

Political Affairs

25¢

JUNE

1948

DRAFT RESOLUTION FOR THE NATIONAL
CONVENTION, C.P.U.S.A.

THE IMPERATIVE NEED FOR UNITED LABOR ACTION

JOHN WILLIAMSON

THE ITALIAN ELECTIONS

JOHN GATES

FALSIFIERS OF HISTORY: A HISTORICAL NOTE

PEOPLE'S VICTORY IN CZECHOSLOVAKIA

by Walter Storm

An eye-witness account of the February event in Czechoslovakia by the well known foreign correspondent.

A day-by-day account of the seven-day crisis with full reporting on the principal meetings, mass demonstrations, and speeches in Prague and throughout the country.

Storm had been living in Czechoslovakia for over a year before these stirring days and his account is full of his talks with workers, with housewives, youth, and with all the flavor of on-the-spot reporting.

The People's Victory in Czechoslovakia gives the truth about a most important event, a truth that American newspapers have tried desperately to conceal.

PRICE: \$.25

LINCOLN'S THIRD PARTY

by Elizabeth Lawson

Here is a historical study to fill an important gap in American history, and to provide pointed lessons for the third-party movement today.

Lincoln's Third Party describes the formation and building of the Republican Party, and the political and economic conditions which enabled its growth in six years from a handful of supporters to a party which succeeded in electing its candidate—Abraham Lincoln—to the presidency of the U.S.A.

PRICE: \$.20

THE PALMER RAIDS

Prepared by LABOR RESEARCH ASSOCIATION

Based on an exhaustive study of contemporary documents and reports, this book throws a searching light on the present reactionary drive spearheaded by the Un-American Committee against civil liberties. It includes an exposé of the sinister role of J. Edgar Hoover.

PRICE: \$.30

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

POLITICAL AFFAIRS

*A magazine devoted
to the theory and practice of Marxism-Leninism*

EDITORIAL BOARD

V. J. JEROME, *Editor*

ABNER W. BERRY, ALEXANDER BITTELMAN, JACK STACHEL, MAX WEISS

VOLUME XXVII, NO. 6

Contents

JUNE, 1948

- Draft Resolution for the National Convention, C.P.U.S.A.
Submitted by the National Committee 483
- The Imperative Need for United Labor Action *John Williamson* 514
- The Italian Elections *John Gates* 529
- Falsifiers of History: A Historical Note *Soviet Information Bureau* 538
- Some New Approaches to Party Organization and Concentration Work
Jim Tormey 551
- FROM THE TREASURY OF MARXISM:
The June Days *Karl Marx* 561
- COMMUNICATIONS:
- On Comrade Foster's Article, "The Theoretical Work
of the Party" *George Miller* 566
- BOOK REVIEW:
Cornforth's Critique of "Modern" Philosophies *Harry K. Wells* 570
-

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

RECENT PAMPHLETS

• • •

- | | |
|---|--------|
| WOMAN AGAINST MYTH
<i>by Betty Millard</i> | \$.10 |
| BEWARE OF THE WAR DANGER! STOP, LOOK,
AND LISTEN!
<i>by William Z. Foster</i> | .03 |
| THE MARSHALL PLAN — RECOVERY OR WAR?
<i>by James S. Allen</i> | .15 |
| MURDER, INC., IN GREECE
<i>by Olive Sutton</i> | .05 |
| THE CRIME OF EL FANGUITO, AN OPEN LETTER
TO PRESIDENT TRUMAN ON PUERTO RICO
<i>by William Z. Foster</i> | .03 |
| THE THIRD PARTY AND THE 1948 ELECTIONS,
<i>by Eugene Dennis</i> | .15 |
| NEW YORK HERALD TRIBUNE'S 23 QUESTIONS
ABOUT THE COMMUNIST PARTY ANSWERED
<i>by William Z. Foster</i> | .10 |
| JEWES IN THE SOVIET UNION, CITIZENS AND
BUILDERS
<i>by Paul Novick and J. M. Budish</i> | .15 |

DRAFT RESOLUTION FOR THE NATIONAL CONVENTION, C. P. U. S. A.

TO BE HELD AUGUST 3-6, 1948

SUBMITTED BY THE NATIONAL COMMITTEE

I

Peace or war, democracy or fascism—these are the decisive issues confronting the American people today.

Determined that our country shall put its great influence on the side of peace, democracy, and progress, we Communists dedicate ourselves to promoting labor's united action against the monopolies and for the development of the broadest people's coalition against the peril of fascism and a new world war.

I. WALL STREET'S DRIVE FOR WORLD RULE AND THE GROWING DANGER OF WAR

Since the end of the anti-Axis war, U.S. imperialism has stepped up its drive to dominate the world. The postwar offensive of the American monopolies takes place at a time when the general crisis of capitalism has reached a new and more advanced stage. Capitalism on a world scale emerged from the anti-Axis war greatly weakened. Germany, Japan, and Italy were left shattered by military defeat. France's role as a great power came to an end. And Britain, by Bevin's admission,

"in the dollar's grip," is sinking into the depth of bankruptcy and the status of an American dependency. Great new sections of the world have broken away from the imperialist system since the war. They include, in the first place, the new democracies of Europe where true peoples' governments headed by the working class are carrying out far-reaching economic, social, and political changes and are beginning to make the transition to Socialism. In all colonial and dependent countries, the struggle for national liberation has taken on unprecedented scope. This is particularly true in China, where the People's Liberation Army, led by the Chinese Communist Party, has freed huge areas and many millions of people from the rule of Chiang Kai-shek. In Western Europe, now menaced by the offensive of American imperialism, the unfolding of the people's struggle for peace, democracy, and national sovereignty is further deepening the general crisis of capitalism.

The basic fact that characterizes the world situation today is the division of the world into two opposing camps: the camp of imperialism,

reaction, and war, on the one hand, and the anti-imperialist, democratic, peace camp, on the other. The first camp has at its head the finance-capitalists of Wall Street, whose policies are carried out by the Truman Administration and the bipartisan Congressional coalition. The other camp is led by the Soviet Union and includes the new peoples' democracies, the liberated Chinese areas, the colonial liberation movements, and the anti-fascist and anti-imperialist forces of labor and the people in all countries.

In the United States alone imperialism emerged from the war militarily and, in certain respects, economically stronger. Wall Street has become the dominant force in the capitalist world. Thus, the unevenness in the development of capitalism in the various countries was intensified by the course of the war.

Simultaneously, American capitalism is subjected to a sharpening of its internal contradictions. This process, caused by the inherent laws of its system, is intensified by the weakened state of world capitalism. Since imperialism is a world system, the very decline in the strength of capitalism in Britain, as well as in other countries, while temporarily advancing the imperialist positions of American monopoly capital, in the long run works to undermine them.

Playing this losing game against history, American imperialism has embarked upon a course of desperate expansionism abroad and repression at home. It has launched a foreign

policy of bullying and bribing; of conniving with and supporting cartelists, quislings, royalists, fascists, pseudo-socialists, feudalists, and clerical obscurantists; of fomenting civil wars and of intervening with diplomatic, material, and military assistance on the side of the peoples' enemies; of establishing far-flung war bases and brandishing the atom bomb in the face of the nations; of plotting a Western European and American-hemisphere war front against the Soviet Union and the new peoples' democracies—all for the realization of its central aim and war policy—the hoisting of Wall Street's flag over the world.

Basing itself on its increased economic and military power, American imperialism is determined to maintain monopoly profits at their unprecedentedly high level. The mountainous rise in profits is revealed in the fact that in 1939 corporate profits (before taxes) were 6.5 billion dollars, whereas in 1947 the figure rose to 28 billion dollars. Avid for markets for its 75 per cent increase in productive capacity and for the export of its mounting surpluses of capital, Wall Street seeks to hold on to its monopoly of the markets seized during the war and to extend this monopoly into all parts of the world. It is striving ruthlessly to achieve world domination and for this purpose prepares a third world war.

The Truman Doctrine and the Marshall Plan are major instruments of American imperialism in its drive to dominate the world. The Tru-

man-Marshall Plan seeks to enslave Europe, to rebuild the war potential of Western Germany as a base of Wall Street operations in violation of the Potsdam agreement, to establish strategic economic, military, and political bases in the Mediterranean and the Near East, to arm the European capitalist countries against the U.S.S.R., to bolster up the feudal-comprador dictatorship of Chiang Kai-shek, as well as to stem the growth of all colonial liberation movements, to subjugate Latin America, to build up reaction and fascism everywhere, and, finally, to prepare a war against the Soviet Union and the democratic anti-imperialist camp.

It is a dangerous illusion that the Marshall Plan is a program for the economic recovery of Europe, that it is therefore different from the Truman Doctrine. Both the Truman Administration and the Republican leaders openly link the Marshall Plan with the political and military aims of Wall Street imperialist expansion.

It is a tribute to the strong pro-peace sentiments of the American people that the bellicose Truman Doctrine was greeted with a storm of popular opposition. It was for this very reason that the objectives of the Truman Doctrine were so soon thereafter veiled by the Santa Claus pretensions of the Marshall Plan. But the facts speedily confirmed the warning sounded by our Party that the foul heart of the Truman Doctrine is the heart of the Marshall

Plan. It is through the Marshall Plan appropriations and policies that American imperialism is carrying out the interventionist objectives so brazenly announced by the Truman Doctrine.

The imperialists are making the most extensive use of the press, radio, movies, etc., to deceive the masses about the Marshall Plan with demagoguery about the economic recovery of Europe and with slanderous assertions about Communist "sabotage" of recovery. It is therefore necessary to demonstrate daily that the Marshall Plan, the Truman Doctrine, the atom-bomb strategy and diplomacy are all intertwining parts of one program—economic, military, and political—to establish American imperialism's domination of the world, for which it prepares a third world war.

Wall Street's war provocations have now entered a new stage. It has split Germany and is already using the Anglo-American-French zones as a base for the economic conquest of Europe and for the preparation of war against the Soviet Union. It has succeeded in establishing an imperialist military bloc in Western Europe and is preparing to supply this bloc with arms and munitions for actual warfare. Simultaneously, it is preparing in Italy and France for civil war by the reactionary and fascist camp against the democratic forces of those countries. It has brought Latin America into a Western Hemisphere military bloc which it is striving to implement with an

Arms Standardization Plan. At the same time, it is extending its military intervention in Greece and China, and is preparing to light and fan the fires of imperialist war in other countries, *i.e.*, Turkey, Palestine, etc.

At home, actual mobilization for a war has reached major proportions. More than twenty billion dollars of the 1948 national budget is for war preparations. Stock-piling of the atom bomb* as well as other deadly devices of mass destruction continues apace. All branches of the armed services are engaged continuously in a "cold war of maneuver" in open preparation for a new war. The new Department of National Defense has been vested with extraordinary powers as the organ for directing total war. The armed forces are being steadily augmented and the enactment of peacetime conscription is being rushed through.

This sharpening of the war danger reflects the growing mood of desperation of monopoly capital in face of the looming economic crisis which it hopes to forestall through colossal war preparations and military adventures, in face of the rapid growth of the people's peace coalition and the new party movement, and, above all, in face of the increasingly visible failures of its foreign policy—of the Truman Doctrine and the Marshall Plan.

Although Wall Street has achieved limited and precarious successes in establishing its domination over many capitalist countries in both hemispheres, it has utterly failed to

intimidate the Soviet Union, to undermine the new peoples' democracies, to smash the peoples' movements in Western Europe, or to crush the national liberation movements in the Far East. It is because of the growing recognition by Wall Street that it cannot establish its world domination by economic and political means alone, that the present war crisis has been precipitated by the monopolists. For, failing to do so by economic and political bludgeoning, American imperialism is now openly preparing to establish its world domination through military means, through war.

This war drive of the monopolies, promoted by their bipartisan Democratic-Republican coalition and executed by the Truman Administration, is in profound contradiction to the true national interests of America. It is a monstrous falsehood to assert that our country is in danger of attack by the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union strives resolutely to achieve the aims for which the peoples fought in the anti-fascist; liberation war. Its policy is directed firmly toward securing a lasting democratic peace by carrying out the decisions of the Big Three at Teheran, Yalta, and Potsdam. It strives to complete the destruction of fascism and to make possible the growth of the forces of democracy all over the world. Its determined struggle for peace is demonstrated by the steady demobilization of the wartime strength of its armed forces. This is in sharp contrast to American impe-

rialism's aggressive war policy and systematic rejection of all efforts of the Soviet Government to establish friendly relations and co-operation in the interests of world peace.

The real danger to the peace of America and of the world is a military onslaught by the war-incendiaries of Wall Street. The monopolies, the capitalist circles which are tied in with the monopolies and have become dependent upon them, the reactionary Social-Democratic leaders and reformist trade union bureaucrats, the Roman Catholic hierarchy, the phoney liberals who have sold their souls to Wall Street, and the Trotskyite accessories of fascism—these promote the drive to war.

The American people want peace. Therefore the monopolistic warmakers seek to induce in the American people a fatalistic idea that war has become inevitable. Hence, the crucial importance of the most intense struggle against the ideological war offensive of the imperialists and their agents. It is necessary to demonstrate daily that a new world war is not inevitable, that the masses of the people are already unfolding many struggles for peace against the warmakers, as is demonstrated by the spectacular growth of the Wallace-for-President movement. The American people must be helped to realize that the anti-imperialist peace forces in the world at large are strong and growing, that the American people have it in their power through a united front of struggle to create a peace coalition strong

enough to check and defeat the warmakers.

Labor must take to heart the great message to the peoples of the world issued last September by the Conference of the Nine European Communist Parties. We must especially grasp the profound declaration that there is a great distance between the desire of the Wall Street monopolies to start a new war and their actual ability to bring about such a disaster. Likewise, we must appreciate the warning given by these nine Parties that the great danger today lies in underestimating the forces of peace and overestimating the forces of war and imperialist reaction.

The peoples of the world are for peace and democracy. Neither the imperialist circles in the capitalist countries abroad, nor their Right-wing Social-Democratic agents, falsely parading as a so-called "third" force, can change the basic fact of the world situation—the growth of the camp of peace and democracy and the weakening of the camp of imperialism and reaction. On a world scale, the tide of struggle is surging against the imperialists of Wall Street. Here in our country a new mood of resistance to the monopolists is developing among the people. The people's fight against their traditional Wall Street enemies can be won. United labor action and the mass action of all democratic forces together with the world camp of peace and democracy, can and will win the fight against the warmakers, against the monopolies.

2. WALL STREET'S REACTION-ARY DRIVE AT HOME AND THE ACCELERATED GROWTH OF FASCISM

The aggressive drive of American imperialism abroad has its accompaniment in the offensive of reaction at home and the rapid processing of our country for an American form of fascism.

Ever since the end of the war, the scope of the offensive of imperialist reaction has been widening and the danger of fascism increasing. But with the introduction of the Mundt Bill, the development toward a police state approaches the stage of *qualitative change*, affecting every aspect of American life.

The postwar fascization of the United States assumes the characteristic disguise of a defense against the mythical foreign and domestic "menace of Communism." But, while the development of fascism in our country evidences the general characteristics of monopoly capital's threat to establish its open and terrorist dictatorship, its significance is in large measure hidden from the American people by features peculiar to the process of fascization in the United States.

In Germany, in the presence of a mass Socialist-conscious proletariat, fascism had to style itself "National Socialism." Here, in the face of the people's devotion to the traditions of American democracy and the Constitution, each reactionary move to undermine the Constitution and to facilitate the coming of fascism to

power, is brought forward as a measure to "preserve" democracy and "safeguard" the Constitution against some new prefabricated "Communist threat."

Here, existing bourgeois-led mass organizations and existing bourgeois political parties are being subverted to do the work done in Germany and Italy by an openly fascist political party and its auxiliary storm-troop formations.

Here, fascist-minded Big Business uses the press, radio, movies, as well as the organs of government, to create an atmosphere conducive to mob action. It points to the Communists, the picket lines of labor, the new party, as fair prey for "upstanding patriots." It leaves the actual dirty work of organizing hooliganism to the clerical-fascist leadership of the Catholic War Veterans and the Association of Catholic Trade Unionists, to Wall Street's gauleiters in the American Legion and to the Ku Klux Klan.

Thus, in the development of the drive toward fascism, the monopolists traditionally employ both legal and semi-legal methods. Together with concealment behind a "constitutional" façade, they are increasingly fomenting and organizing storm-trooper violence against meetings and headquarters of progressive organizations.

The absence at present of a mass fascist organization in the United States should not lull anyone into a false sense of security that therefore the threat of fascism is not actual,

or that such an organization may not be created. The American people are faced today with the danger of fascism, "constitutionally" clamped upon the country by the fast developing police state.

Through anti-Soviet hysteria and warmongering, the promoters of the police state have sought to condition the American people for passive acceptance of the Mundt Bill. The big push to enact this monstrous bill into law comes at a time when reaction has already succeeded in adopting a number of preliminary measures designed to facilitate fascism's coming to power.

Among these measures we need cite only a few to illustrate the pattern of the whole. The elevation of the bipartisan House Committee on Un-American Activities to the status of a permanent body with inquisitorial powers, has had far-reaching significance and effects. It paved the way for Truman's proclamation of thought control "loyalty" tests, for the Committee's assumption of punitive power in the large number of contempt cases, for the persecution of government employees and labor leaders on trumped-up perjury charges, for intensified attacks on the foreign-born, and for the new deportation delirium with its new wrinkle of denial of bail.

For their failure, over a period of ten years, effectively to challenge the Un-American Committee's anti-Communist premise, the American people are now paying heavily. Not only the Committee, but its Hitler-

like standards, are penetrating into every walk of American life.

Conformity with the views of J. Parnell Thomas and John Rankin is becoming the test of acceptability in education, the arts, the sciences, and private or public employment. Censorship, crass or subtle, and intimidation, are closing in on the American people from all sides, even though the resistance from Hollywood and all sections of the artistic and scientific world, as well as from labor, is growing.

The right to continue the struggle for social progress and for the liberation of the Negro people, like all other democratic rights of labor and the people, is most seriously threatened by the Mundt Bill. This legislative creature of the infamous Thomas-Rankin Committee would, if passed, enormously increase the rate of fascist development and transfer the police state from the blueprint to the construction stage.

The pattern was established on the continent of Europe in the 'twenties and 'thirties. In country after country where fascism advanced to establish its rule, it signalized its destruction of democracy by first outlawing the Communist Party.

