McCarthyism-McCarranism, of anti-Communist incitement, of attacks on the rights of labor and the Negro people; to cripple resistance to its war and hunger program both by building a mass base for fascism and by diverting the people from the real issues of peace and bread.

How does Big Business fare? What does the record show?

FOREIGN POLICY

In the field of foreign policy, Korea was the dominant issue. Faced with a military stalemate and a grass-roots demand for the promised truce, Eisenhower at first (State of the Union Message, Feb. 2) sought a way out for American imperialism through threats to expand the war. Sharply rebuffed by American and world opinion and thrown off balance by the spring peace initiatives of the Soviet Union and People's China, he then sought refuge in peace demagoguery (April 16 address to the Society of Newspaper Editors). Finally, when even the last-minute provocations of Rhee failed, the Administration reluctantly agreed to

a truce. And today, through Dulles and Lodge, it is doing everything possible to prevent the truce from becoming a peace.

What of Congress? Following the State of the Union Message, Senator Sparkman led the Democrats in a short-lived sally against the danger of expanding hostilities (they quickly switched to attacking the "danger" of reduced war expenditures). With this exception, Congress did nothing but throw up road blocks in the way of peace. Taft, shortly before his death, called for American withdrawal from the UN and a "free hand" in Korea. Knowland, his successor as Senate Majority leader, publicly sponsored and encouraged the Rhee provocations throughout. McCarthy was permitted to serve as Administration spokesman in condemning the Churchill-Attlee concern for an armistice. And the major official action by Congress was unanimous passage of a resolution opposing the admission of People's China into the UN.

The second question was the war budget. Eisenhower had promised both tax cuts and a balanced budget, and the obvious way to comply was to slash "defense" funds. Here an elaborate deception was engineered with the aid of Truman and the Democrats. First, Truman deliberately inflated the estimates for the 1953-54 war budget. Then, under the plea of balancing the budget, the Eisenhower Congress squeezed some water out of the Truman arms esti-

mates and made real cuts in the tiny labor and welfare sector of the budget. Some military overhead was trimmed and war contracts cancelled and reallocated in accordance with Secretary Wilson's dictum—"what's good for General Motors is good for the country." Thus, the appearance of arms cuts was contrived, while the big unexpended sums from past budgets guaranteed continuation of maximum arms outlays. Actual war expenditures, according to the Department of Commerce *Survey of Current Business* (August) rose from 48.9 billion in 1952 to the annual rate of 53.5 billion in the second quarter of 1953. And the Administration at this writing is planning new appropriations for atomic war and atomic war "defense" in next year's budget.

(As a by-product of inter-corporate rivalry for war contracts—and some re-direction of arms production along atomic war lines—some cut-backs have taken place, as in the Chrysler tank plants. It was to the workers thus displaced that Truman no doubt directed his Labor Day attack on "defense cuts." But the very pressing problems of these workers can be solved only by expanded trade and peace-time production, not, as the Democrats have been urging, by further ruinous arms expenditures.)

Finally, throughout the session a variety of war-inciting steps were taken. Eisenhower appointed a commission to prepare the way for the

reintroduction of UMT legislation. With Congress concurring, he appointed the notorious atomic war enthusiast, Admiral Radford, as Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff; and the Dixiecrat Byrnes, as a UN delegate—now slated to be top American representative to a UN committee handling the question of South Africa! Dulles and Senator Wiley announced plans to disrupt the UN from within through Charter revision, while the McCarthyites used the Bricker amendment to spark the attack from without. McCarthy carried his fight against peaceful negotiations even to the point of opposing Bohlen's confirmation as Ambassador to the Soviet Union on the grounds that he had been present at the Yalta Conference.

If, then, Big Business was unable to stem the crisis in foreign policy, if it was forced to give ground on the Korean truce, this was due to the strength of the world peace camp, the growing conflicts in the camp of aggression, and the mass yearning for peace among the American people. In Congress, however, no voice reflected this yearning, no consistent opposition was expressed to the Administration's drive to heighten world tension.

DOMESTIC POLICY

In the matter of domestic policy, the campaign promise "not to turn the clock back" was quickly scrapped, as Eisenhower set about completing the job that Truman had begun. Big

Business inaugurated a new era of "give-aways" and "take-aways"—so many-sided that a mere catalogue of the main steps taken and planned will have to suffice.

First, the Eisenhower Congress launched the "give-away" program by opening up vast public areas to the profit-hungry corporations. The very first piece of major legislation, the Tidelands Oil Bill, turned over to four state governments to pass on to monopoly capital, some \$50 billion's worth of offshore oil and mineral resources. Eisenhower's phrase, "the TVA is creeping socialism," guided Congress in slashing funds for public power. His Department of the Interior promptly dropped plans for the 560-million dollar Hell's Canyon project (leaving the field to that "free enterprise," the Idaho Power Company) and on August 18 publicly buried public power with a policy declaration calling henceforth for a "partnership" of federal, local and private interests in power development. Legislation was signed providing for the disposal of 500 million dollars worth of government-owned synthetic rubber plants on terms favorable to private industry. Bills were introduced to turn over 458 million acres of public lands to mining, cattle and lumber interests. The Atomic Energy Commission proposed that private industry take over the development of power from atomic energy, a move that the away of atomic know-how."

Second, Congress and the adminis-

tration took away what little was left of price and rent controls—with the result that the BLS index measuring cost of living reached a new record high in July (114.7% of the 1947-49 average) and climbed still higher in August to 115 (*N.Y. Times*, Sept. 24). Extortionate returns for realty interests were further assured when Eisenhower appointed Albert Cole, enemy of public housing, to direct the program and Congress provided the final blow by limiting new public housing units to 20,000 for the coming year—after that none.

Thirdly, more giveaways and takeaways came in the area of tax and fiscal policy. Congress not only failed to cut income taxes but held hearings to lay the ground for a federal sales tax. Treasury Secretary Humphrey raised interest rates on long-term government bonds from $2\frac{1}{2}$ to $3\frac{1}{4}$ %, with the result that “taxpayers of this nation will have to pay 1 billion more just to finance the government’s debt” (*AFL News-Letter*, Aug. 7)—and small borrowers are being compelled to pay increased tribute to banks and finance companies. The Senate approved a German debt treaty whereby the U.S. “forgives” \$2 billion in post-war debts (*i.e.*, gives away \$2 billions in taxpayers’ money), one billion to assure private American holders of pre-Hitler German bonds of 100% payment plus $3\frac{1}{2}$ % interest, and one billion to bolster the Aden-C.I.O. called a “multi-billion giver government.

Fourthly, Congress, with no objection from “fair-minded” Eisenhower, in effect took away what protective labor legislation was on the books (minimum wage, child labor, Walsh-Healey) by slashing the budget for the Labor Department’s enforcement agencies. It cut the Office of Education budget so severely that Commissioner McGrath resigned. The Taft-Eisenhower pledge to extend Social Security went by the board and instead, as Truman pointed out in his Chicago speech (Sept. 14), Eisenhower “set up a study committee headed by a man who not only voted against extending Social Security, but said the whole program is ‘totally unmoral.’”