The attacks upon the Communist Party of the U.S.A. are not occurring as an isolated happening. The same offensive of reaction has already struck dangerous blows at the trade unions through the Taft-Hartley Act. It helped to put over the illusion that this anti-labor measure was "only" anti-Communist. By this

measure, which Philip Murray, once upon a time, justly called "a step to fascism," the monopolies inaugurated their drive to establish government domination of the unions. Through this fascist-inspired legislation the government has placed limitations on the right to strike and has resorted to open strike-breaking, rule by injunction, imposition of oppressive fines, curtailment of collective bargaining rights, curbs on free and democratic choice of union officers, and restrictions on trade union political activity. Collective bargaining is being legally denied to hundreds of thousands of workers if their elected leaders refuse to sign the slave-labor "anti-Communist" affidavit. The monopolists have taken the Taft-Hartley Law as a mandate to reject arrogantly the just demands of the unions and to resort to violent strike-breaking and the revival of company unions. Meanwhile, vicious enemies of labor in Congress are devising even "tighter" measures to destroy the labor movement.

The offensive of reaction is striking at the most elementary civil rights of the people. There is an alarming growth of anti-Semitism, of discrimination against and persecution of the national groups of non-Anglo-Saxon origin, of attacks upon the foreign-born, of deportation drives.

The intensified attacks upon the Negro people demonstrate clearly the growth of imperialist reaction and national oppression in the United States. The Negro people are

experiencing the most extreme, the most brutal manifestations of the growing fascist danger, especially in the South. The cynical demagoguery of Truman's Civil Rights Committee Report and of the G.O.P.'s election promises, stands exposed by the refusal of the Truman Administration and of the Republican-controlled to fight for anti-poll tax, anti-lynching, and F.E.P.C. legislation, as well as by the callous refusal of the President, as Commander-in-Chief, to abolish Jim Crow in the armed forces. Hence, the crucial and decisive importance of the national liberation struggles of the Negro people for the American people as a whole and for the democratic forces everywhere.

For the people to permit the enactment of the fascist Mundt Bill, designed to outlaw the Communist Party, would be to help legislate their total democratic rights out of existence. Reaction is directing its vicious attacks upon the Communist Party because the Communists are the most active and militant forces in the trade unions and all progressive movements, because they are the most devoted and consistent builders of the people's peace coalition. But the Mundt Bill's attempt to outlaw the Communist Party would, if successful, place every progressive force in American life in dire peril. Its purpose is to drive the Communists underground, in order to unleash an all-out attack on the trade unions, the peace movement, and all people's organizations, under the guise of

hunting down the "hidden Communists."

The Mundt Bill is the real criminal conspiracy to establish a fascist dictatorship in the United States. Our Communist Party, together with labor and all democratic forces, is fighting, and will continue to fight, this criminal conspiracy every step of the way. Mundt Bill or no Mundt Bill, we will never abandon our vanguard role in the struggle for democracy and peace. The broadening of the front to defeat the Mundt Bill confirms our estimate that there is a fighting chance to prevent its passage. But should this fascist measure become law, we will not be accessories to the murder of the Bill of Rights. We will not give *de facto* sanction to Hitler's Big Lie, on which the Mundt Bill rests. We will not expose our members to F.B.I. persecution and blacklisting in employment. Therefore, we will not register.

In the crucial fight against the Mundt Bill, we must make clear to the American people that the process of fascist development in our country could not have advanced thus far if labor and all democratic forces had fought it unitedly at every step. More than any other single factor, it was the Hitlerite poison of anti-Communism that prevented the forging of effective anti-fascist unity up till now.

That is why the monopolist camp and its henchmen in the labor movement have developed Red-baiting and the "Red scare" to the propor-

tions of a national hysteria. They seek to terrorize the masses and thus prevent them from uniting their forces and taking action to defend their democratic liberties. Hence, the struggle against Red-baiting is a life-and-death matter for the American people. Only the fighting unity of all democratic and peace-desiring forces, both Communists and non-Communists, can defeat fascism and prevent war.

Step by step, reaction is militarizing the United States. Generals and admirals fill increasingly important civilian posts in the government. The new Department of Defense, under Forrestal, combines its feverish war preparations with decisive intervention in foreign policy and Cabinet decisions.

More and more the whole field of scientific research is coming under the control of the military. The largest university in the country is now headed by General of the Army Eisenhower. The drive for peacetime conscription and universal military training is intended not only to build a war army, but to militarize American youth and indoctrinate them with fascist chauvinism.

At the same time, the Wall Street bankers and big industrialists are rapidly increasing their open control over all agencies of the government. In the Cabinet, the State Department, the new Department of National Defense, and the administration of E.R.P., this widening tie-up of the monopolies with the government, the ever-expanding integration

of finance-capital with the state, is taking place.

A most menacing aspect of Wall Street's fascist offensive and drive to war is the accelerated growth of state monopoly capitalism. This is clearly evident in the extensive network of plants operated and owned by the government for the production of warships, arms, and munitions—but actually managed by agents of the monopolies. This ultra-reactionary phase is being further expanded through the government-industry partnership controlling the production of atomic bombs and atomic energy, and is reaching into all industries being geared to the preparation for war. The growth of state monopoly capitalism is stimulated by the operation of the International Bank and Monetary Fund, the Export-Import Bank, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and the Federal Reserve System.

The previous tempo of this development is being accelerated by the Marshall Plan, whose administration will help place the material resources of the United States behind the monopolies for the enslavement of the American people, as well as the European peoples.

It is against this background of accomplished fact that we must measure the Mundt Bill and appraise the real and imminent danger of fascism.

Now a fateful hour for American democracy has struck. Now the united action of labor must rally all defenders of the Bill of Rights. Now

courage must answer intimidation, and the democratic political initiative of the people replace the initiative of the fascist-minded trusts.

Now confidence in the people's united strength must cast out all fatalistic fear that our country is doomed to pass through the hell of fascist enslavement.

3. WALL STREET'S ATTACKS UPON THE PEOPLE'S ECONOMIC STANDARDS

While profits mount to unprecedented heights, the living standards of the people continue to sink. The cost of living continues to rise, due largely to high monopoly prices, while workers' incomes continue to decrease. The burden of the shamefully inequitable tax program falls most heavily on low-income groups, while the corporations are the recipients of generous tax refunds by the government. Speedup is growing and capitalist exploitation has become more intense. The purchasing power of the masses has considerably decreased since the last round of wage increases in 1946-7. According to the C.I.O. steel workers' union, the real income of steel workers decreased since the last round of wage increases by thirteen dollars a week. At the same time, the profits of the steel corporations reached the astounding total of \$500,000,000 in 1947. The C.I.O. electrical workers' union has shown that the purchasing power of its workers has decreased by thirteen dollars a week since January, 1945, while monopoly profits

of the electrical corporations reached in 1947 the record-breaking total of \$95,000,000 after taxes.

Under pressure of monopoly attacks, the economic position of wide masses of farmers is growing worse in contrast to the tremendous profits of the banks, the food trusts, the commodity speculators, and the big agrarian capitalists. Reactionaries have tried to build up the myth that farmers are rolling in clover and responsible for high food prices. But the fact is that farm costs have risen more rapidly than prices. The recent drop of the commodity markets has shown what present policies have in store for farmers. Despite the ballyhoo to present the Marshall Plan as a gigantic food relief program, government statements indicate that grain exports from the United States will be cut in half for the year beginning June 30, 1948, although food needs abroad are greater than ever.

The most devastating consequences of the rising cost of living are felt by the masses of the Negro people, who are doubly gouged because of their status of economic, social, and national oppression.

Government employees, white collar workers, people with small fixed incomes, old-age pensioners, find the bottom dropping from under their subsistence base.

In the coming period, the American people must be prepared to meet much sharper and more serious attacks upon their living standards. These attacks will follow inevitably from the Marshall Plan program of

the monopolies for increasing armament production in order to re-establish a war economy.

The Marshall Plan has a direct inflationary effect because it is part of, and is based upon, the already swollen war economy of the United States. This war economy diverts necessary materials into industries producing for the gigantic military establishment of our country as well as for the shipment of vast military supplies to reactionary forces all over the world. As a result, even within the framework of the shortages deliberately created by the restrictive policies of the trusts, additional shortages are created by the gun-not-butter program. In the absence of necessary democratic price controls, prices are continuing to soar, cutting into the pay envelopes and living standards of the mass of American people.

An essential part of the present development of this Marshall Plan war economy is to prevent a new round of wage increases, to freeze wage levels and to lengthen the working day (Baruch Plan, Wilson Plan, etc.). This accounts for the arrogant refusal of the steel, auto, electrical, packing, and maritime trusts to grant substantial (and in many cases, any) wage increases to the unions in these industries. For the monopolies plan to "cope" with inflationary pressures by reducing the consumption of the masses while guarding their high prices and profits.

The increased economic and mili-

tary power of American capitalism as a result of the war, far from lessening, has greatly intensified the major internal contradictions of American capitalism—the contradiction between increased productive capacity and capital accumulation, on the one hand, and the greatly decreased and further decreasing imperialist market, on the other; the contradiction between production and consumption, etc. These are expressions of the basic contradiction between the social character of production and the private capitalist nature of appropriation, which is irresistibly driving the American capitalist system toward a new economic crisis. The approach of the crisis has been signaled, among other indications, by repeated breaks in the stock and commodity markets.

The large-scale armament program and industrial war mobilization, planned with a view to rebuilding a war economy, may retard the tempo of the coming economic crisis, but cannot prevent the disjointed development of the economy and the outbreak of the crisis.

The trade unions stand in the front line of the American people's fight to defend their living standards against monopoly's offensive, now and in preparation for the approaching economic crisis.

Every division in the ranks of labor exposes all labor and the people to the new dangers of wage-cutting, price-gouging, and union-busting. Therefore it is now more than ever essential that the trade unions act

unitedly to defend their own organizations and the people's living standards.

The trusts are seeking to take the unions on one at a time—in order to knock out all of labor and its allies. Therefore every wage struggle and every strike must become a front of common struggle, to be defended by the resolute and united action of all the workers and their trade unions.

4. THE RESISTANCE OF THE AMERICAN PEOPLE TO WALL STREET'S IMPERIALIST OFFENSIVE OF WAR AND FASCISM

The resistance of the masses of the American people to Wall Street's offensive is steadily gaining in breadth and momentum. But this resistance is only in its early stages; the working class is only beginning to move in the direction of becoming the leading force in the people's progressive movements.

Labor's role in the people's struggles is of paramount and decisive importance. In the period immediately following the end of the war, labor came forward in militant strike struggles of unprecedented magnitude and gained substantial economic victories. In these significant developments, the Left-progressive forces in the trade unions, especially in the C.I.O., played an increasingly important and decisive role. The Communists in the trade unions formed a vital and significant part of the Left-progressive forces. But today the economic struggles of the trade

unions are jeopardized by the surrender of the C.I.O. and A. F. of L. top leadership to the warmakers on all questions of foreign policy. For surrender to the warmakers is also surrender to the wage-cutters, the speedup experts, the profiteers.

In resistance to Wall Street's attacks upon the civil rights and democratic liberties of the American people, important sections of labor have displayed considerable activity, due mainly to rank-and-file pressure. This was seen most particularly in the struggle against enactment of the Taft-Hartley Law. Significant, although sporadic, actions have taken place among the workers against the reactionary attacks of the Thomas-Rankin Committee, against Truman's "loyalty" tests, against the attacks upon the Negro people, against anti-Semitism, against the deportation drives, and against the persecution of Communists. If these actions have not yet drawn in the wide masses, nor reached the stage of sustained mass resistance, it is due to the capitulation of the reactionary and reformist top leaders of the C.I.O. and A. F. of L. to the bipartisan war policy of the monopolies.

It is in the crucial and decisive field of resistance to the imperialist war policies of the monopolies that labor is displaying its greatest weaknesses. Here, the fight has been carried on thus far only by the more advanced sections of the labor movement and by those masses that are directly influenced by the Left-progressive forces. As to the Greens,

Wolls, and Hutchesons, as well as the Murrays, Reuthers, and Careys—they have surrendered to the warmakers and are actively engaged in promoting, here and abroad, the expansionist, pro-war policies of Wall Street.

The main reasons for this dangerous lag of the labor movement in the struggle for peace are: first, the confusion created among wide masses by monopoly propaganda that the Soviet Union "threatens" American security, the demoralizing influences of chauvinism, the corrupting effects of the false propaganda that imperialist expansion and war preparations will sustain the industrial boom and prevent a crisis; and, second, the collaboration of the reactionary trade union bureaucrats, A.C.T.U. and Social-Democratic leaders, and Trotskyite cliques, with Wall Street, in promoting the war offensive and in attempting to corral the labor movement for support of the war program against the forces of democracy and Socialism throughout the world.

At the same time, the developing struggle of the more advanced sections of labor against the bipartisan, war-breeding Truman Doctrine and Marshall Plan is beginning to create a united front of action from below among the peace-minded workers in the shops and factories. The much more rapid unfolding of united labor actions against Taft-Hartleyism and the warmakers is essential to the victory of the broad people's peace forces.

Their own experiences and the peace struggles of the politically more alert sections of the American people have already begun to influence millions of Americans—workers, small farmers, Negroes, youth, middle-class and professional groups, and masses among the national groups. This is demonstrated most clearly in the steady growth of the movement for a new people's peace party and in the mounting mass support for its independent Presidential ticket among the intellectuals, educators, and students, as well as among the workers and the Negro people.

The role of the Negro people in the struggle for peace and democracy is growing in importance in the South as well as in the North. In the struggle for equal rights and for national liberation, the Negro people are learning in ever-larger numbers that Wall Street imperialism is the main enemy and that the fight for peace is also a fight against Jim Crow and for equal rights. To promote still further participation by the Negro people in this common struggle, it is imperative that the labor movement and the entire progressive camp promote the unity of Negro and white, and engage themselves more consistently and energetically in the fight against all forms of white-chauvinism ideology and practices, for equal rights, and in support of the national aspirations of the Negro people in the Black Belt. It is also necessary to combat more effectively the Social-Democratic and

other reformist agents of imperialism who are seeking to confuse and mislead the Negro masses.

Among the small farmers, the movement of resistance to the reactionary foreign and domestic policies of the monopolies is beginning to make significant advances. Despite traditional weakness and lack of organization, farmers have generally shown a distinct reluctance to support the bipartisan war policy, especially such proposals as Universal Military Training and the Draft. They have developed movements of considerable magnitude against the attacks upon their co-operatives by Big Business. They oppose and will resist the program advanced by the N.A.M. and Chamber of Commerce for driving two-thirds of the farmers from commercial agriculture. There is strong pro-Wallace support in many rural areas. But the great need is to win farmers for active participation in the new party movement. One of the chief impediments to the further development of such farm struggles is the reactionary big farmer-big business leadership of the Grange and the Farm Bureau. A weakness which affects this development, and which must be overcome speedily, is the lack of collaboration on specific economic and political issues between labor and its rural allies.

Of great significance is the growing resistance to the offensive of the monopolies by the masses of the national groups. The resistance of the Jewish masses is now directed pri-

marily against the menacing growth of anti-Semitism and national discrimination and to defending the new Jewish State, Israel. As a result of these specific struggles, the Jewish masses are entering the broader arena of struggle for peace and against the Truman-Marshall Plans, despite the efforts of Wall Street agents among the Jewish people. Equally, the masses of many national groups and minorities are entering into the fight for peace and democracy as a result of their specific struggles for equal rights, against national discrimination, for friendship with the democratic forces and the new democracies of their lands origin.

At the same time, the successful unfolding of these campaigns demands the most serious struggle against the open and veiled agents of imperialism and fascism operating in the midst of the national groups, some in positions of high leadership. In these times of the closest interconnection between domestic and foreign affairs, the democratic and peace-loving national groups in the United States, while fighting for security, peace, and democracy as Americans, increasingly function as a factor in helping the peoples of their original homelands shape their national destinies. And it is in these times, too, that imperialist agents of the type of Dubinsky and Antonini extend their domestic anti-labor, anti-Socialist, and anti-democratic activities internationally, in order to halt the forward march of the labor

and popular movements both here and abroad. The cause of peace and progress in the United States and the solidarity of the national groups with the progressive strivings of their native peoples demand relentless struggle to defeat the machinations of these false leaders, the capitulators, the splitters, the lay and clerical helpmates of the imperialist enemy.

Favorable developments in the resistance to Wall Street's offensive are taking place among the youth, despite the fact that certain sections of the veterans of World War II have become partly demoralized by imperialist and chauvinist corruption. The progressive movement must seriously undertake to win the basic masses of the American youth, especially of the working-class and student youth, to the anti-fascist, peace movements of the people and for participation in independent political action. In this connection, the Communist Party should also support the organization of a non-Party center for the Marxist training and education of the anti-fascist democratic youth of America.

The masses of American women are displaying significant activity in the fight against monopoly prices and the rising cost of living, in defense of democratic liberties, for people's health and education programs, for peace. They continue, even after the war, to be a major factor in industry, in the whole national economy and in the labor movement. Accordingly, the task of winning the

masses of American women for sustained and militant resistance to Wall Street is of paramount importance.

But above and beyond all other classes and groups of the American people, it is the working class and the trade unions that must come forward in the shortest possible time as the leader and the main driving force of the people's resistance to Wall Street. Upon this depends the very fate of the struggle for peace and democracy. Consequently, it is vitally necessary to wage an unrelenting ideological and political struggle against Wall Street's agents in the labor movement—the reactionary trade union bureaucrats and Right-wing Social-Democratic leaders—on the basis of promoting the united front of mass struggles from below and by broadening the alliance of all Left and progressive forces.

Today, when American imperialism, aiming to dominate the world, has marshalled all its spokesmen, agents, and apologists to spread its propaganda of reaction and war to every land and nation; when the lords of this dollar empire send forth their unholy missions-at-large of Harrisons, Dulleses, Spellmans, Myron Taylors, and Careys to bolster the tottering regimes of reaction and divide the forces of labor and democracy—in this situation the American labor movement has a special and solemn duty toward the international labor movement and the anti-imperialist forces everywhere. The more rapacious and peace-de-

stroying Wall Street's policy becomes, the more affirmative and consistent must be the anti-imperialism and proletarian internationalism of American labor. Let us face the facts: the American labor movement in its major sections has to date not accepted this responsibility. It still needs to free itself from the trammels of capitalist class ideology. Important sections of the labor movement have permitted themselves to be turned into accomplices of Wall Street's Truman-Marshall war plan for world domination. Let the American working class guard against a course that would bring upon it the judgment pronounced upon the German working class for deserting its vanguard Party and its own class interests, for failing to take its stand at the head of the people against Nazism, and for sharing the guilt of the Third Reich against humanity!