Finally, the Administration, through Secretary Benson, unfolded a powerful campaign in the name of “free enterprise” to convince the farmers to give up or weaken the farm price-support program which expires next year unless renewed by Congress. But the crisis-ridden farmers, a pivotal electoral force, have not succumbed. On the contrary, as the overwhelming (87%) pro-price support vote of the wheat farmers showed in July, they are fighting the Eisenhower-Benson campaign to a standstill.

And to drive the lesson home, the predominantly agrarian 9th Congressional District of Wisconsin, in a special election (October 13) that the whole country agreed would be a test of support for the record of the Eisenhower Administration—

particularly on farm policy—defeated the Republican candidate by a wide margin.

Beyond this, and the list is far from complete, the record shows that Eisenhower has just about completed the job of packing with arch-reactionaries the key government economic and regulatory commissions and boards, such as the Federal Trade Commission, the Federal Power Commission and soon the NLRB. Further, as the *Democratic Digest* (October) points out in detail, he continues to appoint literally dozens of “study” commissions, in order to devise new—and conceal accomplished—attacks on public housing, anti-trust prosecutions, farm benefits, etc.

Especially loaded and dangerous are two groups authorized in the closing days of the session. One is a new Hoover Commission which will study government function (*i.e.*, policy) and not merely efficiency. The other is the President’s commission on Intergovernmental Relations which under the guise of “studying” the “proper” division of labor between federal and state or local government, will prepare new Republican-Dixiecrat “states-rights” drives against the remaining federal-aided social welfare and civil rights programs.

Thus, on the domestic front, if we except the farm situation, Big Business has largely succeeded. This is likewise the case in the area of democratic rights legislation—scene

of the most extensive Eisenhower campaign demagoguery in 1952.

The story regarding labor’s rights is familiar. Eisenhower failed even to issue a statement on Taft-Hartley Act revision and his celebrated double-cross of Durkin removed the one outsider from his millionaires’-club cabinet. (The *N.Y. Times*, following Durkin’s resignation, seriously proposed that Eisenhower appoint a new commission to “study” labor legislation—and no doubt he will). Meanwhile, a most dangerous drive shaped up in Congress to pass the Butler Bill which would McCarranize the entire trade-union movement.

Despite many campaign promises to the Negro people, the record on Civil Rights was the worst in years. Since the struggle on cloture at the opening of the Senate, not a single committee hearing—much less floor debate and action—has taken place on the many F.E.P.C., anti-lynch, anti-poll tax and other civil rights bills introduced in this session. Even the American Jewish Congress Commission on Law and Social Action is moved to note (*N.Y. Times*, Aug. 11) that “President Eisenhower gave no leadership in any of these legislative efforts.” Nor did the “liberal” Democrats—with one or two exceptions—make any serious attempt to force these issues to a decision.

Needless to add, in this area, too, Eisenhower appointed a new body—the Government Contract Committee—intended to forestall a federal

F.E.P.C. and divert attention from his unfulfilled pledge to end discrimination in the District of Columbia by executive order. The first step taken in line with this committee, a no discrimination proviso for banks handling federal crop loans, was quickly cancelled when Dixiecrat Byrnes protested.

Instead, the Eisenhower Congress emerged as the Congress of McCarthyism and McCarranism, of witch-hunts and book-burning. An unprecedented number of inquisitorial committees operated throughout and after the session, led by McCarthy and his principal partners, Jenner and Velde, among others. The Senate cooperated by passing Senate Bill 16, to deprive congressional witnesses of the protection afforded by the Fifth Amendment. In time, the spectacle became so revolting, as in the instance of the attack on the Protestant clergy, that the Democratic members of the McCarthy investigating sub-committee resigned in protest. And the lone liberal Democratic spokesman against McCarthyism, Senator Lehman, was joined on the Senate floor by "middle-of-the-road" Democrat Moroney and extreme conservative McClellan.

Eisenhower interposed no obstacle to McCarthyism-McCarranism. Despite the rising public opposition to this menace, he ran out on his specific, repeated pledge to revise the racist McCarran-Walter Act. Worse, the *N.Y. Times* now reveals (Sept.

24, story by Clayton Knowles) that "a hard and fast understanding, originating at the leadership level in the Senate" now exists, the major point of which is "that there shall be no amendments to the McCarran-Walter Act of any nature at the next session"—and all but explicitly traces this understanding to a deal between Eisenhower and McCarran!

Eisenhower had Attorney General Brownell step up the Smith Act and other prosecutions of Communist and progressive leaders, especially after the Korean truce—in order to try and head off the gains for democratic rights that might flow from the easing of world tension. Eisenhower thus earned the hearty commendation of McCarthy who in a recent speech declared (*N.Y. Times*, Sept. 24) there is "not even the remotest kind of a fight between President Eisenhower and McCarthy."

At the close of the session the Jenner Committee issued a report on "subversion" depicting every main achievement of the period of the New Deal and the anti-Hitler war as a "communist plot." Intended as a kind of Republican campaign hand-book for '54, the document gives the full McCarthyite ideological cover for the Big Business offensive against the social gains of the past and against the struggle for peace and democratic rights today.

II

Why was it possible for Big Busi-

ness so largely to have its way in the Eisenhower 83rd Congress? Why was there so little popular resistance? Could the record have been different? Can the Wall Street drive be checked in the next session?

To begin with, there was relatively little resistance because—

(1) The people generally did not grasp the full meaning of what was happening. The concrete effects of the session, for the most part, will not show up in experience until later—when taxes increase, electricity-rates rise, slum conditions worsen, wages-hours inspection breaks down, etc. (The exception, again, is the farmers; *already* experiencing critical price declines for their products, they fought every Administration step to pave the way for dropping price-supports.)

(2) The illusions in Eisenhower remained strong in many sectors. These stemmed from his campaign demagoguery but were reinforced and spread by the "wait and see" policy of the labor and Democratic Party leadership, by the Dubinsky-Right Social-Democratic thesis that Eisenhower is all right but McCarthy and the "isolationists" won't let him be President, and now by the truce in Korea which the Administration is seeking both to exploit and wreck.

(3) The "opposition" party—the Democrats—*didn't oppose*, and the main labor, Negro and liberal organizations, trailing along under Social-Democratic influence, gave no effective lead to struggle. This was

the decisive factor.

What was the role of the Democratic Party? The official line of Stevenson and the Democratic Congressional leadership was "loyal opposition" where loyalty was to the bi-partisan cold war program and opposition was largely centered on the so-called "defense cuts." Senate Minority Leader, Lyndon Johnson, in his remarks at the close of the session, put the point bluntly (*Democratic Digest*, August, p. 37): "Never since the time of the Whigs and the Federalists has an opposition party so abdicated partisanship [read opposition] as we have done." Little wonder he then gave this estimate of the session: "What we [Democrats] have actually been confronted with [by the Administration] has been largely a matter of creating study commissions and extending the legislation that we had passed. We are content."

Johnson may be content, but millions of trade-unionists, Negro people and farmers are not. Sensing this growing mood, the canny Truman, at the Detroit Labor Day dinner, a month later (*N.Y. Times*, Sept. 8) confessed: "I wanted to see this Administration a success. I advised our people in the Senate to give them a chance." But, he continued, "We gave them their chance and they threw it out of the window. Now let's go after them and get this thing corrected."