The American labor movement has grown vastly in numerical strength. It has demonstrated its capacity to struggle and achieve victories. To safeguard its century of class gains from fascist destruction, to save its movement from disintegration and degeneration, American labor must repudiate the pro-war and Red-baiting policies of its dominant reactionary leadership, and develop united struggles for peace, democracy, and the economic needs of the people. American labor can and must measure up to its great responsibility toward itself, the nation, and the world.

II. THE NATIONAL ELECTIONS OF 1948 AND THE NEW PARTY MOVEMENT

The democratic forces of the American people have a historic task in the election battles of 1948. It is to curb the warmongers and profascists, and break once and for all the reactionary two-party system of the monopolies. It is to establish in the political life of the United States a united front, a people's, anti-monopoly peace party which will effectively combat the Wall Street bipartisan coalition, lead the masses in effective struggle against Wall Street's drive to war and fascism, and defend the daily interests and needs of the people.

One of the most important political developments following the death of President Roosevelt was Truman's betrayal of the people's mandate of the 1944 Presidential elections. Even before final victory in the war, the Truman Administration began to accelerate monopoly's postwar program, to break with Roosevelt's progressive peace policies, and to betray the Roosevelt-labor-progressive coalition. Since the war's end, it has passed completely into the camp of militant reaction and aggressive war-provoking imperialism. Heading the Democratic Party, it has become a leading force in the bipartisan war coalition of the monopolies. Together with the Republican Party, the Truman government and the Democratic Party bear full responsibility for the growing danger of a new world war, for the accelerated ap-

proach of the coming economic crisis, for the sinking standards of living of the American people, for the upswing of reaction, for the growth of the fascist danger.

The other most important event in the postwar political life of the United States was the emergence and growth of a new progressive political alignment and peace coalition of the American people. This democratic coalition and its new, third, party are now challenging the monopoly drive to war and fascism.

This new people's coalition has taken over and is carrying forward the progressive policies of the former Roosevelt-labor-progressive coalition. But it has arisen and is developing in an entirely new world situation created as a result of World War II. Therefore, it has acquired a new and higher political content. Learning from the lessons and experiences of the Roosevelt period, the new people's coalition is developing with greater internal unity and is moving in the direction of effective struggles to curb the monopolies. The working class plays a new role within the coalition and is beginning—but only beginning—to develop as its main driving force and leader.

The former democratic coalition of labor and Roosevelt forces operated within the framework of the Democratic Party. By contrast, the new people's coalition, while embracing sections that have not yet broken away from the two-party system, has by its struggles given rise to a new political party and an independent

Presidential ticket challenging the Republican - Democratic bipartisan war coalition in the 1948 elections. The emergence of this new anti-monopoly, anti-fascist people's party has deepened the crisis in the Democratic Party and is leading to its disintegration. It is also influencing many followers of the G.O.P. to break with the two-party system.

The formation of this new party is of paramount historic significance. It marks the beginning of the end of the two-party system through which Big Business has so long ruled. Crystallized by the most urgent requirements of the present election struggle, it represents a permanent, structural force in American politics.

It is developing under an anti-monopoly, anti-fascist, and anti-imperialist leadership and not under Social-Democratic and Red-baiting influences.

Despite the violent opposition of the top circles of the C.I.O. and the A. F. of L., it already has a broader working-class base than had the La-Follette third-party movement in 1924, which was formally supported by organized labor. At the same time, the broadening of this labor base is absolutely necessary for the further development and consolidation of the new party. The new party has wide support among sections of the Negro people, has begun to attract increasing support among sections of the farmers, and wields great influence among professionals and city middle classes.

Beyond the millions who already

grasp the significance of the new party and are allying themselves with it, stand other millions of working people potentially with it, although today they may be still undecided or even opposed to the question of a third ticket. Among these are many, in and outside the labor movement, who, in their own way, even though confusedly, seek a path to peace and democratic advance. These forces are by no means irrevocably committed to the twin parties of Wall Street. They must be fought for, and they can be won. To find common ground with them now, in common struggle around specific issues, is a vital task for all who would help to guarantee that the new people's party becomes a permanent and increasingly decisive factor in American political life. Toward this end every effort should be made by the supporters of the new party forces to unite with all groups for the election of progressive, anti-war Congressmen irrespective of party labels. And while the Communist Party will bring forward its independent program in the elections, and in certain cases run candidates for Congressional and State office, it will render maximum support to the progressive candidates of the people's coalition.

The following major issues confront the people in the present election struggles:

1. To fight for peace by checking and defeating the Truman Doctrine and Marshall Plan; to press for a return to the Roosevelt policy of

friendship and collaboration with the Soviet Union; to fight for the adoption of the Wallace Plan for economic aid through the United Nations; for withdrawal of all American military aid and personnel from Greece, China, and Turkey, and for an end to American military and naval pressure in the Mediterranean area, as well as a halt to the militarization of Latin America; to grant immediate independence to Puerto Rico; for fulfillment of the Potsdam agreements to guarantee a united, democratic, and peaceful Germany and Japan; for full support to the new Jewish State, Israel; for the strengthening of the U.N. on the basis of equality and collaboration of the Big Five and against the anti-Soviet Western military bloc.

2. To resist the militarization of the United States; to oppose U.M.T., conscription, and the colossal war budgets; to fight for a policy of genuine disarmament, including a halt to the production of atom bombs, destruction of existing stockpiles, and establishment of true international control of atomic energy.

3. To resist the reactionary offensive at home and the mounting attacks on the rights of labor and the civil liberties of the people; to repeal the Taft-Hartley Law; to defeat the Mundt Bill and all other efforts to outlaw or persecute the Communist Party; to cancel Truman's "loyalty" decrees; to dissolve the Un-American Committee; to halt all forms of political discrimination and persecution of labor, progressive, and

Communist organizations; to stop the deportation drive and other forms of persecution and discrimination against the foreign-born; to demand the prosecution and punishment of all fascist, anti-Semitic, and anti-Negro acts and groupings, and to fight for legislation making such activities a criminal offense.

4. To combat the high cost of living, monopoly profiteering, and inflation; to fight for substantial wage increases and better working conditions to protect the masses from the rapacious crisis-policies of the monopolies; to fight for raising the minimum hourly wage level to \$1.00; to demand a roll-back of prices to O.P.A. days and to fight for such price controls as will insure the democratic supervision of the people's progressive mass organizations over the price-fixing agencies; to fight for a people's tax and housing program; for a capital levy on large fortunes to retire the national debt on a graduated basis; for widening and strengthening all social security laws; for adequate immediate aid to all unemployed and partially employed; for an adequate and non-discriminatory people's health and educational program; for effective measures to safeguard the economic well-being of the farmers, the Negro people, the aged, the youth, veterans, women, and small businessmen.

5. To fight for the equal rights of the Negro people; for the outlawing of Jim Crow, and the passage of the anti-lynching and anti-poll tax legislation for the abolition of all forms

of discrimination against the Negro people in army and civilian life; for democratic agrarian reforms in the South, satisfying the needs of the Negro people for land, freedom, and equality; and for the right to self-determination of the Negro people in those Southern areas where they form the majority.

To fight for an effective F.E.P.C. to outlaw all forms of discrimination against the Negro people, the Jewish people, the Mexican-Americans, and all other national groups, and the foreign born.

6. To press for a Federal farm program, including extension and strengthening of wartime price guarantees, which will guarantee a decent minimum annual income to every family-sized farm; promote soil conservation, make Federal credit available at low interest rates, encourage independent ownership, establish co-operative machinery pools, check the inflationary increase in farm indebtedness, and defend the co-operatives against Big Business-inspired attacks.

In the course of the crucial election campaign of 1948, it will be necessary to combat the false "lesser evil" theories of the phoney liberals, the reactionary union bureaucrats and pseudo-Socialist leaders of the A. F. of L., the top reformist and Social-Democratic leaders of the C.I.O. It will also be necessary to combat the most recent maneuver of these forces to check the advance of the new people's party and to save the Democratic Party as a major

force in Wall Street's two-party system—their maneuver to eliminate Truman from the Democratic ticket in favor of some less compromised Wall Street candidate, such as Eisenhower.

We must also combat the candidates and activities of the reactionary Socialist Party.

The capitalist class is systematically publicizing the party of Norman Thomas in an effort to deflect votes from the people's party into the safe channels of the pro-imperialist "Socialist" Party. Thus, significantly, the *New York Times* (May 11, 1948) greeted the nomination of Norman Thomas as the Socialist Party's Presidential candidate with the editorial declaration that "it is good to have Mr. Thomas in the field" and "we are not sorry that this sort of campaign is being made by this sort of man. It won't do us any harm at all."

It cannot be doubted that Wall Street's build-up of its "Socialist" Party is related to the perspective to form a spurious, pro-imperialist third party as a counter-movement to the Wallace-led forces, as a "Third Force" against the people's coalition. We must therefore make clear to all that the waging of an effective struggle against reactionary Social-Democracy is an integral part of the entire struggle of the peace coalition.

The election campaign constitutes a crucial phase of the great struggle of the American people for peace, democracy, and security. Consequently, it must be linked with the strug-

gles of the people in all fields, electoral, economic, and political. It must aim at an all-around strengthening of the progressive mass organizations of the people, a consolidation of the alliance between the workers, farmers, urban middle classes, and the Negro people, and the establishment of the new party as a major factor in the life of the nation.

The 1948 election campaign of the people must aim at reinforcing the new party and people's coalition as powerful bulwarks against the monopolies and warmongers, and at creating the conditions for bringing about a new and generally favorable political situation within the country which can advance the cause of peace, democracy, and social progress.

III. ROLE OF THE WORKING CLASS IN THE PEOPLE'S COALITION AND TASKS OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY

The central task of the Communist Party in this period is to help forge the broadest people's anti-monopoly and peace coalition, in which the working class must play the leading role. The Communist Party will steadfastly help develop the class consciousness and independent political role of labor. It will energetically promote the unity of action of the American working class, especially the united front of struggle from below of Communists and non-Communists in the shops, factories, communities, etc., and will help

forge a mighty peace front of all anti-war and progressive forces.

As yet the American working class is only taking the first steps on the road to establishing its leading role in the people's coalition and the new people's party. But there can be no doubt that it is capable of becoming, and that it must become, the leader of the people's struggles against the monopolies, if these struggles are to succeed.

The working class is basically the consistent anti-imperialist and democratic class in American society. It suffers most from capitalist exploitation, and is therefore fundamentally interested in combating monopoly oppression. It is the class which must seek to undermine and eliminate monopoly-capitalist rule in order to advance to Socialism. That is why it is destined to be the leader of the people's anti-monopoly coalition.

The people's coalition is a loose alliance of workers, farmers, the Negro people, city middle classes, professionals, national groups, etc. All forces in the people's coalition are vitally interested in waging an anti-imperialist, democratic struggle against the monopolies. But not all are capable of the same consistency and stability. Therefore, the coalition must have the relatively well-organized and disciplined working class as its backbone and eventual leader. Only this leadership can supply the consistency, the strength of organization, and the experience in struggle which is necessary for win-

ning the historic fight against the monopolies.

The chief obstacle to the working class establishing its leadership in the people's coalition and in the new people's party is the activity of the reactionary and reformist trade union bureaucrats and pseudo-Socialist leaders of the A. F. of L., the C.I.O., and the R.R. Brotherhoods. These gentlemen try to tie labor to the imperialist war-making Truman Doctrine and Marshall Plan. They resist unity of labor against Wall Street at home and conspire against world trade union unity. They use the poisonous and divisive Hitler-weapon of Red-baiting and anti-Communism. They bargain away labor's demand for substantial wage increases and do nothing effective to combat inflation and the high cost of living, or to prepare labor to fight the coming economic crisis. Many of them have already completely adapted themselves to the Taft-Hartley Law, while others are compromising their opposition to it and are preparing to abandon the fight altogether. They have abandoned all serious efforts to organize the unorganized and have embarked on a course of raiding the organized membership of the progressive and Left unions. Within the trade unions, they weaken and destroy labor's internal democracy and launch campaigns of persecution against the progressive and anti-imperialist forces in the labor movement. These policies are tending seriously to undermine the integrity and

strength of the whole trade union movement.

Naturally, these social-reformists and Social-Democrats, as well as the A.C.T.U., in the trade unions, concentrate especially on combating the growth of the people's coalition and the emergence of labor as its leading force. They strive desperately to keep the American working class in political and ideological subjection to the capitalist class, its leaders and parties, and from participation in the building of the third party and in promoting the Wallace Presidential ticket in 1948. In the trade unions, it is especially the top C.I.O. leadership and Social-Democratic combination that now represent the main obstacle to the development of labor's political independence and leadership.

It is therefore clear that it is necessary to wage an unrelenting political and ideological struggle against these agents of Wall Street in the labor movement.

The working class will not become the main driving force in the people's coalition solely because of resolutions adopted by trade unions. It will gain influence and leadership among the broader forces of the people's coalition to the extent that the trade unions, especially the progressive-led unions, show themselves *in action, unitedly*, as a militant champion of peace and the daily interests of the people. Such united labor action will attract new and broader allies to the coalition and will help set in motion, not only forces ready

to break with the two old parties, but every active fighter for security, democracy, and peace.

In view of the capitulation of the top circles of the C.I.O., A. F. of L., R.R. Brotherhoods, and U.M.W.A., to the imperialist course of Wall Street, such united action must today be built primarily from below, in the shops, factories, and local unions, involving also the lower and secondary levels of leadership of the Right-dominated unions.

The Communist Party will carry out its tasks in helping to strengthen the people's coalition and in advancing the united action and leadership of the working class. It will perform its tasks as an independent political party of the American working class, as its Marxist vanguard, dedicated to preventing the establishment of fascism and the unleashing of World War II, and to ensuring the abolition of capitalism and the establishment of Socialism in the United States.

Life has already demonstrated the correctness and effectiveness of the Party's main line of struggle against Wall Street's imperialist and reactionary offensive—the line formulated by the Emergency National Convention of the Party in 1945.

The Convention said:

Now with the defeat of Nazi Germany and the Axis, the possibility of realizing an enduring peace and of making new democratic advances and social progress has been opened up for the peoples by the weakening of reaction and fascism on a world scale and

the consequent strengthening of the world-wide democratic forces.

However, a sharp and sustained struggle must still be conducted to realize these possibilities. This is so because the economic and social roots of fascism in Europe have not yet been fully destroyed. This is so because the extremely powerful reactionary forces in the United States and England, which are centered in the trusts and cartels, are striving to reconstruct liberated Europe on a reactionary basis. Moreover, this is so because the most aggressive circles of American imperialism are endeavoring to secure for themselves political and economic domination in the world. . . .

If the reactionary policies and forces of monopoly capital are not checked and defeated, America and the world will be confronted with new aggressions and wars and the growth of reaction and fascism in the United States.

In the period since the Convention, this main line has been further developed by the National Committee on all major questions. As a result, the Communist Party rendered outstanding service to the American people.

Even before the end of the war, the Party warned the American people that Wall Street imperialism had for its objective the domination of the world. This clear and correct evaluation of the policy of American imperialism cut through the fog of illusions created during the war and armed the advanced workers for the struggle against the assault launched by Wall Street upon the decisions of Potsdam, Yalta, and Teheran.

Long before it had become obvious to great masses of the American people, the Communist Party exposed the systematic betrayal by Truman of the policies of the Roosevelt-labor-progressive coalition which had been given a people's mandate in the 1944 Presidential elections.

The Communist Party was the first to signalize the growth of the danger of a new world war and to make serious efforts to mobilize the American people to fight for peace.

The Communist Party quickly exposed the formation of a Republican-Democratic bipartisan war coalition, despite the strenuous efforts of the Truman Administration to conceal this coalition by demagogic exploitation of the Roosevelt tradition.

The Communist Party, beginning with its exposure of the first loan to Britain, condemned the use of American loans as a political weapon by Wall Street to intervene in and dominate the affairs of all countries.

The Communist Party was the only force in American political life which instantly grasped the reactionary, imperialist essence of the Marshall Plan and, without waverings or vacillations, undertook the struggle for its exposure and rejection.

The Communist Party, from the earliest days after the end of the war, understood that its traditional fight for a new people's party directed against the two-party system of the monopolies had once more been placed by events as an immediate, practical question before the American people, and, acting upon this

understanding, it boldly proclaimed the need for such a new people's party. Because of its correct line, the Party was able to carry on effective mass work and make significant contributions to the struggle for peace and democracy and to the forging of the new political alignment and people's coalition.

The Communist Party alone, long before it had become clear to wider sections of the people, signalized the rise of a fascist danger in the United States, and exposed the ominous drive toward the transformation of our country into a police state.

As an integral part of this, the Party has waged a courageous and uncompromising struggle for its legality and constitutional rights. In its determined conduct of this struggle, as well as in its vanguard role in the fight for the rights of the Negro people and against the Taft-Hartley Act, our Party has significantly contributed to the defense of the people's organizations and the Bill of Rights. At the same time, in the midst of mounting attacks and a barrage of anti-Communist hysteria, the Party was reconstituted in the South and has succeeded in strengthening its ranks and influence.

The Party has waged an energetic fight to combat the remnants of Browder revisionism, as well as Leftist sectarianism, adventurism, and Trotskyism.

The fight against Browder revisionism and against Right opportunism and Leftist sectarianism must be continued and intensified in all

fields of work. We must energetically combat the sundry cliques of expelled renegades who carry on their vicious anti-Party struggle under "Left" adventurist catchwords. An essential part of this struggle must be continued vigilance and struggle to defend and enhance the unity, discipline, and policies of our Party.

In noting the correctness of the Party's main line, we must self-critically examine and learn from a number of serious weaknesses and errors which mitigated against the more effective application of this line and which adversely affected the building of the Party. We failed to maintain a sufficiently clear independent and critical position toward our allies during the various phases of struggle since the last Party Convention, although the specific policy of alliances was fully correct. We did not as a rule base united front relations from above upon adequate work for the united front of mass struggle from below. We were slow to recognize and counteract the new political role of the Murray forces in the C.I.O. in connection with the Marshall Plan and tended for a short time to continue the old policy of Left-Center unity even after the political basis for it began to disappear. Nor did we move quickly and decisively to overcome the opportunist vacillations of certain Communist leaders in the trade unions and the people's movements. At the same time, it must be noted that our Party has not always kept sufficiently

in the forefront the imperative need to help organize united labor struggle to defeat the offensive of reaction.

In connection with the development of the third party movement, our Party—despite its generally correct position—was slow in respects in overcoming certain doubts as to the advisability of an independent Presidential ticket, doubts and hesitations which reflected influences of the "lesser evil" theory and which flowed from confusing the treacherous position of most of labor's top officialdom with the attitude of the rank and file.