What of labor? Generally, the A.F. of L. and the C.I.O. adopted a

wait-and-see attitude, with much of the A.F. of L. even wooing Eisenhower. On the Washington scene, they confined their activity to the routine of hearings, press-releases and bulletins. Locally there was considerable mass activity in relation to state legislatures and city councils. But throughout the session, labor organized no mass delegations and lobbies to Washington, no conferences in the field to mobilize the membership. Exceptions were the independent unions, like the U.E. and the Mine Mill, which not only covered hearings and kept their membership informed, but also, within their limitations, organized a number of delegations and conducted field activity. (Incidentally, while this is not the principal point, it is nonetheless interesting to note that in the first six months of '53 the power, railroad, and real estate lobbies alone recorded lobbying expenditures of \$480,000 whereas the A.F. of L. spent \$62,000 and the C.I.O. \$18,000—*AFL News-Reporter*, Aug. 28).

This lack of leadership carried over into the early estimates of the session—which confused and understated the real picture. Thus, the *Auto-Worker* (August) wrote: "The best that can be said for the first Eisenhower Congress is that its record on international affairs was better than on domestic issues." The A.F. of L. Executive Council (*AFL News-Reporter*, Aug. 14) said: "The last session of Congress did little more than tread water. Instead of

advancing, Congress actually drifted back." The C.I.O. Executive Board description came closer (*C.I.O. News*, Aug. 24)—"a record of doing too little for the little people and too much for the big boys."

With labor and the liberal Democrats largely abdicating, the N.A.A.C.P. took a pessimistic view of legislative activity, confined itself to hearings and statements and conducted no mass mobilizations on civil rights to Washington as in the past.

The Communists and the Left generally, apart from some contributions to the work of the independent unions and the Progressive Party, were largely isolated from the Congressional battle and by no means fully alerted to what was happening. This was due first to the fact that the Left was just beginning during this period to recognize and take steps to overcome general isolation from the main currents of political life. The problem was accentuated by past neglect of, and defeatist attitudes towards, national legislative struggles. A further factor was the failure to integrate the central issue of peace into the national legislative scene and to place it in the context of the struggle against the Big Business "give-away" drive.

There can be no doubt that if the mass democratic forces—who held such deep fears of the consequences of an Eisenhower-Republican-Dixiecrat victory in '52—had been continuously mobilized and alerted for

struggle, the Big Business drive could have been slowed down or stalled. And there can be no doubt today that as the effects of the session take concrete shape, the broken promises pile up, and the illusions in Eisenhower weaken, it will become all the more possible to check the offensive in the second session—provided the real story and the lessons of the first session are brought home. It is here that the Communists and the Communist and Left press can play a major role.

As it is, a mass demand for leadership has already begun to arise in the last weeks as the results of the 83rd Congress begin to sink in. It was not only for partisan reasons but also because he sensed this mass impatience that Truman felt it necessary on Labor Day to tell his party to "go after them." The Durkin resignation has helped clear the way for a more militant fight by labor. The Stevenson speech opens up new possibilities in the legislative struggle for peaceful negotiations. The N.A.A.C.P. Convention's call for a mass Civil Rights Mobilization in Washington next year can spark a new upsurge in legislative activity especially among the Negro people.

Communists, as they enter increasingly into the mainstream of labor and political life, will find these and other new opportunities to press for an active mass legislative struggle against Big Business in the second session of the 83rd Congress.

III

The second key task at this moment therefore is to help develop broad movements of struggle on specific Congressional issues; movements to stave off new threats such as the sales tax (or manufacturer's tax, to use Eisenhower's euphemism) U.M.T., the Butler Bill; movements to undo the damage of the past session, e.g., in regard to McCarthyism, public power and public housing; movements to press ahead for a policy of peaceful negotiations, for F.E.P.C., Taft-Hartley repeal, extension of Social Security, etc.

A major obstacle will be the tendency to postpone legislative activity until after the '54 elections on the ground that the situation in Congress is hopeless. This "wait-for-'54" theory must be fought. It misconceives the entire relationship between movements on issues and electoral activity. If movements are not developed now—between sessions—and during the next session, if labor and the people "wait for '54," they will wait in vain. For electoral successes can only be won on the basis of movements on issues. Further, the "wait-for-'54" theory assumes that there is now a kind of breathing-spell, that reaction too will wait. The present activities of the McCarthy, Butler and other committees show how wrong this is.

What are the main issues around which broad legislative struggles can be developed? These include:

(1) For peace in Korea and a policy of major-power negotiations to settle international differences.

(2) Against U.M.T. and for cuts in the war-budget.

(3) Against a sales tax (or "manufacturer's tax") for tax cuts in lower income brackets, tax exemptions for working mothers, tax increases on corporate profits.

(4) For restoration and expansion of public housing and other public construction, increased Social Security and expanded world (and especially East-West) trade to meet the growing problem of lay-offs.

(5) For repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act and defeat of the Butler Bill.

(6) For a federally enforced F.E.P.C., for anti-lynch, anti-poll-tax and other civil rights legislation.

(7) For farm price-supports based on 100% of parity and the other main farm demands, increased credit, soil conservation payments, etc.

(8) For defense and extension of the public power program and an end to land-grabs and other giveaways; for restoration of the Hell's Canyon project, strengthened rural electrification and additional TVA's.

(9) For the 18-year old vote, and increased recreational and educational facilities.

(10) Against the McCarthyite inquisition; for the expulsion of McCarthy from the Senate, for the abolition of the House Un-American Activities Committee; for the repeal or thorough revision of the McCarran-

Walter Act, defeat of Senate Bill 16, repeal of the McCarran Internal Security Act and Smith Act; an end to Smith Act and other McCarthyite prosecutions and amnesty to all victims of McCarthyism.

Some of the immediate forms of action on these issues to which Communists and other progressives should give urgent attention are;

(1) Visit-your-Congressman campaigns during the recess. These are vitally necessary to focus mass attention on the record of Congress and to put pressure on the individual Congressman in the coming session. Thus, the Executive Council of the A. F. of L. (*AFL News-Letter*, Aug. 14) has called on "the American people to make clear between now and January to their Congressmen and Senators the necessity for enacting a courageous and constructive program which would fill the vacuum left by the present session."

In this connection, particular note should be made of the welcome initiative of the Progressive Party in launching a poll of congressmen on some ten critical issues. They urge their local P.P. organizations not only to set up their own delegations but also to get other groups to organize parallel delegations on any one or more of these questions.

(2) Struggles in relation to Congressional Committee Field Hearings. A number of these are being held throughout the recess and can become important occasions of struggle. Apart from the McCarthy-Jenner

hearings, the most important include:

(a) The Butler Bill hearings on "communism" in unions: these will be held beginning Nov. 1 by a self-styled "task force" composed of McCarthy's protegee, Butler, Welker and McCarran. (Velde, too, has announced that he will conduct similar hearings in Illinois, and also announced his candidacy for the Republican Senatorial nomination.)

(b) House Agriculture Committee Hearings: These have been held in New England and the South and are scheduled for the mid-West in October. The Southern hearings, as reported in the *N.Y. Times* (Sept. 23) have shown "farmers overwhelmingly in favor of high price-supports," with a group of farmers led by H. L. Wingate, president of the Georgia Farm Bureau, telling the committee that "not only should we have 100% of parity, but supports should be extended to perishables. Similiar pleas have been made for farmers in Mississippi, the Carolinas and Alabama."

(c) The Hendrickson Committee Hearings on Juvenile Delinquency, scheduled for the main industrial areas.

(3) Participation in specific issue movements of national, regional and local character linked to legislative struggles shaping up in the coming session. Some examples already under way are: movements in mid-west farm equipment and other industrial centers against lay-offs; the

Western states movement to save public power, like the Hell's Canyon Association; movements in the Southern and farm belt states to protect farm price-supports; the N.A.A.-C.P.-sponsored Civil Rights Mobilization projected for Washington; the movement to break up the McCarran-Eisenhower deal and repeal or fully revise the McCarran-Walter Act in the coming session.

The Left and advanced forces should participate fully in these and other movements. They should, however, learn to put forward their own critical, advanced thinking both within these movements and independently. Especially is this needed where the broad movement uncritically accepts as its program a measure like the Lehman-Celler Bill which makes serious concessions to the McCarranism of the McCarran-Walter Act.

Likewise, Left and advanced forces should give careful thought to some independent Washington delegations and appearances, on the questions of peace, McCarthyism, etc.

IV

Legislative movements, however, will not of themselves produce electoral victories against the Big Business - Eisenhower Administration. What is necessary, in addition, are specific electoral preparations in the form of political action organization, platforms, candidacies, and campaigns.

Time is already of the essence. A

number of states, among them Illinois, Pennsylvania, Ohio, New Jersey, Alabama, Florida, and Oregon, hold primaries in April or May, with filing deadlines as early as January. Many races will go by default unless electoral tasks are tackled immediately.

The chief issues of the '54 campaign, as they presently shape up, have been outlined above in connection with the legislative movements. What remains is to review electoral objectives and to point up some questions of emphasis and direction in the electoral work of the Communists.

As to electoral objectives. To begin with, as the effects of the Eisenhower Congress begin to be felt and legislative struggles sharpen, undoubtedly the main labor and people's organizations will more and more view the '54 elections as an opportunity to deal a significant blow against Big Business-Republican-Dixiecrat reaction. With this sentiment and aim the Communists fully associate themselves.

At the same time, in view of the generally pro-cold war policies of the Democratic Party leadership—and the prevailing tendency of labor's leadership to trail along behind the Democrats in electoral activity—this aim will surely be frustrated unless labor and its allies display greater independence and initiative in their relations with the Democrats as regards both issues and candidates.

Therefore, it is essential that, with-

in the context of this broad general movement against Big Business and its Republican-Dixiecrat spokesmen, the Communists urge upon labor and its allies the following specific electoral objectives, as outlined in the Main Report to the Communist Party National Conference:

(1) To bring the fight for peace into the halls of Congress by defeating the most rabid war-mongers and opponents of peaceful negotiations, and by electing a strong bloc of active fighters for peace and proponents of peaceful negotiations.

(2) To elect an anti-McCarthy Congress by defeating every McCarthyite-McCarranite, especially singling out for defeat those who are incumbents, and by electing a powerful bloc of conscious and determined fighters against McCarthyism.

(3) To increase the number of trade-unionists in Congress; to increase the representation of the Negro people in Congress.

For it is to the extent that labor adopts, fights for and achieves these three key objectives, that the '54 elections will in fact yield a setback for Big Business and "a big step forward in independent political action."

How can the Communists help realize these objectives?

First, Communists must intensify all aspects of the struggle to implement the electoral policy of the National Committee Resolution. Here, experience shows that in a number of areas a beginning has been made in overcoming isolation and in de-

veloping Communist understanding of a coalition electoral policy.

Thus, the rich experience of the New York Municipal campaign indicates that the New York CP has conducted a generally effective struggle for a coalition line. The Party has made real contributions to the victories already recorded in the area of Negro representation. It has helped influence the outcome of successful electoral battles against reaction, as in the Democratic Mayoralty primary.

But experience likewise shows that *little practical headway has been made in New York and elsewhere on the decisive question of strengthening labor's independent political action.* There is little evidence throughout the country, for example, of serious, sustained efforts to help carry out the recommendations—essentially a sound basis for immediate labor political action—of the U.A.W. Convention Political Action Resolution.

It is therefore necessary, secondly, that Communists center their attention above all on helping to carry out the concrete, specific and local steps required to further labor's independent political role and its ability to fight for such electoral objectives. Among these steps are:

(1) The participation and leadership of labor in the legislative movements on specific issues flowing from the struggle for peace, against McCarthyism, against lay-offs, for civil rights, etc.

(2) The activation and building, on the basis of issues, of local P.A.C. and L.L.P.E. organizations—based on the shops but also emphasizing independent neighborhood organization as well as special measures to mobilize women workers and young workers.

(3) The preparation of independent state-wide and district-wide political action conferences of the organizations of labor, the Negro people, the farmers, the liberals—as called for by the U.A.W. Resolution.

(4) The early projection of active trade-unionists as candidates—and the energetic championing by labor of movements for increased Negro representation in Congress and state office.

Thirdly, labor must be urged, while building its independent strength, to develop a real fight for these electoral objectives in the course of its relations with the Democratic Party. The forms of this fight naturally will vary, depending upon the precise form of the relations all the way from conferences to primary fights.

This is all the more necessary in view of recent developments in the struggle within the Democratic Party. Labor needs to take note of the opposing tendencies which are at work. On the one hand, the struggle sharpens, as in the New York City Mayoralty primary where the Farley-Dixiecrat group suffered a signal defeat in their attempt through the Impellitteri candidacy, to take over the New York State Democratic

Party. On the other hand, the national Democratic Party, in the name of party unity, makes further concessions to the Dixiecrats at its Chicago Conference.

Furthermore, not only are the Farley-Dixiecrat forces seeking to extend their influence but a new so-called "moderate" or border grouping is emerging around Senators Symington, Lyndon Johnson and others whose chief function is to run interference for the Dixiecrats and to make increased war expenditures the central campaign plank of the Democratic Party in '54 and '56. Characteristic of this thinking is the projection of the names of such warmongers as Gordon Dean and Kimball into the early discussions of California Democratic Senatorial candidates.

Faced with these developments, labor and its allies need to exercise maximum independent pressure especially upon the Stevenson-ADA Democratic grouping—for a policy of peaceful negotiations as reflected to a degree in the Stevenson report, for an all-out fight against McCarthyism and McCarranism, for an end to the betrayal of the civil rights program in appeasement of the Farley-Dixiecrat forces, for a sharper, more consistent fight against the economic and social offensive of Big Business and the Eisenhower Administration.

In their relations with the Democratic Party organizations they must seek out and fight for candidates who

will champion such a program, including more candidates drawn from the ranks of labor, the Negro people, the working farmers, the youth. In particular, they must reject the Democratic McCarthyites like Walter as well as the Veldes.

The rank and file will welcome a more aggressive labor electoral policy. This is reflected in the James Carey speech to the national P.A.C. conference (*C.I.O. News*, Aug. 24) where, speaking personally, he warned the Democrats "to stop taking the liberal movement and the labor movement for granted" if they expect continued support from the C.I.O. "I am convinced," he continued, "that there must be a realignment — preferably within the Democratic Party. And if the realignment can't come within the Democratic Party, then perhaps there must be a realignment outside that party."