Another important weakness to be registered has been our neglect of work among the youth, especially in the Party's failure adequately to develop Marxist education and Marxist cadres among the youth, and its slowness in the recent period in recognizing the need for the existence of a non-Party Marxist youth organization in the United States.

In connection with the veterans, it is clear that, unlike the period following World War I, the monopolists have been unable to utilize the mass of the veterans of World War II for their strike-breaking and union-busting campaigns. The veterans, in the main, are today playing a different role. However, in the recent period, many Party organizations tended to lose sight of the role which the veterans are capable of playing on the side of the people's coalition, whereas reaction has energetically invaded this field to build

for itself a social base. While Communists and other progressives are determined to work among the veterans in all their existing mass organizations, it must be recorded that we Communists share responsibility for the fact that the trade union and progressive movement lost an opportunity during and immediately after the war for the creation and building of a new, mass, labor-based veterans' organization.

Furthermore, we must recognize serious weaknesses in building the Party. Failure to exercise effectively the Party's vanguard role—ideologically, politically, and organizationally—in all vital fields of the people's struggle, is the main source of weakness in Party building and in the building of the Party press.

In this important connection, it is necessary to make a sharp turn in improving our struggle for Negro rights. An essential part of this struggle must be a heightened consciousness of the need to combat unceasingly influences of white-chauvinism which find their way into our midst and which often manifest themselves in passivity toward day-to-day struggles for Negro rights in the communities, shops, and unions. Furthermore, all bourgeois-nationalist influences which find their way into our ranks, must be strenuously combated.

The foregoing are errors and weaknesses in the application and practical development of a correct main line and correct policies on all major issues in the life of the Ameri-

can people. The Party stands before the working class and the people as the vanguard fighter for their most vital interests and fundamental aims, as an indispensable force in the people's coalition. As a result of its correct Marxist-Leninist line, the Party stands united as never before around its principles, policies, and leadership.

In carrying through its tasks as vanguard in the struggles of the working class and people's movements, our Party must develop to the maximum its political and organizing initiative. It must expand its ties with the masses and resolutely develop the tactic of the united front, primarily from below.

At the same time, our Party must engage in a broad ideological campaign involving the following main aspects:

1. *Against Imperialist Chauvinism.*

It is necessary to expose the fraudulent assertions that Wall Street's drive for world domination is motivated by high moral considerations; that Wall Street is merely asserting "leadership" in the world; that it fights for "western civilization," allegedly "superior" to other civilizations; that it fights against the forces of "disorder," "anarchy," and "totalitarianism"; that the "white, Christian, Anglo-Saxon world" is the cream of humanity and therefore entitled "to lord it" over everybody else.

The essence of these arrogant imperialist arguments is the racist and

extreme chauvinist ideology from which Nazi fascism molded its "German master race" theory. Under cover of this theory Hitler prepared ideologically for the war to conquer the world for Germany's monopolists, and in the name of this theory the Nazis destroyed millions of lives. Wall Street is now promoting the same fascist ideology, using its agents among the masses of the American people for this purpose.

2. *Expose Fascism's "Constitutional" Cloak*

American reaction is advancing toward fascism under the banner of "democracy" and "constitutionalism," against "totalitarianism," and in defense of "the American way of life." We must expose Wall Street's hypocritical professions of democracy; its destruction of the Bill of Rights in the name of "constitutionalism"; its true role as the main-spring of reaction and fascism, as the chief source of violent opposition even to Roosevelt's moderate bourgeois reforms.

It is necessary once more to revive before the masses the revolutionary working-class and generally democratic traditions of the American people's fight for peace, democracy, and equality. It is necessary to show that this represents the people's conception of the American way of life which, together with every democratic American ideal and aspiration, as well as the true national interest, Wall Street is violating.

3. *Expose the Anti-Communist "Foreign Agent" Myth*

From time immemorial, reaction has everywhere sought to label the indigenous growth of popular resistance to its oppressive rule as "foreign." Thus, the Federalists called Jefferson a "French agent"; the Russian landlords and capitalists called Lenin a "German agent"; and now Wall Street calls the Communists "Russian agents." The entire history of capitalist attacks upon manifestations of proletarian class consciousness, long before there was a Soviet Union, exposes this demagoguery. Today, the hysterical shouting of this shibboleth is commensurate with the crisis-throes of the decayed capitalist system. The "foreign agent" demagoguery, furthermore; is the stop-thief cry of rapacious Wall Street imperialism which has made a colossal system of financing its foreign agents in every country, most notoriously symbolized in "Project X."

We must engage in a widespread campaign to bring the truth to the people that the Communist Party arose inevitably from the economic, social, and political soil of the United States, in the course of the struggles of the American working class against capitalist exploitation; that the Communist Party is an organic part of the American working class and the American people. As the vanguard of the working class, the class qualified and destined to be the defender of the nation, the Communist Party, in its program, policies, and activities, is the consistent, un-

swerving, and staunch defender of America against its real enemy—the trusts.

As the defender of America's true national interests, which are in harmony with the true people's interests in all countries, the Communist Party holds high the banner of proletarian internationalism and the friendship of nations. It seeks, in the first place, to promote Soviet-American friendship and co-operation—the keystone of United Nations unity and world peace.

4. *Against the Influences of Economism in the Labor Movement*

While the struggle against economism in all its aspects within the labor movement is and always has been a central ideological task of our Party, we must at this time particularly emphasize one major aspect of this struggle: to educate the labor movement toward a class orientation to the foreign policy of American imperialism. We witness a situation today in which our labor movement has been conducting great militant struggles on economic issues against the monopoly capitalists, and yet, at the same time, fails to recognize the class-enemy face of the very same monopolists who operate with their Marshall Plans and anti-Soviet incitements. This accounts for the situation in which labor fights against a Studebaker auto magnate as an enemy and supports the self-same auto magnate in his capacity of E.R.P. director.

We must show concretely the

heavy price that labor is already paying for this contradictory attitude in the weakening of its economic struggle. Capitulation to the class enemy in the field of foreign policy leads inevitably to capitulation in the domestic field.

5. *The Struggle for the Marxist-Leninist Theory of the Relation Between Democracy and Socialism*

At the present time, the people's coalition is making its first steps on the road of struggle to curb the monopolies. It is only in the initial stage of launching the anti-monopoly party. Hence, the central immediate task of the Communists is to help the people's coalition to realize its immediate tasks. But in doing so, Communists must present to the masses the perspectives of the struggle, the nature of the next and higher stages of the struggle, and the strategic objectives of the movement.

We must not make the fatal Leftist sectarian error of failing to rally the masses for the realization of the immediate tasks of the coalition because there are higher stages of struggle to come. Equally, we must guard against the fatal Right-opportunist mistake of failing to treat the struggle for the immediate tasks in the light of the strategic needs of the struggle as a whole and of the coming higher stages.

The present fight to curb the monopolies is waged by a democratic, anti-imperialist, anti-fascist, peace coalition. In order to protect its gains and safeguard its objectives, in order

to curb the monopolies in the United States effectively, the working class will have to enhance its influence and leading role within the people's coalition. Eventually the working class and its allies will have to attack the very foundations of monopoly rule by advancing and fighting for measures drastically to curb the monopolies and finally to break the power of monopoly capital.

In connection with this, it is necessary to expose the illusion that the abolition of monopoly rule in the United States will usher in a system of "progressive capitalism," or restore the era of free competition. On the contrary, the elimination of the power of monopoly capital must lead inevitably to Socialism.

The special path along which the transition to Socialism will proceed will be determined by the democratic choice and struggles of the American working class and its popular allies, on the basis of the concrete conditions in the United States.

Exposure of illusions about a "progressive capitalism," illusions that are prevalent in the labor movement of this country, as well as in many circles in the new party, makes necessary a struggle against "liberal" Keynesism—an influential school of bourgeois economics which breeds illusion in the possibility of overcoming the basic contradictions of capitalism within the confines of the capitalist system. It requires a struggle to clear up and dissipate economic illusions widespread among the masses in the United States and cle-

erly exploited by both reformists and outright reactionaries in the service of the monopolies. It requires an ideological struggle to promote Marxist economic teachings and to establish theoretical clarity on such major problems as cyclical crises, full employment, and the role of the capitalist state in the country's economy. It requires an ideological struggle against certain economic fallacies and illusions of major forces in the people's coalition, of the adherents of certain New Deal theories.

An important phase of the ideological struggle against Keynesism is the struggle against the many existing variations of "American exceptionalism." This requires a struggle against the bourgeois and opportunist ideology that American capitalism is immune to the fundamental contradictions of the capitalist system. Exposing and combating this fraud, which has become part of the general American imperialist ideology, we must not fail to take full account, theoretically and tactically, of the many specific features and characteristics of American capitalist development in order more effectively to rally the masses against Wall Street.

IV. BUILD A MASS VANGUARD COMMUNIST PARTY

For the American working class to advance to leadership of the developing people's democratic coalition, and for the coalition itself to become a power for victory, there must be

a growing and influential Communist Party.

Only a Communist Party of mass strength and influence, and functioning as an organic and inseparable part of the people's coalition, can effectively promote the struggle for working-class leadership in the nation. Without such a Communist Party, this struggle cannot be won. In the course of daily and resolute struggle for working-class leadership in the progressive movements of the American people for peace and progress, for the defense of their vital interests, a mass Communist Party of great strength and influence must and will become a reality in the United States.

We must build our Party along these lines—politically, ideologically, and organizationally. It must be built daily in the realization of the Party's vanguard role in the working class and among the people as a whole. It must be built, in the first place, among the basic industrial workers by a consistent, unflagging policy of concentration. The Party must be built in the struggle for its Marxist-Leninist principles and policies.

We must combat the false idea that we need only a small Party of key people, that we do not need a strong mass Party. We must educate our members and followers to understand that without a strong mass Communist Party there can be no strong progressive labor movement and no leading position for the working class in the people's peace coalition. We

must demonstrate further that only a strong mass Communist Party, recognized by the masses as its vanguard, will be able to lead the fight against war and fascism, insecurity and chaos, and eventually for Socialism, the only guarantee that a world will be built free of wars, crises, fascism, exploitation, and oppression.

Hence, the crucial importance of developing loyalty to the Communist Party, of strengthening Communist discipline and mass activity—based on a clear understanding of, and devotion to, the Party's principles and policies—of building Communist cadres and leadership, and of extending the circulation and use of the Party press, *Political Affairs*, and other Party publications.

FORWARD WITH CONFIDENCE
—IN OUR PEOPLE, OUR CLASS,
AND OUR PARTY!

We live in stirring times, fraught with the most terrible dangers, but pregnant with unprecedented opportunities to advance toward the realization of mankind's highest aspirations.

As the vanguard Party of the American working class, we Communists have a heavy responsibility to our own people and to all the peace-loving peoples of the world.

Only if our Party fulfills its vanguard obligations will the American working class succeed in leading the American people's struggle to repel

the dangers of war and fascism, and realize the objectives of peace, democracy, and social progress.

We have confidence that our Communist Party will build itself, bigger and stronger, to measure up to the needs of our class and our country. We have confidence that the very fury of the coming storms will convince the best of the American workers to struggle with us, in our ranks.

We will fight unflinchingly for the legality and constitutional rights of our Party. We do not shrink from the hammer blows of reaction. Under them we will steel our Party in Communist discipline, loyalty, and unity, develop its Marxist-Leninist understanding, and temper our cadres and leadership. Sharing the hardships and struggles of America's working people, we will root our

Party ever deeper in the American working-class soil from which it sprang.

As the vanguard Party of the American working class we take our place in the front line of battle, conscious of our responsibility to all Americans who struggle for peace, democracy, economic security, and social progress. We hold aloft the banner of our conviction that the American working people have the capacity, means, and allies to curb and defeat the fascists and warmongers, and, eventually, to advance toward the Socialist reorganization of society, which will forever end the dangers of fascism, crises, and war—the misery of exploitation and oppression. We face the oncoming struggles with confidence in our people, our class, and our Party.

“Consequently, according to Marx, the direct task of science is to give a true slogan of the struggle, *i.e.*, to be able to present this struggle objectively as a product of a definite system of production relations, to be able to *understand* the necessity of this struggle, its content, its progress and the conditions of its development. A ‘slogan of struggle’ cannot be given without a detailed study of every individual form of this struggle, without following every one of its steps when it passes from one form to another, so as to be able at every given moment to determine the general nature of the struggle and its general aim—the complete and final abolition of all exploitation and all oppression.”

V. I. Lenin, *Marx-Engels-Marxism*, pp. 62-3.

THE IMPERATIVE NEED FOR UNITED LABOR ACTION

By JOHN WILLIAMSON

THE LIVING STANDARDS of the workers are today under the sharpest attack since the crisis of 1929. The trade unions are facing an offensive by Big Business which aims to reduce them to a position like that after the First World War. *To fail to see this is to court disaster.*

The trusts, grown more powerful and more greedy from the profits of the last world war, are striving to establish their right to dominate and exploit the whole world. The offensive against the workers' living standards, the drive to weaken and smash the powerful trade unions, is part and parcel of this imperialist drive. *Not to recognize this is to disarm the workers in the face of the enemy.*

In the first round of struggles immediately following the end of the war the trade unions, thanks to their strength and the militant struggles led by the steel, electrical and auto workers, were able to ward off the first postwar attacks and to emerge stronger, with their major gains intact. In the second round of struggles the workers' gains were less substantial and much of what was gained

in the economic struggles was lost through the wiping out of O.P.A. and price control, through the high monopoly inflation prices that were imposed on the people by the Truman Administration and the Republicans. *This was a danger signal which unfortunately was ignored by the majority of the trade union leaders.*

Now when the workers, facing the unbearable high cost of living, embark on a new round of wage demands, the trusts are taking full advantage of the support of their imperialist program by most of the leaders of labor and are finding encouragement for their offensive in the division in the ranks of the labor movement which they have been and are skillfully promoting. *Unless this situation is changed the labor movement faces a disastrous defeat.*

In the face of this grave and dangerous situation the workers must insist that all steps be taken to establish united action of the trade unions on a program of demands and through such forms of struggle that can adequately defend the gains of the workers and safeguard the trade unions. Such united action can and must be established despite the many and serious differences on vital political issues. Differences—which must be fought out within the ranks of the labor movement—must not be allowed to divide the workers' ranks in the face of the economic offensive of the employers. United labor action must be fought for and estab-

lished on every level, carrying through such united action where possible without waiting and using every advance toward united action to broaden this unity, extend it to the rest of the working class, and embrace even those who in the first stage resist such united action.

MONOPOLY'S OFFENSIVE

A major distinguishing feature of this new round of wage-strike struggles is that it occurs when the big trusts feel themselves ready to make the fullest and most arrogant use of the union-busting Taft-Hartley Law.

Today several million workers and their unions are engaged in some phase of struggle for higher wages and renewed contracts, but their fight is not co-ordinated. Among all these workers in those industries there is great dissatisfaction, which expresses itself in a demand for higher wages. However, as a result of the monopoly offensive and the unwillingness of some of the top trade union leaders to move into struggle, there is also confusion among the workers and some hesitation on their part to press for the adoption of a militant policy. But once given a perspective of struggle, accompanied by support from other trade unions and a leadership of their own that demonstrates ability and fighting capacity, the workers do respond and conduct militant struggles. This has been clearly demonstrated in the packing and coal mining industries.

The big trusts, feeling the situation most favorable for them and having the Taft-Hartley Law as their "big stick," have launched a new offensive against the entire trade union movement. (This was dramatized by the arrogant refusal of the U.S. Steel Corp. to grant a single penny of wage increase to the C.I.O. steel workers' union, which is led by Philip Murray. Seemingly intended as a pattern, U.S. Steel policy has been rapidly followed by all other steel companies, and other big monopolies.

Prior to this, the trusts had been concentrating their attacks on the so-called Left-progressive led unions and the coal miners. This led those trade union leaders who had jumped on Wall Street's bandwagon to think that they were exempt from attack. The figurative "kick in the teeth" which the steel workers' union received dramatized an important lesson for all of labor, namely, the more a union weakens itself by tying itself to the political program of the monopolies, the more arrogantly and aggressively will the big corporations move against any union which has thus weakened itself.

That this action of U.S. Steel is part of an over-all pattern is also shown by the attacks on the meat-packing, farm equipment, fur, telephone, typographical, coal, and railroad workers.

Everywhere the employer-government pattern is the same—a strike-breaking, union-busting offensive

with the Taft-Hartley Law as the main weapon. There is no discrimination—the attack is pressed against unions which belong to the C.I.O. or A. F. of L., or which are independent; which are progressive or Right-wing led; which do or do not comply with the Taft-Hartley “non-Communist affidavit” provision; which are for or against the Marshall Plan.

The over-all picture is dramatized by a reported incident on the Wall Street A. F. of L. office workers’ picket line. When the New York City police splattered the blood of these conservative office workers and A. F. of L.-I.S.U. sailors on Wall Street’s pavements; it is reported that one of the strikers shouted to a club-wielding cop: “Hey, we are anti-Communists. Why do you club us?” The cop, continuing to club the pickets, reportedly gave the answer: “I don’t care what kind of damned Communist you are.” In this little story is epitomized the offensive of the trusts against all the trade unions.

The arrogance of the employers and government arises primarily from the following developments:

1. The majority of C.I.O. and A. F. of L. leaders have now become active propagandists for various aspects of Wall Street’s imperialist program at home and abroad, and have committed themselves to a policy of supporting the capitalist two-party system and opposing the building of a new people’s peace party.

2. The Murray-Potofsky forces in the C.I.O. have reached agreement

with the Reuther-Rieve-Carey forces on the basis of the latter’s Right-wing program, which includes the raiding of Left-progressive unions. This has weakened the over-all fighting capacity of the C.I.O.

3. The employers are making full use of their knowledge that adherence by the majority of the trade union leaders to the Marshall Plan renders them ineffective fighters for the economic demands of the workers and against the Taft-Hartley attacks of the very forces these officers are supporting on the political field. In fact “endangering the Marshall Plan” will soon be the open political club used against all strikes and all demands of the workers.

4. The trade union movement has allowed itself to become further divided by biting the Taft-Hartley sucker bait of signing “non-Communist affidavits.” Instead of maintaining their original common front of opposition to the entire Taft-Hartley Act, some trade union leaders played the employers’ game by getting diverted into internal strife against those who correctly refuse to sign these “yellow dog” affidavits.

This new offensive of employers and government creates a very dangerous situation for the welfare and the continued existence of the labor movement.

However, if the significance of these same new developments we have outlined above are grasped by the unions, and especially by the rank and file, it will be possible to

develop united action to such an extent that it will reinvigorate the trade union movement, place it on a plane of struggle, and enable it to overcome such negative developments as the inter-union raids and the capitulation to the "anti-Communist" clauses of the Taft-Hartley Act. And this will help make possible the defeat of reaction's offensive.

HOW TO DEFEND THE TRADE UNIONS

Today the very existence of the trade union movement and its ability to defend the interests of its members as well as to fulfill its responsibility to the workers and people generally, urgently demands consideration of the following:

1. *The acceptance and working out of an over-all wage-strike policy by the trade unions.*

So far, in the present round of wage struggles, each trade union has moved for itself. All the trade unions have had the illusion that a wage increase would inevitably be granted, the only issue being how large the increase would be. No real effort has been made by the C.I.O. or the A. F. of L. on a national level—nor for that matter by the Left-progressive trade unions—to realize, in full or partially, a common wage strategy. The result has been that different trade unions have been projecting different and conflicting demands, with some unions striking for their maximum demands and others signing for much less.

Thus far, the result of this incorrect go-it-alone strategy has been that the A.C.A. cable workers and the A. F. of L. stock exchange workers have suffered defeat; the I.T.U. has capitulated to the Taft-Hartley injunction; the railroad unions have called off their strike; the packinghouse and Peoria farm equipment workers are in a weakened condition as this is written;* and all the unions have been weakened by the capitulation of Murray and the C.I.O. steel workers' union to U.S. Steel Corporation.

The most elementary prerequisite for changing this situation and moving over to the offensive is the establishment of some form of united wage-strike strategy. Most desirable would be the involvement of the entire C.I.O. and A. F. of L., the U.M.W.A., the R.R. Brotherhoods, and the International Association of Machinists in working out such a strategy. An absolute minimum starting point is the immediate realization of such an over-all wage-strike strategy involving the following C.I.O. unions—auto, electrical, packing, rubber, maritime, smelter and farm equipment. Of course, even under the present unfavorable conditions, it is possible for some of the above individual unions to win their

* Since this was written, both the packinghouse and Peoria farm equipment workers' strikes have been called off by their respective unions. Each was a temporary setback. The absence of a united wage strategy, the scabbing of the A. F. of L. packinghouse union, and the general lack of support, particularly for the C.I.O. packinghouse workers, by other trade unions, were the causes of these setbacks.—J.W.

demands, in full or in part, without striking or by winning strikes. These, however, will be exceptional cases, based on the specific strength and fighting policy of a particular union, or in isolated cases upon the utilization of the contradictions within the employers' ranks.

For the success of such a policy it is necessary that all trade unions recognize the present-day validity of an old union slogan—an injury to one is an injury to all. Whichever unions—at the moment of writing the packinghouse, farm equipment, and Chrysler unions—are on the front line of battle, must be guaranteed maximum support from all other unions. This support should take the form of relief, pickets, joint actions, etc., and it should be timely. It is shortsighted indeed for some unions to hold on to large treasuries for their own defense while allowing brother unions on the front line of battle to be decimated. The loss of a few strikes, such as that of the A.C.A. workers, will seriously lower the fighting capacity of all other unions.

2. The adoption of a fighting policy by the trade unions.

The present offensive of the trusts and the Government against the trade unions cannot be defeated by the "gentlemanly" type of struggle of the past few years, for with the adoption of the Taft-Hartley Act a completely new situation exists. The workers' demands cannot be gained either through the good will of the

employers or the intervention of some Government board. Only the organized strength and fighting quality of each union—and the maximum unity of all unions—can wrest concessions from the employers and particularly the big corporations. *Even in cases when the relationship of forces is least favorable for advance, an offensive strategy and fighting policy is the prerequisite to maintain the status quo.*

This also means that trade union leaders and staff members need to be of a different type than that developed during the war. At that time a knowledge of law and statistics and skill in conducting round-table negotiations were considered the principal qualities of a labor leader. Today, without negating completely the value of these abilities, the main quality required of trade union leaders and staff members is initiative, boldness, and capacity in leading and developing the struggles of the workers.

3. The adoption of demands that will arouse the full support of the workers.

The workers and their trade unions, as a result of the over-all offensive of the employers, are aware of the need for action on a series of burning demands. These include wage increases, reduction in speedup, improvement in grievance machinery, hospital and pension plans at company expense, and prevention of Taft-Hartley mutilation of the unions.

However, because of the present political atmosphere and the past failure to orientate on a fighting policy, there are varied tendencies to capitulate to the employers without a fight, as well as opportunist trends expressed in attempts to "get something" at once at the expense of other workers or the common people generally.

In the case of the steel workers' union, Philip Murray, despite his public statement that "U.S. Steel did not bargain in good faith," repeats over and over again that the union will "live up to its no-strike pledge." It even appears that Murray was ready to delay the wage negotiations to see the effects of the alleged price cuts of the Steel Trust, but even this face-saving proposition was rejected by Mr. Fairless.

In the maritime industry, the hiring hall, which is the key to the maritime union's existence is still in danger. Any surrender on the substance of this issue, whether via the Lundberg formula of "preferring" to hire union seamen, or any variation of it, will be disastrous for seafaring unions.

It is equally wrong for any single group of workers to join with their employers—directly or indirectly—in tying their demand for increased wages to the employers' demand for increased prices or fares. This is a step backward, and even if momentary concessions are achieved they will boomerang against the particu-

lar group of workers or union in a short time.

This type of "practical" trade union leadership throws overboard one hundred years of trade union experience, not to speak of disregarding the new situation in which the labor movement is operating. It will lead to dividing the trade union movement, to disregarding the lessons of the past decade which show that a policy of militant struggle achieves results and maintains the morale of the workers. In the long run it will lead to more disastrous examples of class collaboration.

When the ordinary trade union leader, who is still tied to capitalist ideology, falls victim to any variation of this misnamed "practical" trade unionism, it is wrong and we must expose it and oppose it unhesitatingly. However, when any trade union leader who claims to be a Marxist capitulates to such tendencies, not only must it be exposed, but the workers should be told bluntly that he is wrong, and he must be called to account for conduct that is contrary to the best interests of the working class and therefore non-Marxist.

In some cases, the people concerned should reread their labor history and draw its lessons so that they themselves may help guarantee that latter-day models are not developed of some trade union leaders of Europe as well as America who started as Marxists and then by day-to-day neglect of the theory, practice,

and organizational principles of Marxism, degenerated into "pure and simple" trade union leaders who, in the name of "practicality" and "knowing better," strayed a long way from Marxism.

To sum up on this point, it is imperative today, while recognizing the generally defensive character of the economic struggles, to select those demands that will win the maximum support of the workers and make it possible for the entire labor movement to adopt a militant fighting policy.

4. *Combine the struggle on the economic and political field.*

To gain success today in the struggle for the economic demands of their members, the trade unions must also be convinced of the need to fight on the political field. The fight to wrest higher wages from the trusts will in the end be a vain one if these same trusts are allowed to dictate the policies of Congress and the Administration. The living standards of all workers are already taking a nose-dive because of the 20 billion dollar war budget arising from the Truman-Vandenberg doctrine. The right to strike is not only being curtailed by Taft-Hartley injunctions, but the alleged threat to Marshall Plan production will soon be the excuse for trying to break or prohibit strikes.

The urgency of action on the political field is made particularly clear by the Mundt Bill, just introduced in Congress as this is written.

Officially called "The Subversive Activities Control Act of 1948," this bill should really be called "The American Police State Act of 1948." Its aim is not only to outlaw the Communist Party. For example, it falsely states that the following methods are used by the "world Communist movement" to achieve their aims:

"(a) . . . the disruption of trade and commerce";

"(b) . . . the inciting of economic, social and racial strife and conflict";

"(c) . . . the dissemination of propaganda calculated to undermine established government and institutions."

If the reactionaries succeed in illegalizing the Communist Party, then, under any one of these alleged aims, strikes, struggles for Negro rights, issuance of trade union newspapers or pamphlets, protest actions against the Taft-Hartley Act, or support and participation by the trade unions in the new party led by Wallace and Taylor, would be attacked on the pretense that this is the work of "hidden" Communist conspirators. If found guilty, the penalty is imprisonment for 10 years or \$10,000 fine, or both, and loss of citizenship regardless of whether one is a native or foreign-born American citizen. The fight to defeat the Mundt Bill is therefore an act of self-defense for every trade union.

Hence, for the trade unions to try to limit their struggles to the economic field while big political battles

are raging around them aimed at crippling and destroying the trade unions and everything they stand for, would be either amateurish practice or criminal neglect. The trade unions must be convinced through open discussion—and by the pressure and action of their own members—to combine their economic struggles with political struggles today. Full understanding of this would result in active support and participation by larger numbers of trade unions in the new people's party.

POLITICAL ACTION

Those workers who were fooled into support of the Marshall Plan because they believed reaction's propaganda that it was different from the Truman Doctrine of intervention in the internal affairs of other nations, and because they honestly wished to give aid to the victims of Hitler in the European nations, can now see the truth of the position of the Communists and other progressive forces who saw from the beginning that the Marshall Plan was the same as the Truman Doctrine.

Today the Administration and the bipartisan supporters of the Marshall Plan openly proclaim that this plan is an extension of the Truman Doctrine and must be accompanied by increased armaments, militarization, and plans for military as well as political intervention; that it is part of the stepped up preparations for a third world war. The latest acts by Truman and Marshall in reject-

ing conversations with the U.S.S.R. show that the imperialists fear the "outbreak of peace" more than anything else, since it would run counter to their entire program of world domination.

It is necessary and possible to make new approaches to those workers who did not see this clearly before. It is necessary to strive for united action on such questions as an end to intervention in Greece, China, etc.; a demand that the Administration take up the offer of conversations with the U.S.S.R. toward easing the situation and aiming at a settlement of differences. It is possible to develop united action against the growing armament and militarization program. Such struggles will inevitably result in greater clarity on the real aims of the Truman Doctrine and the Marshall Plan.

While differences on these issues should be no bar to united action on the wage struggles and in defense of the trade unions, the Communists and the progressive forces must continue to wage a fight to win the workers on these issues.

Those workers who were trapped into opposition to Wallace and the new people's party on the false ground that Truman was a "lesser evil" as compared with any Republican candidate, and that there was a so called "third force" in between the camp of democracy and anti-imperialism on the one side and the reactionary imperialist camp, can also see more clearly now that only

by supporting the new party can they act in their own interests.

The fact is that the labor leaders who oppose the third party find it very difficult to sell Truman to the workers. For this reason they have begun a campaign to replace Truman with Eisenhower or Douglas. They have thus admitted that the workers would not support Truman even though these leaders were ready to support an Eisenhower on a Truman program. These labor leaders wanted to change Truman only to be better able to fight Wallace. But today it is becoming more likely that Truman will still be the Democratic candidate. Hence, these leaders find themselves now in a difficult position. They are silent at their conventions and hope that at the last moment after the Republican and Democratic Conventions, they will again be able to put across the "lesser evil" line. But millions of workers will by then have become further disillusioned. This will create the possibility for a new initiative by the progressive forces in the trade unions for convincing the workers and some leaders to support the new party. *This initiative must be grasped and pushed forward.*

At the same time it is necessary to find a basis for common action with those who can not yet be won over to the new party. This is possible on Congressional candidates, on local and state candidates, even where there is as yet no agreement on the Presidential ticket. Such

unity, to the extent that it can be developed, will strengthen labor's fight against the Taft-Hartley Law and for other progressive legislation. It will not weaken but strengthen the fight for the new party and help promote genuine independent political action by the workers.

THE REAL PURPOSES OF THE TAFT-HARTLEY ACT UNFOLD

Less than a year after its adoption, millions of workers are beginning to understand the real purposes of the Taft-Hartley Act. The employers succeeded at the beginning in having the trade union movement weaken itself by fighting within its own ranks on the question of signing the non-Communist affidavits and filing financial statements, instead of unitedly refusing to comply with these provisions of the slave-labor law.

Today it becomes increasingly clear to the workers that the Taft-Hartley Act is the bosses' club against every union demanding wage increases, and is a club to weaken and smash the trade union movement. The Taft-Hartley Act is being used, not merely against so-called Communist-led trade unions, but also against unions with conservative and Right-wing, anti-Communist leaderships. It is a weapon, as we Communists pointed out from the start, against the entire trade union movement.

Despite this, it is necessary to recognize that there are sections of the

membership of the trade unions, including those who are honestly against the Taft-Hartley Act, who have the mistaken illusion that they acquire some advantages by having their unions avail themselves of the "benefits" of the N.L.R.B., even though that requires signing the non-Communist affidavits.

The last remaining pretense of the National Labor Relations Board to impartial usefulness, *i.e.*, that it would continue to receive and examine cases, is exploded by an examination of the statistics issued by the Board itself. Up to February 29, the N.L.R.B. had received 12,500 cases. On August 22, 1947, when the Taft-Hartley Act became effective, there was a backlog of 3,933 pending cases. But on February 29, 1948, the backlog had increased to 9,500. Robert N. Denham, Chairman of the Board, now predicts that the Board will have over 60,000 cases during the fiscal year starting July 1, 1948. While workers are waiting for decisions in these cases, twice as many new cases will have arisen in the shops, as a result of the employers' offensive.

Let no one think, however, that delaying procedure is typical of Labor Boss Denham when it comes to employers' charges against trade unions. Then we see speed. The Board filed thirteen complaints in Federal Courts for injunctions—twelve against the trade unions and one against an employer. In the case of the conservative 100-year-old

International Typographical Union, eighteen charges have been filed, four administrative hearings held, one injunction issued, and two damage suits filed.

The following two cases are typical of what happens to those trade unions whose leadership rushed to be "good boys" and prove their loyalty to the employers and the Taft-Hartley Board.

First, as regards the International Association of Machinists, the following quotation from Pop Dearborn's popular column "Inside Labor" in the *Chicago Star* (May 1), is fully explanatory:

The International Association of Machinists (unaffiliated) is one union certified chemically pure by test of Section 9-H of the Taft Hartley Act. Nonetheless, the I.A.M. is as entangled in the Act as a fly who has fallen into flypaper.

Before the Act went into action, the I.A.M. had 587 cases on file with the Labor Board. . . . Then they were informed that beginning August 22, 1947, when the Act began to show its teeth, "no certifications would be issued where elections had been held and no elections directed where hearing had been held until the full filing requirements had been completed."

But then the I.A.M. found that until August 27 it couldn't comply with the filing requirements, eager at its officers were to do so. *The N.L.R.B. was fresh out of Forms 1080, 1081 and 44-R700. . . .*

Then the N.L.R.B. asked: But where are your financial affidavits? *The*

N.L.R.B. had no forms prepared for these audits. So the I.A.M. had to prepare its own, ship them out with instructions, and await their return.

N.L.R.B. general counsel, Robert N. Denham, finally admitted the I.A.M. to the coveted status of a complying union on October 15, 1947. Some 12,000 local lodge officers and 600 district officers had to file and secure notarization of Form 1081. Each of the 1124 local and 87 district lodges had had to go through the same business with Form 1080. After that, they had to prepare and submit Form 44-R700.

And now the I.A.M.'s troubles had only begun.

The international officers learned January 15 that this whole business had to be gone through again, to cover newly-elected local officers. I.A.M. local officers are elected in December, but not sworn in until January; hence they were barred from making affidavit on Form 1085 (yes; another one) until the new year. But this in turn debarred the union from taking advantage of its attested purity.

The second illuminating example with a positive lesson is the C.I.O. International Woodworkers of America. The International Officers of this union won, by less than a dozen votes, a convention decision to comply with the Taft-Hartley non-Communist affidavits. After this they rushed to force every official, down through the local unions, to sign, and resorted to suspending many who did not (including an International official in Canada). The employers immediately took advantage of the I.W.A.'s compliance

and demanded that the new contract must be in full accord with the Taft-Hartley Act. The Northwest District of the union refused to sign the non-Communist affidavits and withdrew the right of the International to negotiate with the employers on its behalf. Two sets of negotiations started. The non-complying Northwest District, with its Left-wing leadership, has just completed a new agreement with a 12½ cents an hour increase across the board; additional scale adjustments that bring raises as high as 22 cents an hour to some classifications, and a union security clause which provides maintenance of check-off and a provision that check-off is irrevocable by a member until the next contract negotiations take place.

Meanwhile the Right-wing International leaders who rushed to sign the non-Communist affidavits have gained no settlement with the employers. After months of negotiation only one item out of fifteen that the employers want revised has been settled. A settlement of 12½ cents an hour has been agreed to—but *not* across the board. The International officers accepted a provision whereby it is left to each local union and employer to decide how much of the 12½ cents increase shall be applied to each classification, which means that nothing is settled yet. Furthermore, the employers are insisting upon elimination of seven or eight classifications which they claim the Taft-Hartley Act excludes. The em-

ployers furthermore claim that since the International leaders signed the Taft-Hartley affidavits, that section of the union for which they are negotiating must separate office, guard, and professional employees from the regular trade union locals. On all other issues such as hours, contract revision dates, union security, wage-opening dates, etc., the employers have not even begun to negotiate, and the International officials are fearful to press for a settlement because the employers threaten to refer the entire matter into the bottomless pit of the Taft-Hartley Board cases, where it will remain with the thousands of others while the workers toil without any trade union protection. The contrast here is so vivid, since it is within one industry and one union that one can expect important rank and file repercussions against I.W.A. International President Fadling and his other "anti-Communist" cronies!

As if to reinforce the employers' original effort to mislead workers by the phoney "non-Communist affidavits" of the Taft-Hartley Act, the *Cleveland Plain Dealer* (April 6) printed a lead editorial which states in part:

The C.I.O. is being refined in the crucible of the Taft-Hartley act and the Communist scum is coming to the top, to be drained off and separated from the solid core of Americanism underneath. . . .

Ever since the C.I.O. was organized it has been plagued by Communist

agitators from within. But every effort to get rid of them or curtail their powers was denounced as "Red baiting" or as destructive of union solidarity. Now the much maligned Taft-Hartley act has provided the means by which the unions can rid themselves of the Communist elements. . . .

The Taft-Hartley act, however, did not compel the unions to oust Communist officials, it merely provided the means of doing so. The impetus to drive out the Communists came from the decision of the C.I.O. Executive Board to support the European Recovery Program and to oppose Henry Wallace's third party movement. . . .

In this light, the hysterical campaign which labor leaders waged against the Taft-Hartley act now seems silly and ill-advised. Eventually this law will be acknowledged as a strong bulwark which has protected the labor movement from the excesses of those who posed as its friends.