Fourth, labor should be urged nationally and in each state to concentrate its efforts upon certain key campaigns. These include: to defeat reaction in the main senatorial and gubernatorial races in New York, California, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Michigan, etc.; to defeat outstanding war-mongers and McCarthyites of the Velde type; to re-elect certain labor-influenced incumbents who may be threatened; to elect to Congress a number of peace advocates, anti-McCarthy fighters, labor and Negro congressmen; and as well to assist the growing movements to

change the political climate in certain regional situations—the South, the West and the farm belt.

Finally, the advanced political forces, represented in the Progressive Party, should be urged to seize hold of the new opportunities arising in the struggle for peace, for labor political action and for labor's electoral objectives. Where they do so, the P.P. organizations will be able to make important contributions.

In most instances, their best contribution will lie not in running candidates of their own but in stimulating movements on legislative issues and helping shape up and influence labor-based electoral coalitions. Where the latter do not materialize, the P.P. faces the responsibility to help provide an electoral alternative.

In certain areas, where the McCarthyites are going after Democrats who, although themselves inveterate Red-baiters and pro-war elements, have broad labor support, the Progressive Party and other advanced forces will face some very difficult tactical questions. In our opinion, it would be wrong in such situations simply to project immediately a third or P.P. candidate and let it go at that. Rather, a real, persistent struggle must be waged to influence the labor forces to change the candidate or his policies. At the same time, it would be equally wrong to foreclose the possibility of a third candidate

by failing to develop the necessary organization and movement to make possible such a candidacy if circumstances require it—as they very well may.

It is along these lines, then, that the Communists can help realize the key electoral objectives in '54. Integrally related with the tasks in the broad coalition movements, however, is the need to give increased attention to the independent role of the Communists. This is particularly true today when, despite the increased attacks of the Eisenhower-Brownell-Hoover gang, new possibilities are arising for broadening the whole fight for the Party's legal existence, against further prosecutions and for amnesty for all political prisoners and refugees.

The expression of this independent role requires a major drive to increase the circulation of Communist material embodying the views of the Party on all questions, including the legislative and the electoral. It also requires early consideration of the possibility of entering some Communist candidates in '54—where this does not come into conflict with coalitions of labor and their allies—in order to further the struggle for peace, for economic security, for the rights of labor and the Negro people, for the restoration of the full legality of the Communist Party.

The N. A. A. C. P. Convention

By Hugh Bradley

(The following is an extract from the Report on Negro Work delivered at the recent National Conference of the Communist Party.)

DURING THE PAST TWO YEARS the major Negro organizations, such as the N.A.A.C.P., the Elks, the fraternities, the organizations of women and large religious groups, have increasingly concerned themselves with social, economic and political questions. This is demonstrated by the programs brought forward and acted upon in these organizations, by their establishment of social action machinery, by the election of full time and volunteer executive officers, the opening up of offices for the conduct of social action work, the publication of material and directives on vital issues facing the Negro people, and the raising of special social action funds. If it is true that Negro organizations were born out of struggle, it is equally true that the anti-Negro offensive waged by Big Business has resulted in the revitalization of the spirit to struggle in many of these organizations in the past several years.

* * *

As in the past, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People remains the most important Negro organization dedicated to the fight for Negro equality.

The past two years have witnessed a consistent and steady growth in the influence of the Association, not only among the Negro people, but in the labor movement and among other progressive strata of Americans. The N.A.A.C.P. is increasingly becoming a coordinating center for all major organizations among the Negro people, and the pivot for the further advancement of the Negro-labor alliance. With over two hundred thousand members, reflecting all classes among Negroes, the Association represents the striving toward unity of the Negro people. However, it also typifies the continued dominance of Negro life by the Negro petty bourgeoisie.

Both these factors were strikingly revealed at the 44th National Convention of the Association held in St. Louis in June, 1953. This Convention was held against the background of a new political situation in the country, following closely upon the advent of the Eisenhower Administration. It convened at a time when the hope for peace was rising in the hearts of humanity everywhere, but when, at the same time, the pro-fascist offensive of the

McCarthyites had already reached menacing proportions, and when the reign of terror against the Negro people continued unabated. Manifestly, the Negro people were looking to this Convention for clear leadership on the vital issues facing them, and expected a call for united and militant action in their behalf.

To what extent did the Convention and its leadership live up to this expectation?

First, the Convention adopted a general progressive program on such questions as compulsory F.E.P.C., housing, an end to Jim Crow in education and in the railroad industry. Second, the delegates associated themselves with the growing movement in our country against McCarthyism, calling for an end to book-burning, taking a forthright stand in defense of academic freedom, and demanding revision of the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act, as well as revision of the "loyalty" program. The growing anti-McCarthy feelings among the Negro masses were reflected both in the resolutions adopted by the Convention and by the militant nature of the anti-McCarthy discussions, which found expression also in the opening address delivered by Dr. Channing H. Tobias, chairman of the N.A.A.C.P.'s National Board. Delegate after delegate expressed the sentiment that McCarthy has gone too far, that he represents a serious danger to the country, and that his tactics have

already weakened the fight for Negro rights. Third, a positive stand was taken in defense of the labor movement; there was a call for labor-Negro collaboration and the Branches and members were urged to work with the unions in their community.

The resolution on Labor and Employment, one of the most important adopted by the Convention, represented a significant advance in the pro-labor position of the Association. If this resolution is effectively fought for and implemented at the community level, with the positive features as the guiding principle of every Branch, the coming period should witness a considerable strengthening of the Negro-labor alliance.

Rejecting completely the proposal that the Negro people should break with organized labor (advanced by the *Pittsburgh Courier* immediately following the 1952 Presidential Elections) the resolution stated: "The N.A.A.C.P. reaffirms its support of democratic trade unionism," and pointed out that "it becomes increasingly possible to use the trade union as an instrument to eliminate racial discrimination in employment. . . ." Further, the resolution states: "Democratically run unions serve the interests of all America . . . Negro workers and the entire Negro community have directly benefited from these victories won by a militant American labor movement, and

therefore the N.A.A.C.P. vigorously supports the objectives of organized labor." It demanded the "repeal of all the crippling provisions of the Taft-Hartley Law," and called "upon all labor unions to negotiate strong anti-discrimination clauses in their contracts and to provide for vigorous enforcement of these agreements."

In arguing persuasively for greater Negro-labor cooperation, the resolution pointed out:

Organized labor is an important power center in American life today. The support and cooperation of the American labor movement for the Civil Rights program of the N.A.A.C.P. is extremely important and in certain situations perhaps even decisive. We urge our branches and state conferences wherever possible to seek the support of responsible trade unions for measures that we favor and in turn give our support to such measures supported by organized labor as are consistent with our policy and program.

The program on foreign policy adopted by the Convention also showed an advance. While still weak in several respects, it represents an important departure from that of the 43rd Convention. In contrast to the almost one hundred percent endorsement of the Truman foreign policy a year ago, this Convention refused to give such blanket support to the Dulles-Eisenhower conduct of foreign affairs. Moreover, the growing impact of the African question upon the Negro people was demonstrated

in the ovation given to the letter which had been received from Krunath, Prime Minister of the Gold Coast, as well as by the strong resolution passed on colonialism.

In contrast to the actions of a year ago, the 44th Convention also "urged the planning and execution of a Civil Rights mobilization in Washington, D.C.," and voted to welcome "in this mobilization the cooperation and support of bona fide organizations genuinely at one with us on our stated objective."

Another important feature of the Convention was the militant participation of the youth, and the overwhelming support given to the youth program by the adult delegates.

The Convention launched a program to rid America of Jim Crow and to win the total integration of Negroes by 1963, the one-hundredth anniversary of the issuance of the Emancipation Proclamation. The wiping out of Jim Crow in the United States in the next ten years aroused a great deal of discussion among the delegates. Naturally, when the issue of Negro oppression is placed in this way, one is forced to ask how far have we come and what distance remains to be travelled. Some delegates thought that this objective should be advanced and fought for, others were of the opinion that too much discussion about 1963 would divert from the immediate tasks, while still another group, primarily from the

South, were convinced that such a perspective is entirely utopian. The convention established a committee to review this proposal and make recommendations to the Association's National Board.

A ten-year plan to guarantee equal rights to the Negro people is now being discussed and debated on a national scale, as a result of the decisions of the N.A.A.C.P. convention. The proposal for such a plan places immediately before the Negro movement a number of ideological, strategic and tactical problems. It would be premature to attempt an exhaustive examination of these questions, but it is necessary to make such an examination without long delay. Clearly from this point on, the concept of setting a date by which time Negro freedom must be achieved will gain increasing headway among the Negro people.

* * *

Notwithstanding the many positive features of the 44th Annual Convention of the N.A.A.C.P., there were serious weaknesses revealed in the deliberations. Certain negative and harmful resolutions were adopted which run counter to the progressive and positive ones, and which can only be harmful to the Negro movement. A number of addresses were delivered, the themes of which were in flat contradiction to the main line of the principal resolutions. Chief among these was the closing address, delivered by Mr.

Walter White, Executive Secretary of the Association, an address which should be carefully appraised by the Negro people. In his address, characterized throughout by a fawning attitude, White called for complete confidence in and support for the Eisenhower Administration (an Administration whose policies are generating further anti-Negro measures in the country). He advanced the position of total defense of Eisenhower, exonerating him completely for his duplicity on the Negro question.

He argued that Eisenhower is an unwilling prisoner of his own Cabinet, his party and Congress, and, if the President has failed to do more on the Negro question, it is because he "has been so absorbed with war and foreign problems." Attempting to explain away in advance any further failures of the Administration on the Negro question, the chief executive officer of the Association set forth this program in the following way:

The third and most discouraging barrier to the fulfillment of his intentions to make America a place free from racial handicaps is opposition within his own party which the President faces—those who value their alliance with the Dixiecrats more than they do democracy itself. The conflict on basic issues between the Eisenhower Republicans and the Taft-McCarthy wing of the party is deep and possibly unbridgeable.

This conflict is clearly visible in the failure to date to fulfill the President's

campaign promises to appoint qualified Negroes to important posts in the government.

If Mr. White's premise were to be accepted, a President who is an innocent but sincere victim of evil men, a total captive of forces whom he cannot possibly be expected to control, and whose own Cabinet members defy him daily, should not be expected to carry out successfully his pledges made to the Negro people. Although, we are informed, "there is little prospect that the deadly coalition of reactionary Republicans and Dixiecrats will permit the President to do what I believe is firmly in his mind to do," Mr. White claims to be convinced that the President has the necessary courage to "challenge the entrenched forces of bigotry and greed."

In addition to surrendering to the Eisenhower Administration on the Negro question, Walter White's address included an orgy of Red-baiting and anti-Communist slander that is rare even for these times. "Two of the factors which plague the modern world are universally recognized—war and communism," he falsely proclaimed. There "is the almost total absence of Communist inspiration" for the revolution in Africa. "As is always the case the Communists have rushed in whenever possible to exploit misery and unrest." "Communism is ruthless . . . Godless." We "have rejected the siren song of Communism." "We don't

want the Communists running our affairs."

Having nominated himself as a candidate for chief Red-baiter in the United States, Mr. White rushes on to make an "analysis" of the world situation. He claims to see a "stupendous social revolution which today sweeps throughout Asia." And against whom is this revolution directed? Against British or French or American imperialism? Not at all. Evidently Mr. White has never heard of the evil of imperialism. In his estimation the revolution is directed against "white domination," against "the white man's evaluation of himself as all-wise and all-powerful." Who are the leaders of this revolution? Whom does Mr. White select as the symbol? None other than the American puppet, Syngman Rhee. Modestly professing to shed light on "another consideration which no one has pointed out so far as I know," the speaker spoke rapturously of his new-found hero:

Rhee is a symbol of Asian determination no longer to accept passively and submit meekly to whatever the white Western world decides . . . the West might just as well learn now that the old order is ended. It should awaken to the fact that the South Koreans are willing to die in lieu of being treated as puppets or serfs. The day of Kipling's "white man's burden" is over. Syngman Rhee's adamant stand is a warning to the West which it had better heed or there will be no peace, in Korea now or anywhere else in the world.

But it must be stated that at no time did the convention approve of Mr. White's pro-Eisenhower oration, and it is the opinion of many observers that a majority of the delegates were definitely against the Eisenhower Administration.

The address by Walter White emphasized the major weaknesses and most negative features of the 44th annual convention of the N.A.A.C.P.—the capitulation by the top leadership to the Eisenhower Administration and an orgy of Red-baiting which reached a level never before equalled in any Negro gathering. This Red-baiting began with the opening address of Dr. Tobias, and included the passage of an anti-Communist resolution, the condemnation of the National Negro Labor Council and the progressive-led trade-union internationals.

What is the explanation for the inconsistent and contradictory policy adopted by the Convention—a policy which calls at the same time for struggle and surrender, for anti-McCarthyism and Red-baiting, for support to the national independence movement of Africans and condemnation of Mau Mau "violence"?

The explanation is to be found in the composition of the Convention and its leadership, made up as it was of the Negro middle class and petty-bourgeoisie. The Negro workers in the main were absent; progressives and Communists, in the main, were absent. The reformist leadership of

Walter White was not basically challenged, and he maintained an iron-fisted control over every aspect of the deliberations. The spokesmen claiming to speak for labor at the Convention were primarily a handful of Trotskyites and Social-Democrats, although there was one leading national spokesman for labor present, Patrick Gorman, who delivered one of the principal addresses.

The negative features of the N.A.A.C.P. Convention constitute a prime example of the vacillating role being played today by the Negro petty-bourgeoisie, and of the continuing subordination of the Negro workers to the bourgeoisie in the Negro liberation movement. These negative features should constitute a warning as to the dangers inherent in the present situation, and the necessity of maintaining the most powerful pressure upon reformist leadership. Further, it is a warning which signalizes the vicious effect which McCarthyism is having upon Negro reformist leadership, and the extent that some people will go to "save themselves" from McCarthyism.