The editorial scribbler of the *Plain Dealer* is saturated with the anti-labor fumes that flow from the Cleveland Trust Co. and the Eaton interests who just "happen" to be related to the Americanism of Tom Girdler of Republic Steel fame. A "refining" and "draining off" process within the labor movement is a dream of every big business force in America. The Taft-Hartley Act was made to order for that purpose. To cover its real purposes and to fool and intimidate trade union leaders, the issue of Communism was injected. By "draining off," the *Plain Dealer* and the employers mean:

1) "Draining off" from the trade unions a policy of struggle and militancy;

2) "Draining off" from the trade unions a policy of department struggles and strikes;

3) "Draining off" the established structure of shop stewards and committees;

4) "Draining off" every militant who stands up for his rights and on behalf of the trade union;

5) "Draining off" the unity of the trade unions and pitting worker against worker and trade union against trade union;

6) "Draining off" from the trade unions Communist leaders, who have consistently fought for every interest of the workers and the unions, and inspired many others to do likewise.

The *Cleveland Plain Dealer* did a service in speaking out so plainly, on the real aims of the Taft-Hartley Act.

Because workers are beginning to recognize some of these lessons, the so-called Congressional watchdog committee on the Taft-Hartley Law, headed by Senator Ball, is now proposing further to "strengthen" this Law. Taken together with the anti-labor purposes of the Mundt Bill, the employers are hopeful of having American workers really chained—and all under the phoney cover of anti-Communism.

What is the real issue at this moment, precisely when the union-busting purpose of the Taft-Hartley Act is bared for everyone to see, and

the only trade unions which have made gains—U.M.W.A., the fur and leather workers union, the Northwest District of the I.W.A., sections of the U.E.R.M.W.A. and the U.O.P.W.A.—are all so-called non-complying trade unions? The real issue is not a rediscussion of compliance or non-compliance with non-Communist affidavits. Furthermore, if and when this question is pushed to a point that threatens the life of the majority of a union, the issue can best be settled by taking it to a referendum vote of the rank and file, with a bold fight being made to convince the membership against signing the Taft-Hartley yellow-dog affidavits. The real issue is for the entire trade union movement to adopt a fighting policy reinforced by a common wage-strike strategy and united action. This and only this can defend the trade unions from being attacked and weakened one by one. This and only this can make it possible to strike back successfully against the over-all offensive of reaction.

UNITED ACTION OF TRADE UNIONS IMPERATIVE IRRE- SPECTIVE OF POLITICAL DIFFERENCES

Over a year ago the Communist Party issued the slogan "United Action—or Else." The labor movement in the same period has been getting the "or else." Today, the slogan we raised is more compelling than when it was first issued. The very life of

the trade unions is at stake, what with the further application of the Taft-Hartley Act and its injunctions and restraining orders, and now the Mundt Bill.

Mathew Woll and William Green of the A. F. of L. chose this moment to make a personal appeal to Philip Murray of the C.I.O. for organic unity of the C.I.O. and the A. F. of L. They propose this on the basis of a full-fledged reactionary political alliance. They say to Murray, in effect: "Since you are in agreement with us in supporting the Truman Doctrine and Marshall Plan, in opposing the new party led by Henry Wallace, and in denouncing the Communist Party, why not 'come back home to the house of labor.'" But Woll has further conditions to place before Murray. He demands withdrawal from the W.F.T.U. and splitting the C.I.O. by war against so-called progressive-led unions with 1½ million members. This type of "unity" is a fraud. It would be a weakening, not a strengthening, of the trade union movement. It would play the game of the employers and make it easier for them to carry through their union-busting offensive. This would be the "unity" of the graveyard and not of a living, fighting movement.

We believe that a common stand of the trade union movement against the Wall Street imperialist measures—the Truman Doctrine, the Marshall Plan, war appropriations, interference in affairs of other peoples

and nations, opposition to the New People's Party, anti-Communist hysteria—are decisive for the defense of the trade unions and for defeating the attacks on the workers' conditions.

Nevertheless, while the debate within the labor movement must go on to convince a majority of its members as to the correctness of labor's adopting an anti-imperialist, anti-war policy, today it is possible and urgently necessary to fight for a realization of maximum forms of united labor action on immediate economic issues.

While this must be directed consistently to the rank and file and local union officers of all trade unions, the progressives must never relinquish the initiative for united labor action on any level.

While the trade union movement should strive to realize a common stand on the urgent political issues of the day, failure to achieve this must not undermine the basic unity of the trade unions as economic organizations of the workers. There is room in the trade unions for differing positions on political issues, providing autonomous rights are guaranteed to each affiliate. Recognition of this will make possible a still stronger fight for the primary purposes for which the unions were built and for united labor action *now* in support of such issues as:

a) Adoption of a united wage-strike policy in support of increased wages and signed contracts;

b) Support to all trade unions on strike;

c) Defeat of Taft-Hartley injunctions;

d) Defeat of all pending anti-labor legislation and especially the Mundt Bill.

The Communists in the trade unions, while continuing to fight for their viewpoint on the big political issues of the day, are ready and anxious to join with all others in the trade union movement—irrespective of differences—in a common united struggle on these urgent life-and-death issues of the American trade unions.

Now is the time for United Labor Action, whether on a shop, local union, city-wide, or national basis. The monopolies are already showing their fangs against all of labor, including those trade union leaders who jumped on the bandwagon of imperialist policy or who are permitting themselves to be cowed by the divisive and false weapon of anti-Communism. The men and women of organized labor—16 million strong—must act today. United Labor Action is the road to saving the trade unions from fascist attack and helping to rally the American people to fight for a democratic America.

“Imperialism is the epoch of finance capital and monopolies, which introduce everywhere the striving for domination, not freedom. The result is reaction all along the line, whatever the political system, and an extreme intensification of existing antagonisms in this domain also.”

V. I. Lenin,
Imperialism, The Highest Stage of Capitalism.

THE ITALIAN ELECTIONS

By JOHN GATES

THE ITALIAN ELECTIONS of April 18, 1948, were of great significance for the future of Italy and of the world. For a brief period, the ancient saying "all roads lead to Rome" applied to modern Italy, as the attention of the world centered on the outcome of the Italian elections. Which would emerge stronger—the camp of imperialism, fascism, and war, or the camp of anti-imperialism, democracy, and peace? That was the basic issue at stake in the elections, and the world waited impatiently for the decision.

The De Gasperi government emerged victorious in the election and continues its rule over Italy. But was this retention of power as overwhelming a victory as the capitalist press claims? And how great a defeat did the popular forces suffer? Reactionary circles answer these questions by contrasting the elections of June 2, 1946, with the recent ones. They conclude that, as compared with the results two years ago, reaction made great gains, while the Popular Front suffered huge losses. This, however, is a distortion of the truth, for a comparison of the two elections warrants somewhat different conclusions.

ISSUES AND RESULTS IN 1946

What were the issues and results of the 1946 elections?

The background of the 1946 elections was entirely different than in 1948.

Italy had but recently been liberated. A loose coalition, including the Communists, Socialists, and Christian Democrats, still existed among the major political parties. (In fact, the government formed after that election included representatives of all these parties.) There appeared to be unity against fascism and in favor of basic industrial and land reform. The one big issue in the campaign was the referendum on the restoration of the monarchy, and on this there were no differences between the Socialists, Communists, Republicans, and Christian Democrats. The U.S. government played no large role in the campaign, nor did the Vatican. The Socialist Party—while containing a Right and a Left Wing—had not yet split into two separate parties. There were no Right or Left groupings of parties and each party ran separately in the campaign. The strength of the Italian capitalists had been greatly weakened in the course of the defeat of fascism and they were not able to influence the elections greatly.

In that kind of situation, a total of 23 million votes was cast.

The Communists received 4,350,000 votes, or 18.9 per cent of the total vote, and 104 seats in the Constitu-

ent Assembly. The Socialists received 4,740,000 votes, or 20.7 per cent of the total, and 115 seats. Communists and Socialists together received 9 million votes, or 39.6 per cent of the total, and 219 seats. (Most analysts of the 1948 elections contrast the Popular Front vote of 1948 with the combined Socialist and Communist vote of 1946. This is misleading because in 1948 the Popular Front was a combination of Communists and Left-wing Socialists, while in 1946 the Right-wing of the Socialist Party had not yet split away from it.)

In 1946, the Christian Democrats received eight million votes, or 35.2 per cent, while all the other small parties combined received six million votes, or about 25.2 per cent.

Thus, two years ago, the Socialist and Communist parties received 39.6 per cent of the total vote, and all other parties combined received 60.4 per cent.

THE SITUATION AND OUTCOME IN 1948

What was the situation and outcome in 1948?

In the two years since 1946, in common with a similar trend on a world scale, a sharp differentiation took place among the political parties in Italy, which grouped themselves into two diametrically opposed blocs. Under the direct instigation of U.S. imperialism, the Communists and Left-wing Socialists were driven out of the Italian government. The Right-wing Socialists, led by Sara-

gat, split away from the Socialist Party and formed a new party called the Socialist Unity (with imperialism!) Party. Italian capitalism—recovered somewhat from its shattered state at the end of the war with the aid of the De Gasperi government and, particularly, Wall Street—began to press forward boldly. When the 1948 election period arrived, the reactionary parties banded together in their opposition to the Popular Front, heartened by the United States government and the Vatican which intervened in the elections on a scale and in a manner unprecedented in world history.

In this tense atmosphere, which made the 1946 elections appear almost idyllic by comparison, 26 million votes were cast. The Popular Front ticket received eight million votes, or 31 per cent of the total, and 182 seats in the Chamber of Deputies. The Saragat Socialist Unity Party received 1,800,000 votes, or 7 per cent of the total vote, and 33 seats.

Thus, the Popular Front, consisting of the Communists and Left-wing Socialists, and the Saragat Party received 9,800,000 votes, or 38 per cent of the total, and 215 seats. Therefore, when the capitalist press claims that the Popular Front percentage of the vote dropped from 39.6 in 1946 to 31 in 1948 and its numerical vote from nine to eight million, it deliberately overlooks the voting strength of the Right-wing Socialists. To arrive at a true comparison of the authentic Left-wing strength in the

two elections one must subtract the Right-wing Socialist vote of 1948 from the total Communist-Socialist vote of 1946. On this basis, the Left-wing strength declined by only 1.6 per cent.

Although the Left-wing Socialists and Communists ran together on a single ticket, it is possible to estimate their relative strength inasmuch as the voters for the Popular Front could choose from a list of preferential candidates. Of the 182 Popular Front deputies elected, 142 were Communists and 40 were Left-wing Socialists. This represents an increase of 38 Communist deputies over 1946. 73 deputies were elected by Left-wing and Right-wing Socialists, a decline of 42 compared with 1946. Of the eight million votes in 1948 for the Popular Front, as the proportion of Communist to Left-Socialist deputies indicates, the Communists received 6,200,000 votes and the Left-wing Socialists about 1,800,000. Thus, the Communists received almost two million more votes than in 1946, while the combined Left-wing and Saragat Socialist vote of 3,600,000 in 1948 was one million less than in 1946.

The Christian Democrats amassed 12,750,000 votes in 1948, or 47.9 per cent of the total vote, and 307 seats—an absolute majority in the Chamber. However, this gain of almost five million votes, or 13 per cent, over 1946 was not at the expense of the Left. The total non-Socialist and non-Communist vote was 62 per cent in 1948 as compared with

60.4 per cent in 1946. All the parties other than the Socialist, Communist, and Christian Democratic Parties, received only three million votes out of 26 million votes in 1948, in contrast to the six million out of 23 million votes they received in 1946. This clearly establishes the fact that the Christian Democrats gained their increase in strength through the absorption of the smaller Right-wing parties.

The above are the over-all results, but the picture would not be honest or complete without the breakdown of the vote by regions. Italy can be roughly divided into four parts: the North, which comprises 46 per cent of the electorate, and is the industrial region of Italy, including such cities as Milan, Turin, Genoa and Florence; the Center, which includes Rome; the South, which is mainly agricultural, and includes Naples and takes in the toe and heel of Italy; and the islands of Sicily and Sardinia, which are still largely feudal in character. The Popular Front lost 8 per cent in the industrial North, and gained 8.3 per cent in the Center, 6.6 per cent in the agricultural South, and 5.6 per cent in Sicily and Sardinia. In the Rome region, which is especially important because it is the home of the Vatican and the seat of the government, the Popular Front received 85,000 more votes than in 1946 and increased its percentage of the total vote by 8 per cent.

The following conclusions can be

drawn from the results outlined above:

1. The Popular Front forces did not gain by comparison with 1946; they even declined slightly. Generally speaking, however, they maintained their strength virtually intact, suffering an important loss in the industrial North but gaining considerably in the agricultural areas.

2. Viewed against the results as a whole, the Communists made important gains. Its two million additional votes were made up of the one million votes lost by the Socialist Party and Saragat's Socialist Unity Party, and the one million votes it received from the three million new voters.

3. The combined Right-and Left-Socialist vote declined by one million, mainly because of the split of the Socialist Party by Saragat. The Saragat Party emerged as a Social-Democratic Party of the traditional type, representing a dangerous splitting and weakening factor in the struggle of the forces of progress.

4. The Christian Democrats have emerged as the largest single electoral party, chiefly but not solely through its absorption of the votes of the other reactionary parties. It gained its additional five million votes by taking away three million votes from these parties and winning two million of the three million new voters. As a result, the camp of reaction is more united and represents a greater danger than in the past.

U.S. IMPERIALIST INTERVENTION

The political aspects of the campaign were without parallel in history. The intensity with which it was waged by both sides is shown by the fact that 94 per cent of the electorate turned out to vote. The enormous resources at the disposal of the De Gasperi government enabled it to bring out the vote of the most backward masses of the population. But the decisive factor which influenced the final outcome was the brazen and direct intervention of American imperialism.

Capitalist propaganda in our country portrayed the Italian Communists, in contrast to the "poverty-stricken" reactionaries, as having unlimited funds at their disposal. However C.B.S. commentator Howard K. Smith broadcasting from Milan, revealed that the "anti-Communist parties together spent \$7.50 to every Communist dollar." Where these funds came from was shown by John Foster Dulles who stated in a speech in New York on May 6 that the U.S. had "given nearly \$2,000,000,000" to Italy, and who complained that "yet in Italy communism made a strong fight." And Senator Taft declared on the Town Meeting of the Air (May 18) that "we intervened in the Italian election as we would never have done before the war. . . ."

The most shameful aspect of American intervention was its use of food as a weapon to blackmail the Italian people into voting in accord

with Wall Street's desires. The most widely used poster in the reactionaries' campaign was one which showed a loaf of bread cut into two pieces, and which bore a legend to the effect that 60 per cent of the Italian's loaf of bread comes from the United States which gives it to Italy "free." During the last two weeks of the campaign, Secretary of State Marshall announced that if the Popular Front should win, the United States would withdraw all aid. In this blunt fashion, the Italian people were told that they must either vote as Marshall wanted them to, or he would take the bread out of the mouths of their children. Incidentally, the quality of the bread improved, that is, became whiter, as election day approached; as soon as the election was over it reverted back to its original poor quality.

Although, so far as I could observe, the maneuvers on Trieste and the inspired campaign of letters from the U.S. failed to achieve decisive results, they had some effect in developing anti-Popular Front hysteria. Proof that the letter campaign was not very effective is demonstrated by the fact that the relatives of most Italians living in the U.S. are in Southern Italy, which is where the Popular Front gained influence.

More important was the fear of civil war, which the United States deliberately fostered during the campaign. On three separate occasions Palmiro Togliatti, General Secretary of the Communist Party of Italy, challenged Premier de Gasperi to

state whether he would respect the election results should the Popular Front win. De Gasperi refused to answer and thus made it clear that he would refuse to transfer power peacefully to the Popular Front. Large numbers of people who were undoubtedly sympathetic to the Front's program were intimidated into voting against it because they feared a civil war, which they knew would be provoked by De Gasperi and would receive U.S. government backing.

THE ROLE OF THE VATICAN

Of equal importance with American intervention was the role of the Vatican, which wields enormous power in Italy. It openly participated in the campaign in direct violation of the Lateran Treaty, with the De Gasperi government naturally closing its eyes to this violation.

The Vatican worked directly through the tens of thousands of priests and nuns, but its main direct instrument was Catholic Action, an active, disciplined mass organization which worked on a precinct and house-to-house level.

The extent to which the Church intervened is shown, not only in the threats of excommunication and denial of absolution if one voted for the Popular Front, but also in the sudden outbreak of a rash of "miracles" during the height of the campaign. Witnesses suddenly appeared who had seen a certain religious statue walk from one place to another or

had heard a portrait of some saint talk. Naturally, the message of these "miracles" was to vote against the Popular Front.

RESURGENCE OF RIGHT-WING SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

The third decisive factor in the reactionaries' election campaign was the resurgence of Right-wing Social-Democracy.

The base of traditional pro-imperialist Social-Democracy had been greatly weakened with the defeat of Italian capitalism at the end of the war. This expressed itself in the dominant position of leadership won by the Left-wing, headed by Pietro Nenni, in the Socialist Party. But with the help of American imperialism, world Social-Democracy, the Vatican, and the return of reaction to power in Italy, the Right-wing Social Democrats gained new strength, fought the progressive Nenni leadership, and finally split away to form their own party.

The C.I.O., the A. F. of L., the British Labor Party, and the French Socialists gave considerable assistance to Saragat during the election campaign. How the Vatican regards the Saragat Socialists is shown by the fact that it urged its campaigners to strive in the first place to convince individuals to vote Christian Democrat, but workers who would not vote for a clerical party under any circumstances were to be urged to vote for Saragat.

In addition, Saragat carried on a

very demagogic campaign under the slogan of "Vote for Socialism." Those workers, particularly among the labor aristocracy, as well as middle-class elements, who fell victim to Red-baiting but who nevertheless professed to be for Socialism, were taken in by Saragat.

THE POPULAR FRONT'S CAMPAIGN

In the face of this enormous array of resources and power, the democratic Popular Front conducted a magnificent campaign.

The basis for its excellent work was the creation of the Popular Front itself. This was much more than a mere electoral tactic. The Popular Front was conceived as a coalition of mass organizations banded together in a fighting movement for the realization of an advanced democratic program. It was created, not only for the purposes of the elections, but as a vital instrument in the struggles that would inevitably develop once the elections were over.