The programs adopted by the N.A.A.C.P. and other major Negro organizations reflect, among other things, the striving for unity on the part of the Negro people. Not only is there increased unity of action but the path along which this unity is developing is becoming clearer. First and foremost, it is proceeding

in the struggle around issues. The fight for jobs and F.E.P.C. is one example. Here we see a struggle with its base in the shops, one in which Negro workers are playing a leading role and which is moving tens of thousands of Negro shop workers into many different forms of action.

Second, the path toward unity being taken by the Negro people is the fight for Negro representation and the right-to-vote movement in the South. The recent elections in Atlanta demonstrate the non-partisan character of this movement, its all-class nature, and the fact that it has, and will increasingly receive, the support of progressive whites. The greatest success in such a movement is assured when the Negro people as a people are drawn most fully into the fight, when they see clearly the possibility for victory, and believe that there is a leadership to whom their confidence may be entrusted. The Atlanta Negro community was united on candidates, on how many offices should be contested, what the program or platform should be, and met head-on the white supremacists

who set out to destroy the movement by Red-baiting.

The past period has also witnessed in a number of Northern and Western states a higher unity of the Negro people in advancing the cause of Negro representation. This is particularly true in New York City, the result being the election of the first Negro State Senator, and the nomination by all parties of Negro candidates for the Borough Presidency of Manhattan in the 1953 municipal elections.

The striving for unity among the Negro people is reflected not only by parallel and united action around issues. It is increasingly being effected through joint collaboration between many of the mass organizations with and under the leadership of the N.A.A.C.P. The F.E.P.C. mobilizations recently organized in a number of states by the N.A.A.C.P. have gained the widest support in the Negro community and at the same time that of major sections of the labor movement and important mass organizations among the white population.

Preface To "Letters To Sorge"

By V. I. Lenin

The recently published volume, Letters to Americans, 1848-1895, by Marx and Engels, reviewed in the September Political Affairs by V. J. Jerome, contains as an appendix Lenin's remarkable preface to the Russian edition of "Letters to Sorge". In this preface, written in 1907, Lenin gives a classic example of the different ways in which the principles of Marxism applied on the one hand in the United States and on the other hand in Germany—and, in still another way, to the situation in Russia—demonstrating the truth of Engels' axiom that "Marxism is not a dogma but a guide to action." The extract from this preface, given below, deals with the situation in the United States at the time of the Marx-Engels correspondence—the Editor.

MARX AND ENGELS deal most frequently in their letters with the burning questions of the British, American, and German labor movements. This is natural, because they were Germans who at that time lived in England and corresponded with their American comrades. Marx expressed himself much more frequently and in much greater detail on the French labor movement, and particularly on the Paris Commune, in the letters he wrote to the German Social-Democrat, Kugelmann.*

A comparison of the comments by Marx and Engels on the Anglo-American and German labor movements is highly instructive. This comparison acquires all the greater importance when we remember that Germany on the one hand, and England and America on the other, represent different stages of capitalist development and different forms of

domination by the bourgeoisie, as a class, of the entire political life of these countries. From the scientific standpoint, what we observe here is a sample of materialist dialectics, of the ability to bring out and stress the different points and different sides of a question in accordance with the specific peculiarities of various political and economic conditions. From the standpoint of the practical policy and tactics of the workers' party, what we see here is a sample of the way in which the creators of the *Communist Manifesto* defined the tasks of the militant proletariat in accordance with the different stages of the national labor movement in various countries.

What Marx and Engels most of all criticize in British and American Socialism is its isolation from the labor movement. The burden of all their numerous comments on the Social Democratic Federation in England and on the American Socialists

* Karl Marx, *Letters to Kugelmann*, International Publishers, 1934.

is the accusation that they have reduced Marxism to a dogma, to a "rigid (*starre*) orthodoxy," that they consider it a "*credo* and not a *guide* to action," that they are incapable of adapting themselves to the theoretically helpless, but living, powerful, mass labor movement marching past them.

"Had we from 1864 to 1873 insisted on working together only with those who openly adopted our platform," Engels exclaims in his letter of January 27, 1887, "where should we be today?" And in an earlier letter (December 28, 1886), in reference to the influence of the ideas of Henry George on the American working class, he writes:

"A million or two of workingmen's votes next November for a *bona fide* workingmen's party is worth infinitely more at present than a hundred thousand votes for a doctrinally perfect platform."

These are very interesting passages. There are Social-Democrats in our country who hastened to make use of them in defense of the idea of a "labor congress" or something along the lines of Larin's "broad labor party." Why not in defense of a "Left bloc," we would ask these precipitate "utilizers" of Engels. The letters from which the questions are taken relate to a time when the American workers voted at the elections for Henry George. Mrs. [Florence Kelley] Wischnewetzky—an American who married a Russian and who translated Engels' works—asked him,

as may be seen from Engels' reply, to make a thorough criticism of Henry George. Engels writes (December 28, 1886) *that the time has not yet come* for that, for it is better to let the workers' party begin to consolidate itself, even if on a not altogether immaculate program. Later on the workers will themselves come to understand what is at stake, will "learn from their own mistakes," but "anything that might delay or prevent that national consolidation of the workingmen's party—on no matter what platform—I should consider a great mistake. . . ."

Engels, of course, perfectly understood and frequently pointed out all the absurdity and *reactionary character* of the ideas of Henry George from the *Socialist* standpoint. In the Sorge correspondence there is a most interesting letter from Karl Marx dated June 20, 1881, in which he characterizes Henry George as an ideologist of the *radical bourgeoisie*. "Theoretically the man [Henry George] is utterly backward (*total arriere*)," wrote Marx. Yet Engels was not afraid to join with this veritable *social reactionary* in the elections, provided there were people who could warn the masses of "the consequences of their own mistakes" (Engels, in the letter dated November 29, 1886).

Regarding the Knights of Labor, an organization of American workers existing at that time, Engels wrote in the same letter:

The weakest (literally: rottenest, *faulste*) side of the K. of L. was their *political neutrality*. . . . The first great step of importance for every country newly entering into the movement is always the constitution of the workers as an independent political party, no matter how, so long as it is a distinct workers' party.

It is obvious that absolutely nothing in defense of a leap from Social-Democracy to a non-party labor congress, etc., can be deduced from this. But whoever wants to escape Engels' accusation of degrading Marxism to a "dogma," "orthodoxy," "sectarianism," etc., must conclude from this that a joint election campaign with radical "social-reactionaries" is sometimes permissible.

But what is more interesting, of course, is to dwell not so much on these American-Russian parallels (we had to touch on them to answer our opponents), as on the *fundamental* characteristics of the British and American labor movement. These characteristics are: the absence of any big, nationwide, *democratic* problems whatever facing the proletariat; the complete subjection of the proletariat to bourgeois politics; the sectarian isolation of groups, hand-fuls of Socialists from the proletariat; not the slightest success of the Socialists in the elections among the working masses, etc. Whoever forgets these fundamental conditions and sets out to draw broad conclusions from "American-Russian parallels" displays extreme superficiality.

If Engels lays so much stress on

the economic organizations of the workers in such circumstances, it is because he is dealing with the most firmly established democratic systems, which confront the proletariat with purely socialist tasks.

If Engels stresses the importance of an independent workers' party, even though with a bad program, it is because he is dealing with countries where hitherto there had not been even a hint of political independence of the workers, where, in politics above all, the workers trailed, and still trail, after the bourgeoisie.

It would be making a mockery of Marx's historical method to attempt to apply the conclusions drawn from such considerations to countries or historical situations where the proletariat had established its party before the bourgeois liberals, where the proletariat does not have even the ghost of a tradition of voting for bourgeois politicians, and where it is not socialist, but bourgeois-democratic tasks that are up for immediate decision.

Our thought will become even clearer to the reader if we compare Engels' opinions of the British and American movements with his opinions of the German movement.

There is an abundance of such opinions in the published correspondence, and extremely interesting ones. And what runs like a red thread through all these opinions is something quite different, namely, a warning against the "Right wing" of the workers' party, a merciless (some-

times—as with Marx in 1877-79—a *furious*) war upon *opportunism* in Social-Democracy. . . .

We thus see that for more than ten years Marx and Engels systematically and unswervingly fought opportunism in the German Social-Democratic Party and attacked intellectual philistinism and petty-bourgeois narrow-mindedness in Socialism. This is an extremely important fact. The general public knows that German Social-Democracy is regarded as a model of the Marxist policy and tactics of the proletariat, but it does not know what a constant war the founders of Marxism had to wage against the “Right wing” (Engels’ expression) of that party. And it is no accident that soon after Engels’ death this war turned from a concealed into an open war. This was the inevitable result of the decades of historical development of German Social-Democracy.

And now we very clearly perceive the two lines of Engels’ (and Marx’s) recommendations, directives, corrections, threats, and exhortations. They most insistently called upon the British and American Socialists to merge with the labor movement and to eradicate the narrow and hidebound sectarian spirit from their organizations. They most insistently taught the German Social-Democrats: do not succumb to philistinism, to “parliamentary idiocy” (Marx’s expression in the letter of September 19, 1879), to petty-bourgeois intellectual opportunism.

Is it not characteristic that our Social-Democratic gossips have noisily proclaimed the recommendations of the first kind and have pursed their lips, remained silent about the recommendations of the second kind? Is not *such* onesidedness in appraising Marx’s and Engels’ letters the best indication, in a sense, of our, Russian, Social-Democratic “onesidedness”?

At the present time, when the international labor movement is displaying symptoms of profound ferment and wavering, when extremes of opportunism, “parliamentary idiocy,” and philistine reformism have evoked opposite extremes of revolutionary syndicalism, the general line of Marx’ and Engels’ “corrections” to British, American, and German Socialism acquires exceptional importance.

In countries where there are *no* Social-Democratic workers’ parties, *no* Social-Democratic members of parliament, *no* systematic and consistent Social-Democratic policy either at elections or in the press, etc., Marx and Engels taught the Socialists *at all costs* to rid themselves of narrow sectarianism and *join* the labor movement so as to rouse the proletariat *politically*, for in the last third of the nineteenth century the proletariat displayed *almost no* political independence either in England or America. In these countries — where bourgeois-democratic historical tasks were almost entirely absent—the political arena was

wholly filled by the triumphant and self-complacent bourgeoisie, which has no equal anywhere in the world in the art of deceiving, corrupting, and bribing the workers.

To think that these recommendations of Marx and Engels to the British and American labor movement can be simply and directly applied to Russian conditions is to use Marxism not in order to elucidate its *method*, not in order to *study* the concrete historical peculiarities of the labor movement in certain countries, but in order to settle petty factional, intellectual accounts.

On the other hand, in a country where the bourgeois-democratic revolution was still incomplete, where “military despotism, embellished with parliamentary forms” (Marx’s expression in his *Critique of the Gotha Programme*) prevailed, and still prevails, where the proletariat had long ago been drawn into politics and was pursuing a Social-Democratic policy, what Marx and Engels feared most of all in such a country was parliamentary vulgarization and the philistine compromising of the tasks and

scope of the labor movement.

It is all the more our duty to emphasize and advance this side of Marxism in the period of the bourgeois-democratic revolution in Russia because in our country an extensive, “brilliant,” and rich bourgeois-liberal press is vociferously trumpeting to the proletariat the “exemplary” loyalty, the parliamentary legalism, the modesty, and the moderation of the neighboring German labor movement.

This mercenary lie of the bourgeois betrayers of the Russian revolution is not due to accident or to the personal depravity of certain past or future ministers in the Cadet* camp. It is motivated by profound economic interests of the Russian liberal landowners and bourgeois liberals. And in combatting this lie, this “stupifying the masses” (*Massenverdummung*—Engels’ expression in his letter of November 29, 1886), the letters of Marx and Engels should serve as an indispensable weapon for all Russian Socialists. . . .

* Constitutional Democrats, bourgeois-monarchist party in tsarist Russia.

(Continued from inside front cover)

We know that many Americans, irrespective of their attitude towards Communists, join us in calling upon you to issue executive directions guaranteeing:

1. All the required medical attention for Robert Thompson in the fight to save his life.
2. A swift investigation of the circumstances in the Federal Detention House which permitted a prisoner to obtain a murderous weapon.
3. Swift punishment under the law for Pavlovich.
4. Promptly amnesty for the Smith Act and all other political prisoners.

NATIONAL COMMITTEE, COMMUNIST PARTY
William Z. Foster, Chairman; Elizabeth Gurley Flynn, Pettis Perry.
NEW YORK STATE COMMITTEE, COMMUNIST PARTY
George Blake Charney, Simon W. Gerson, Albert F.

NEW AND FORTHCOMING TITLES

NEW OPPORTUNITIES IN THE FIGHT FOR PEACE AND DEMOCRACY <i>by Andrew Stevens</i>	(New Century)	.25
NEXT STEPS IN THE STRUGGLE FOR NEGRO FREEDOM <i>by Hugh Bradley</i>	(New Century)	.15
ANARCHISM OR SOCIALISM? <i>by Joseph Stalin</i>	(International)	.35
LETTERS TO AMERICANS: 1848-1895 <i>by Karl Marx and Frederick Engels</i>	(International)	\$3.50
FILM IN THE BATTLE OF IDEAS <i>by John Howard Lawson</i>	Cloth \$2.00; Paper \$1.00 (Masses & Mainstream)	
THE CRISIS OF BRITAIN AND THE BRITISH EMPIRE <i>by R. Palme Dutt</i>	(International)	\$5.50
BURNING VALLEY <i>A novel by Phillip Bonosky</i>	(Masses & Mainstream)	\$2.75
POEMS BY NAZIM HIKMET	Cloth \$2.00; Paper \$1.00	
CHINA'S NEW CREATIVE AGE <i>By Hewlett Johnson</i>	Cloth \$2.50; Paper \$1.50 (International)	
MCCARTHYISM AND THE BIG LIE <i>by Milton Howard</i>	(New Century)	.05
STEEL LABOR'S ROAD TO ECONOMIC SECURITY, PEACE AND DEMOCRACY		.35
THE CASE OF PUERTO RICO: <i>Memo to the United Nations</i>	(New Century)	.05
THE 50th ANNIVERSARY OF THE C.P.S.U.	(New Century)	.15
JCSE MARTI AND CUBAN LIBERATION <i>by Carlos Rafael Rodriguez</i>	(International)	.20

Distributed by

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

FROM THE LIBRARY OF

Ishmael & Catherine

Davis FLORY