The central core of the Popular Front is the united front of the Communist and Socialist Parties, but it also includes the factory committee movement; women, youth, partisan, and cultural organizations; the unemployed movement and the "land for the peasants" movement; and organizations of dissident Republicans and Christian Democrats. It is the new form in which the unity of the forces of anti-fascist resistance is being reconstituted after the disintegra-

tion of the old National Council of Liberation of which the Christian Democrats and Republicans were a part.

Despite the strategy of reaction to make Red-baiting the main issue and thus obscure the real issues, the Popular Front succeeded to a large degree in bringing to the people the issues of basic industrial and land reform, the high cost of living, unemployment, the land question, and the danger of fascism and war. It unmasked Wall Street's role before millions of Italians and pointed out the danger of America to Italian independence, freedom, and peace. An especially effective aspect of the Front's campaign was its complete identification of its purposes with the most progressive tradition of Italy—the Garibaldi movement. The Popular Front was Garibaldi and Garibaldi was the Popular Front, and the reactionary camp was unable to destroy that identity though it tried very hard.

Beyond doubt, without American and Vatican intervention the Popular Front would have won an overwhelming victory. Howard K. Smith said, in the same radio broadcast mentioned above:

Suppose that the access of both sides to the press in the campaign had been equal. Suppose the election funds had been approximately equal. Suppose that the most powerful religious institution and the most powerful and richest nation on earth had not intervened on one side in the elections. There is no doubt in anybody's mind here that the Reds

would have dealt the democratic government a crushing defeat. By free choice, the Italian people in that case would have chosen Communism over democracy without a Russian soldier or a Kremlin kopek around to induce or force them.

Despite his gratuitous labeling of the De Gasperi government as democratic, Smith's assertion is eloquent of the fact that the elections were neither free nor democratic.

On the other hand, had it not been for the creation of the Popular Front and the splendid campaign it carried on, the Left forces would have been overwhelmed. Instead, it maintained its strength numerically as compared with 1946, but on a much higher qualitative level. The eight million votes cast for the Popular Front in 1948 represented a far more conscious and advanced vote. Those who voted Left in 1948 did so despite threats of hellfire and damnation, fear of civil war and of bread being taken away from their children, and the most violent Red-baiting. Apropos of this, the London *Daily Mail* commented: "De Gasperi has won a victory, but the Communists have not been defeated." There is some truth in that comment, even though it is not the whole truth.

Togliatti wrote, immediately after the election results became known, that while the Communists had made considerable gains, they were not what had been hoped for. He said, further, that the Communist gains could not be viewed in isolation from the losses suffered by the

Popular Front as a whole. He stated that the Communists had played a major role in the creation of the Front; they took full responsibility for it, and its losses were their losses. There had been a certain tendency to place on the Left-wing Socialists the main responsibility for the failure to achieve better results, but this statement of Togliatti rejected it.

WEAKNESSES OF THE POPULAR FRONT'S CAMPAIGN

Although the main factors influencing the election outcome were U.S. imperialist and Vatican intervention, and the role of Right-wing Social Democracy, there were also important weaknesses in the Popular Front and Communist campaign. These were the following:

1. The Popular Front had only been created in December, 1947, and was therefore only four months old at election time. As a result, it was never really organized as an effective mass movement in some places, where it existed only on paper. Also, in some cases, the Communists worked in such a way as to exclude Socialists from active leadership and participation in the Front, which had a narrowing and suffocating effect.

2. Since the North had always been the traditional Left stronghold, the Communists tended to take it for granted and concentrated their main effort in the South, which was the traditional weak spot. On the other hand, the major concentration of reaction was in the North.

3. The Communists underestimated the effect of foreign intervention and especially the new role of Right-wing Social Democracy in the campaign. Consequently, it failed to struggle seriously enough against Saragat and his party.

4. The Communists tended to be over-optimistic because of the remarkable popular response to them during the campaign. They organized the most successful mass demonstrations in their history, demonstrations of 200,000 in Rome, 300,000 in Milan, 250,000 in Naples, etc. Their own growth of influence blinded them to the losses of both the Left-wing and the Saragat Socialists, as well as to the fact that the enemy was also maintaining and slightly increasing its strength with a regrouping of forces in favor of the Christian Democrats.

PERSPECTIVES

What is now the perspective for Italy? The De Gasperi government is duty-bound to Wall Street, the Vatican, and the Italian capitalists and big landowners. It therefore cannot and will not nationalize basic industry or give land to the peasants. Consequently, great mass struggles are bound to develop, against which the government will use repressive measures.

The government has declared it intends to outlaw strikes and liquidate the partisans' organization. It would like very much to suppress the Communist Party. It is working to split

the trade unions and, once again, the Left-led Socialist Party. Reaction wants to break the peace treaty so as to be able to rearm and to rebuild a big army, navy, and air force, and to draw Italy into the Western military bloc initiated and backed by U.S. imperialism. In a word, the De Gasperi government is moving in the direction of establishing an open clerical-fascist dictatorship.

The main aim of the Popular Front is to prevent the establishment of such a dictatorship by fighting against all reactionary efforts to bring it into existence, and by fighting to carry through the advanced democratic program the Front put forward during the election campaign. The key to achieving this is the continuation and strengthening of the Popular Front as a mass movement of struggle. Following the campaign, the Popular Front met and all its constituent organizations expressed their support and voted to continue and broaden their activity.

A peculiar feature of the post-

election period, expressing itself in certain recent developments, is that the Christian Democrats won, so to speak, too big a victory. In Italy, fear of political rule by the Church is very great. Millions who did not vote Popular Front do not want a clerical dictatorship either. Hence, the very victory of the Christian Democrats has created conditions for a broader, more effective struggle against them.

The perspective in Italy, therefore, is one of a long period of sharp and difficult struggle. Although they are acutely aware of the new dangers ahead, the Italian Communists are confident in their ability to rally the masses to defeat the enemy. As Togliatti said on April 22:

"The more than 8 million votes won under the conditions of the April 18 elections constitute a formidable barrier which cannot be overwhelmed either by the foreign imperialists who would like to push us toward war nor by our own reactionaries who dream vainly of a return to a fascist-type regime."

FALSIFIERS OF HISTORY: A HISTORICAL NOTE

An excerpt dealing with the Soviet-German non-aggression pact, from the text of a communique issued by the Soviet Information Bureau, Moscow, in February, 1948.

FOLLOWING THE SEIZURE of Czechoslovakia, fascist Germany proceeded with her preparations for war quite openly, before the eyes of the whole world. Hitler, encouraged by Britain and France, no longer stood on ceremony or pretended to favor a peaceful settlement of European problems. The most dramatic months of the prewar period had come. At that time it was already clear that every day was bringing mankind nearer to an unparalleled catastrophic war.

What was the policy at that time of the Soviet Union on the one hand, and of Great Britain and France on the other?

The attempt of the falsifiers of history in the U.S.A. to avoid answering this question merely goes to prove that their conscience is not clear.

The truth is that even in the fateful period of the spring and summer of 1939, on the threshold of war, Britain and France, supported by United States ruling circles, continued their former line of policy. This was a policy of maliciously inciting Hitler Germany against the Soviet Union, camouflaged by pharisaical avowals of readiness to cooperate with the Soviet Union, as

well as by certain simple diplomatic maneuvers designed to conceal the real character of their policy from world public opinion.

Of these maneuvers the first were the negotiations which Britain and France decided to open with the Soviet Union in 1939. In order to deceive public opinion the ruling circles of Britain and France tried to create the impression that these negotiations were a serious attempt to prevent the further spread of Hitlerite aggression. In the light of the subsequent march of events, however, it became perfectly clear that as far as the Anglo-French side was concerned these negotiations were from the very beginning nothing but another move in their double game.

This was also clear to the leaders of Hitler Germany, for whom the meaning of the negotiations with the Soviet Union undertaken by the Governments of Britain and France was certainly no secret. Here, for example, is what the German Ambassador to London, Dirksen, wrote in his report to the German Foreign Ministry on August 3, 1939, as is evident from documents captured by the Soviet Army during the defeat of Hitler Germany:

The prevailing impression here was that [Britain's] ties with other states formed during the recent months were only a reserve means for a real reconciliation with Germany and that these ties would cease to exist as soon as the one important aim, worthy of effort—agreement with Germany—was achieved.

This opinion was firmly shared by all German diplomats who watched the situation in London.

In another secret report to Berlin, Dirksen wrote:

By means of armaments and the acquisition of allies, Britain wants to gain strength and catch up with the Axis, but at the same time she wants to try to reach an amicable agreement with Germany by means of negotiations.*

The slanderers and falsifiers of history are trying to conceal these documents, since they shed a lurid light on the situation which developed in the last prewar months, without a correct assessment of which it is impossible to understand the true pre-history of the war. By undertaking negotiations with the Soviet Union and extending guarantees to Poland, Romania and some other states, Britain and France, with the support of U.S. ruling circles played a double game, calculated to lead to an agreement with Hitler Germany with the aim of directing her aggression to the East, against the Soviet Union.

* Dirksen's memorandum: "On the Development of Political Relations Between Germany and Britain During My Term of Office in London," September, 1939.

Negotiations between Britain and France, on the one hand, and the Soviet Union on the other, began in March, 1939, and continued for about four months.

The whole course of these negotiations brought out with perfect clarity that whereas the Soviet Union was trying to reach a broad agreement with the Western Powers on the basis of equality, an agreement capable of preventing Germany, even if at the eleventh hour, from starting war in Europe, the Governments of Britain and France, relying on support in the United States, set themselves entirely different aims. The ruling circles of Britain and France, who were accustomed to having others pull the chestnuts out of the fire for them, on this occasion too attempted to inveigle the Soviet Union into assuming obligations under which it would have taken upon itself the brunt of the sacrifice in repulsing eventual Hitler aggression, while Britain and France would not be bound by any commitments to the Soviet Union.

If the rulers of Britain and France had succeeded in this maneuver, they would have come much closer to attaining their basic aim, which was to set Germany and the Soviet Union at loggerheads as quickly as possible. The Soviet Government, however, saw through this scheme, and at all stages of the negotiations countered the diplomatic trickery and subterfuges of the Western Powers with clear and frank proposals designed to serve but one

purpose—the safeguarding of peace in Europe.

There is no need to recount all the vicissitudes of the negotiations. We need only bring to mind a few of the more important points. Suffice it to recall the terms put forward in the negotiations by the Soviet Government: conclusion of an effective pact of mutual assistance against aggression between Britain, France and the U.S.S.R.; a guarantee by Britain, France and the U.S.S.R. to the states of Central and Eastern Europe, including all European countries bordering on the U.S.S.R. without exception; conclusion of a concrete military agreement between Britain, France and the U.S.S.R. on the forms and extent of immediate effective aid to each other and to the guaranteed states in the event of an attack by aggressors.*

At the Third Session of the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R., on May 31, 1939, V. M. Molotov pointed out that some of the Anglo-French proposals made in the course of these negotiations contained none of the elementary principles of reciprocity and equality of obligations which are indispensable in all agreements between equals.

While guaranteeing themselves [said V. M. Molotov] from direct attack on the part of aggressors by mutual assistance pacts between themselves and with Poland, and while trying to secure for themselves the assistance of the U.S.S.R. in the event of an attack by

aggressors on Poland and Romania, the British and French left open the question of whether the U.S.S.R. in its turn might count on their assistance in the event of its being directly attacked by aggressors, just as they left open another question, namely, whether they would be a party to guaranteeing the small states bordering on the U.S.S.R. and covering its northwestern frontiers, should these states prove unable to defend their neutrality from attack by aggressors. Thus the position was one of inequality for the U.S.S.R.

Even when the British and French representatives gave verbal assent to the principle of mutual assistance on terms of reciprocity between Britain, France and the U.S.S.R. in the event of a direct attack by an aggressor, they hedged it in with a number of reservations which rendered this assent fictitious.

In addition, the Anglo-French proposals provided for the rendering of assistance by the U.S.S.R. to those countries to which the British and French had given a promise of guarantees, but said nothing about themselves coming to the assistance of the countries on the northwestern frontier of the U.S.S.R., the Baltic States, in the event of an aggressor attacking them.

Taking into account these considerations, V. M. Molotov announced that the Soviet Union could not undertake commitments in respect of some countries unless similar guarantees were given in respect of the countries bordering on the northwestern frontiers of the Soviet Union.

* Report by V. M. Molotov to the Third Session of the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R., May 31, 1939.

It should also be remembered that when, on March 18, 1939, Seeds, the British Ambassador to Moscow, asked the People's Commissar of Foreign Affairs what the Soviet Union's position would be in the event of Hitler aggression against Romania—concerning the preparation of which the British were in possession of information—and when the question was then raised by the Soviet side as to what Britain's position would be under those circumstances, Seeds evaded a reply with the remark that Romania was geographically closer to the Soviet Union than it was to England.

Thus it was quite clear from the very first that Britain's ruling circles were endeavoring to bind the Soviet Union to definite commitments while standing aloof themselves. This artless method was repeated regularly again and again throughout the whole course of the negotiations.

In answer to the British inquiry the Soviet Government suggested that a conference be called of representatives of the most interested states—namely, Great Britain, France, Romania, Poland, Turkey and the Soviet Union. In the opinion of the Soviet Government such a conference would offer the best opportunity for ascertaining the real state of affairs and determining the position of each of the participants. The British Government, however, replied that it considered the Soviet proposal premature.

Instead of a conference, which

would have made it possible to come to agreement on concrete measures to combat aggression, the British Government, on March 21, 1939, proposed that it and the Soviet Government, as well as France and Poland, should sign a declaration in which the signatory governments would obligate themselves to "consult together as to what steps should be taken to offer joint resistance" in case of a threat to "the independence of any European state." In arguing that this proposal was acceptable, the British Ambassador laid particular emphasis on the point that the declaration was couched in very noncommittal terms.

It was quite obvious that such a declaration could not serve as an effective means of averting the impending threat of aggression. Believing, however, that even so unpromising a declaration might constitute at least some step toward curbing the aggressor, the Soviet Government accepted the British proposal. But already on April 1, 1939, the British Ambassador in Moscow intimated that Britain considered the question of a joint declaration as having lapsed.

After two more weeks of procrastination the British Foreign Secretary, Halifax, through the Ambassador in Moscow, made another proposal to the Soviet Government, namely, that it should issue a statement declaring that "in the event of an act of aggression against any European neighbor of the Soviet Union, who would offer resistance, the assistance

of the Soviet Government could be counted upon if desired."

The underlying meaning of this proposal was that in the event of an act of aggression on the part of Germany against Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, or Finland, the Soviet Union would be obliged to render them assistance, without any undertaking by Britain to come to their aid—in other words, the Soviet Union was to go to war with Germany single-handed. As to Poland and Rumania, whom Britain had given guarantees, the Soviet Union was to render assistance to them too against an aggressor. But even in their case Britain refused to assume any joint obligation with the Soviet Union, leaving herself a free hand and a field for any maneuvers, not to mention the fact that, according to this proposal, Poland and Rumania, as well as the Baltic States, were to assume no obligations whatever toward the U.S.S.R.

The Soviet Government, however, did not want to miss a single opportunity to reach agreement with other powers for joint counteraction against Hitler aggression. Without the least delay it presented to the British Government its counterproposal, which was: first, that the Soviet Union, Britain and France should mutually undertake to render one another every immediate assistance, including military, in the event of aggression against any one of them; secondly, that the Soviet Union, Britain and France should undertake to render every assistance,

including military, to the states of Eastern Europe situated between the Baltic and the Black Sea and bordering on the Soviet Union in the event of aggression against these states; lastly, that the Soviet Union, Britain and France should undertake to determine without delay the extent and forms of military assistance to be rendered to each of these states in both the above-mentioned cases.

Those were the most important points of the Soviet proposal. It will be easily seen that there was a fundamental difference between the Soviet and the British proposals, inasmuch as the Soviet proposal provided for really effective measures for joint counteraction to aggression.

For three weeks no reply to that proposal came from the British Government. This caused growing anxiety in Britain, owing to which the British Government felt constrained in the end to resort to a new maneuver in order to deceive public opinion.

On May 8, the British reply, or, to be more exact, the British counterproposals, were received in Moscow. It was again proposed that the Soviet Government should make a unilateral declaration in which it "would undertake that in the event of Great Britain and France being involved in hostilities in fulfillment of these obligations [to Belgium, Poland, Rumania, Greece and Turkey] the assistance of the Soviet Government would be immediately available if desired and be afforded in such man-

ner and on such terms as might be agreed."

Once again the Soviet Union was expected to assume unilateral obligations. It was to commit itself to render assistance to Britain and France, while they assumed no obligations whatever toward the Soviet Union with regard to the Baltic Republics. Britain was thus proposing to put the U.S.S.R. in a position of inequality—a position unacceptable to and incompatible with the dignity of any independent state.

It was easy to see that the British proposal was really addressed not so much to Moscow as to Berlin. The Germans were being invited to attack the Soviet Union, and were given to understand that Britain and France would remain neutral if only the Germans attacked through the Baltic States.

On May 11, the negotiations between the Soviet Union, Britain and France were still further complicated by a statement made by the Polish Ambassador in Moscow, Grzybowski, to the effect that "Poland does not regard it possible to conclude a pact of mutual assistance with the U.S.S.R. . . ."

It goes without saying that a statement of this kind could only have been made by the Polish representative with the knowledge and approval of the ruling circles of Britain and France.

The behavior of the British and French representatives in the Moscow negotiations was so provocative that even in the ruling camp of the

Western Powers there were some who sharply criticized this crude game. Lloyd George, for one, severely took the makers of British policy to task in an article published in the French newspaper *Ce Soir* in the summer of 1939. There was only one reason, he said, for the endless procrastinations in the Anglo-French negotiations with the Soviet Union: "Neville Chamberlain, Halifax and John Simon do not want any agreement with Russia whatever."

It stands to reason that what was obvious to Lloyd George was no less obvious to the bosses of Hitler Germany, who understood perfectly well that the Western Powers had no serious intention of reaching agreement with the Soviet Union, but were pursuing an entirely different aim. It was to induce Hitler to speed his attack on the Soviet Union, offering him, as it were, a premium for doing so by placing the Soviet Union in the most unfavorable conditions in the event of a war with Germany.

Furthermore the Western Powers dragged out the negotiations with the Soviet Union endlessly, seeking to drown the major issues in a swamp of minor amendments and counter-variants. Every time the question of real guarantees arose, the representatives of these powers affected an air of perplexed misunderstanding.

Toward the end of May Britain and France advanced fresh proposals which somewhat improved their previous variant, but which still left

open the essentially important question for the Soviet Union of guarantees for the three Baltic Republics bordering on the Soviet Union's northwestern frontier.

Thus the rulers of Britain and France, while making certain verbal concessions under the pressure of public opinion in their countries, stuck to their previous line and hedged in their proposals with reservations which they knew would make them unacceptable to the Soviet Union.

The behavior of the British and French representatives in the negotiations in Moscow was so intolerable that V. M. Molotov was constrained, on May 27, 1939, to tell the British Ambassador Seeds and the French Chargé d'Affaires Payard that their draft agreement for joint counteraction to an aggressor in Europe contained no plan for the organization of effective mutual assistance by the U.S.S.R., Britain and France, and that it did not even indicate that the British and the French Governments were seriously interested in concluding a pact to this effect with the Soviet Union. It was further plainly stated that the Anglo-French proposal created the impression that the Governments of Britain and France were not so much interested in a pact itself as in talk about a pact. It was possible that this talk was needed by Britain and France for purposes of their own. What these purposes were the Soviet Government did not know. But the Soviet Government was in-

terested, not in talk about a pact, but in organizing effective mutual assistance of the U.S.S.R., Britain and France against aggression in Europe. The British and French representatives were warned that the Soviet Government did not intend to take part in pact talks the purpose of which the U.S.S.R. had no knowledge, and that the British and French Governments might find more suitable partners for such talks than the U.S.S.R.

The Moscow negotiations dragged on endlessly. The London *Times* blurted out the reasons for this inadmissible procrastination when it wrote: "A hard and fast alliance with Russia would hamper other negotiations."* The *Times* was apparently referring to the negotiations which British Minister of Overseas Trade Robert Hudson was conducting with Hitler's economic adviser, Dr. Helmut Wohltat, on the possibility of a very substantial British loan to Hitler Germany, of which more anon.

Furthermore, as is generally known, on the day Hitler's army entered Prague the press reported that a delegation of the Federation of British Industries was negotiating in Düsseldorf for the conclusion of an extensive agreement with German big industry.

Another circumstance that could not help attracting attention was that, whereas the men who had been sent to Moscow to conduct the ne-

* Sayers and Kahn, *The Great Conspiracy: The Secret War Against Soviet Russia*. Boston, p. 329.

gotiations on behalf of Great Britain were officials of secondary rank, Chamberlain himself had gone to Germany, and moreover on several occasions, to negotiate with Hitler. It is also important to note that Strang, the British representative in the negotiations with the U.S.S.R., had no authority to sign any agreement with the Soviet Union.

In view of the Soviet Union's insistence that concrete measures to oppose a possible aggressor should be discussed, the Governments of Britain and France were constrained to agree to dispatch military missions to Moscow. However, these missions took an extraordinarily long time getting to Moscow, and when they finally arrived it transpired that they were composed of men of secondary rank, who, furthermore, had not been authorized to sign any agreement. Under these circumstances, the military negotiations proved as sterile as the political ones.

The military missions of the Western Powers demonstrated from the first that they did not even desire seriously to discuss measures of mutual assistance in the event of German aggression. The Soviet military mission held that, since the U.S.S.R. had no common border with Germany, it could render Britain, France and Poland assistance in the event of war only if Soviet troops were permitted to pass through Polish territory. The Polish Government, however, declared that it would not accept military assistance from the Soviet Union,

thereby making it clear that it feared an accession of strength of the Soviet Union more than Hitler aggression. Poland's attitude was supported by both the British and the French missions.

In the course of the military negotiations the question also arose as to what armed forces the parties to the agreement were to put in the field immediately in the event of aggression. The British named a ridiculous figure, stating that they could put in the field five infantry divisions and one mechanized division. And this the British proposed at a time when the Soviet Union had declared that it was prepared to send into action against an aggressor 136 divisions, 5,000 medium and heavy guns, up to 10,000 tanks and whippets, over 5,000 war planes, etc. It will be seen from this how unserious was the attitude of the British Government toward the negotiations for a military agreement with the U.S.S.R.

The facts cited above fully confirm the inescapable conclusion:

1. That throughout the negotiations the Soviet Government strove with the utmost patience to secure agreement with Britain and France for mutual assistance against an aggressor on a basis of equality and with the condition that this mutual assistance would be really effective, *i.e.*, that the signing of a political agreement would be accompanied by the signing of a military convention defining the extent, forms and time-limits of assistance, since all preced-

ing developments had made it abundantly clear that only such an agreement could be effective and could bring the Hitlerite aggressor to his senses, encouraged as he was by the fact that for many years he had been able to act with complete impunity and with the connivance of the Western Powers.

2. That it was fully evident from the behavior of Britain and France in the negotiations that they had no thought of any serious agreement with the Soviet Union, since British and French policy was pursuing other aims, aims which had nothing in common with the interests of peace and the struggle against aggression.

3. That it was the perfidious purpose of Anglo-French policy to make it clear to Hitler that the U.S.S.R. had no allies, that it was isolated, and that he could attack the U.S.S.R. without the risk of encountering resistance on the part of Britain and France.

In view of this it is not surprising that the Anglo-Franco-Soviet negotiations ended in failure.

There was, of course, nothing fortuitous about this failure. It was becoming obvious that the representatives of the Western Powers had planned the breakdown of the negotiations beforehand as part of their double game. The fact was that, parallel with the open negotiations with the U.S.S.R., *the British were clandestinely negotiating with Germany, and that they attached in-*

comparably greater importance to the latter negotiations.

Whereas the primary purpose of the ruling circles of the Western Powers in their negotiations in Moscow was to lull public vigilance in their countries and to deceive the peoples who were being drawn into war, their negotiations with the Hitlerites were of an entirely different character.

The program of the Anglo-German negotiations was formulated plainly enough by British Foreign Secretary Halifax, who was making unambiguous overtures to Hitler Germany at the very time his subordinates were negotiating in Moscow. In a speech at a banquet of the Royal Institute of International Affairs on June 29, 1939, he declared his readiness to come to terms with Germany on all the problems "that are today causing the world anxiety." He said:

In such a new atmosphere we could examine the colonial problem, the problem of raw materials, trade barriers, the issue of *Lebensraum*, the limitation of armaments, and any other issue that affects the lives of all European citizens.*

If we recall how the Conservative *Daily Mail* which was closely associated with Halifax, interpreted the problem of *Lebensraum* as early as 1933, when it recommended the Hitlerites to wrest *Lebensraum* from the U.S.S.R., there can be not the slight-

* *Speeches on Foreign Policy*, by Viscount Halifax, Oxford University Press, London, 1940, p. 296.

est doubt as to what Halifax really meant. It was an open offer to Hitler Germany to come to terms on a division of the world and spheres of influence, an offer to settle all questions without the Soviet Union and chiefly at the expense of the Soviet Union.

As early as June, 1939, British representatives inaugurated strictly confidential negotiations with Germany through Hitler's commissioner for the four-year plan, Wohltat, who was then in London. He had talks with Minister of Overseas Trade Hudson and Chamberlain's closest adviser, G. Wilson. The substance of those June negotiations is still buried in the diplomatic vaults. But in July Wohltat paid another visit to London and the negotiations were resumed. The substance of this second round of the negotiations is now known from captured German documents in the possession of the Soviet Government, which will shortly be made public.

Hudson and Wilson suggested to Wohltat, and later to the German Ambassador in London, Dirksen, that secret negotiations be started for a broad agreement, which was to include an agreement for a worldwide division of spheres of influence and the elimination of "deadly competition in common markets." It was envisaged that Germany would be allowed predominating influence in Southeastern Europe. In a report to the German Ministry of Foreign Affairs dated July 21, 1939, Dirksen stated that the program discussed by

Wohltat and Wilson comprised political, military and economic issues. Among the political issues, along with a pact of non-aggression, special stress was laid on a pact of non-intervention, which was to provide for a "delimitation of *Lebensraum* between the Great Powers, particularly between Britain and Germany."*

During the discussion of the questions involved in these two pacts, the British representatives promised that if the pacts were signed, Britain would withdraw the guarantees she had just given Poland.

The British were prepared, if an Anglo-German agreement were signed, to let the Germans settle the Danzig problem and the problem of the Polish Corridor with Poland alone, and undertook not to interfere in the settlement.

Further, and this too is documentarily corroborated in the Dirksen reports shortly to be published, Wilson reaffirmed that if the above-mentioned pacts between Britain and Germany were signed, Britain would in fact abandon her policy of giving guarantees.

"Then Poland would be left, so to speak, alone, face to face with Germany," Dirksen comments in his report.

All this signified that at a time when the ink with which Britain's guarantees to Poland were signed had not yet dried, the rulers of Brit-

* "Memorandum of German Ambassador to Britain, Dirksen, July 21, 1939." Archives of the German Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

ain were prepared to surrender Poland to Hitler.

Furthermore, if the Anglo-German agreement had been concluded, the purpose which Britain and France had set themselves in starting the negotiations with the Soviet Union would have been achieved, and the possibility of expediting a clash between Germany and the U.S.S.R. would have been further facilitated.

Lastly, it was proposed to supplement the political agreement between Britain and Germany with an economic agreement, which would include a secret deal on colonial questions, for the partitioning of raw materials and the division of markets, as well as for a big British loan to Germany.

The rulers of Britain were thus lured by the seductive picture of an enduring agreement with Germany and the "canalization" of German aggression toward the East, against Poland, whom they had only just "guaranteed," and against the Soviet Union.

Is it then to be wondered that the slanderers and falsifiers of history are so careful to hush up and conceal these facts, which are of paramount importance to an understanding of the circumstances which were thus making war inevitable?

By this time there could already be no doubt that Britain and France, far from seriously intending to undertake anything to prevent Hitler Germany from starting war, were doing everything in their power by

secret deals and agreements and by every possible provocation to incite Hitler Germany against the Soviet Union.

No counterfeits can expunge from history or from the minds of the peoples the overriding fact that under these circumstances the Soviet Union was faced with the alternatives:

Either, in its self-defense, to accept Germany's proposal for a pact of non-aggression, and thereby ensure the Soviet Union the prolongation of peace for a certain period, which might be utilized to better prepare the forces of the Soviet State for resistance to eventual aggression.

Or to reject Germany's proposal for a non-aggression pact, and thereby allow the provocators of war in the camp of the Western Powers to embroil the Soviet Union immediately in an armed conflict with Germany, at a time when the situation was utterly unfavorable to the Soviet Union, seeing that it would be completely isolated.

Under these circumstances, the Soviet Government was compelled to make its choice and conclude a non-aggression pact with Germany.

In the situation that had arisen this choice on the part of Soviet foreign policy was a wise and farsighted act. This step of the Soviet Government to a very large degree predetermined the favorable outcome of the second world war for the Soviet Union and all the freedom-loving peoples.

To assert that the conclusion of the pact with the Hitlerites formed

part of the plan of Soviet foreign policy is a gross calumny. On the contrary, all the time the U.S.S.R. strove to secure an agreement with the Western non-aggressive states for the achievement of collective security, on the basis of equality, against the German and Italian aggressors. But there must be two parties to an agreement. And, whereas the U.S.S.R. insistently urged an agreement for combating aggression, Britain and France systematically rejected it, preferring to pursue a policy of isolating the U.S.S.R., of conceding to the aggressors, of directing aggression toward the East, against the U.S.S.R. The United States, far from counteracting this fatal policy, backed it in every way. As to the American billionaires, they went on investing their capital in German heavy industry, helping the Germans to expand their war industries and thus supplying the arms for German aggression. It was as good as saying: "Go on, you Europeans, fight to your heart's content and God be with you! Meanwhile we modest American billionaires will make fortunes out of your war by raking in hundreds of millions of dollars in super-profits."

This being the state of affairs in Europe, the Soviet Union had naturally only one choice, which was to accept the German proposal for a pact. After all, it was the best of all available alternatives.

Just as in 1918, when, owing to the hostile policy of the Western Powers, the Soviet Union was forced to conclude the Peace of Brest-Li-

tovsk with the Germans, so in 1939, twenty years after the Peace of Brest-Litovsk, the Soviet Union was compelled to conclude a pact with the Germans owing again to the hostile policy of Britain and France.

The slanderous claptrap that all the same the U.S.S.R. should not have agreed to conclude a pact with the Germans can only be regarded as ridiculous. Why was it right for Poland, who had Britain and France as allies, to conclude a non-aggression pact with the Germans in 1934, and not right for the Soviet Union, which was in a less favorable situation, to conclude a similar pact in 1939? Why was it right for Britain and France, who were the dominant force in Europe, to issue a joint declaration of non-aggression with the Germans in 1938, and not right for the Soviet Union, isolated as it was because of the hostile policy of Britain and France, to conclude a pact with the Germans?

Is it not a fact that of all the non-aggressive Great Powers in Europe, the Soviet Union was the last to agree to a pact with the Germans?

Of course the falsifiers of history and similar reactionaries are displeased with the fact that the Soviet Union was able to make good use of the Soviet-German pact to strengthen its defenses, that it succeeded in shifting its frontiers far to the West and thus putting up a barrier to the unhampered eastward advance of German aggression, that Hitler's troops had to begin their Eastern offensive not from the

Narva-Minsk-Kiev line, but from a line hundreds of kilometers farther West, that the U.S.S.R. was not bled to death in its Patriotic War but emerged from the war victorious. But this displeasure can only be regarded as a manifestation of the

impotent rage of bankrupt politicians.

The vicious displeasure of these gentlemen only serves to bear out the indubitable fact that the policy of the Soviet Union was and is a correct policy.

“By the word materialism the philistine understands gluttony, drunkenness, lust of the eye, lust of the flesh, arrogance, cupidity, avarice, miserliness, profit-hunting and stock-exchange swindling—in short, all the filthy vices in which he himself indulges in private. By the word idealism he understands the belief in virtue, universal philanthropy, and in a general way a ‘better world,’ of which he boasts before others, but in which he himself at the utmost believes only so long as he is going through the depression or bankruptcy consequent upon his customary ‘materialist’ excesses. It is then that he sings his favorite song, ‘What is man?—Half beast! Half angel!’”

Frederick Engels, *Feuerbach*, pp. 42-3.

SOME NEW APPROACHES TO PARTY ORGANIZATION AND CONCENTRATION WORK

By JIM TORMEY

THIS ARTICLE is based on some of the results of a study of the organizational structure of the Party in New York County (Manhattan), made over a period of several months.

The size and complexity of the problems investigated are indicated by the fact that in New York County there are over 10,000 Party members, organized in hundreds of clubs and dozens of sections. The mere physical problem, for example, of giving leadership to such a complex organization is an enormous one.

The purpose of the County Organization Department's study was to find a means by which the channels of leadership to the clubs could be bettered so as to improve the quality of leadership and, generally, to increase the mobility of our entire County organization.

To carry out this examination, two sub-commissions were set up—one to study our Industrial Sections and the other our Community Sections. This article will deal only with the thinking and findings of the Community sub-commission, since its conclusions may be more applicable to other parts of the country.

The Commission recommended the formation of Regional organiza-

tions to conform with six areas of our County, because within each of these areas there are certain common problems of Party work. The full content of their thinking will be developed in this article.

ROLE OF PARTY ORGANIZATION

At the outset, it became necessary to establish certain broad approaches to the study of Party organization in order to find the correct solutions to the diverse problems facing the county.

Our investigation was based, to begin with, on the proposition that the role of Party organization is to determine how we can best carry the Party's policy into life. Party policy is the determining factor in arriving at the forms of Party organization and methods of work for carrying out that policy. The correctness of Party organization is determined by how well it helps to carry out Party policy and to meet the specific tasks of a given period and of specific conditions of work. For example, the organizational forms and methods required to carry out the policy of the Party will vary in a shop, an industry, and in a community. In fact, they will vary from

shop to shop and from community to community. But the role of Party organization is not limited to the passive carrying out of our policy. It also helps to deepen and implement our understanding of the policy itself, and to test more accurately its correctness. Conversely, when an organizational form or method is an obstacle to the carrying through of our policy, the need will arise to make adjustments in that form or method. In this way we establish the unity between theory and practice, between politics and organization.

What results if this principle is neglected can be seen in the results of Browder revisionism which inevitably led to liquidation of the Party as a whole, and the substitution of Social-Democratic forms of organization and methods of work. For, since the policy denied the specific leading role of the Communists, the Party of the Communists became an impediment to the carrying through of the Browder policy of complete reliance on the bourgeois parties, of tailing behind the bourgeoisie.

If organizational forms and methods of work are viewed in their correct relation to policy, they will help us to avoid the tendency toward blue-printism, toward formalism, which is widespread in the Party, and which becomes particularly evident in various specialized fields of Party organization.

THE HARLEM REGION

On the basis of this general ap-

proach to politics and organization, the decision was made to set up a regional organization of the Party in the Harlem area. The concrete thinking which led to this decision was the following:

We noted that while we generally have a large Party east and west, as well as north and south, of Harlem, this membership—except on one side—was not close to or on the immediate periphery of Harlem. Rather, the membership increased in density as one went further away from Harlem and into the white middle-class communities. In other words, on the fringe of Harlem, where tens of thousands of Negro and white workers live—where the white landlords' discriminatory practices are particularly vicious—we were weak or had no membership, a very serious weakness, indeed, and a criticism of our work. For densely populated Harlem, the cultural and political nerve center of Negro life in America, is a ghetto in which the Negro people are oppressed by every discriminatory practice developed by the American lily-white ruling class. Hence, it is precisely where the Negro and white communities meet that there should be an intensification of the general struggle for Negro rights. Struggles led by our white comrades in the white communities adjoining Harlem should merge with the struggles of our Negro comrades in their effort to lead the Negro people out of the ghetto into the white areas.

Another important weakness noted was that the boundaries of the Harlem Section were, in the main, those of the Negro community, whereas the white communities adjacent to Harlem were organized in other sections. (In fact, when recognized, this impermissible situation motivated the present study.) The establishment of the Harlem Section boundaries in this manner, immediately after the reconstitution of the Party, was a serious error. Thus it prevented a daily working together of our Negro and white comrades in a struggle for Negro rights, with our white comrades taking a leading part in these struggles.

In addition to alerting the Party to this weakness, the Commission proposed:

1. That the Harlem Regional Organization be so constituted as to include all of the 22nd Congressional District (Congressman Powell's district), which includes the large white sections of the population adjacent to the Negro community, and which cuts through a number of Assembly Districts, but includes all of the 11th, 12th, and 13th A.D.'s.

2. That since this new region will end the separation of the Party organization in the Harlem Negro community from the surrounding white areas, the predominant characteristic of this region must become—within the general framework of our Party's concentration on the Negro question—a concentration center of militant struggle for Negro rights.

3. That the unity in action of our Negro and white comrades in the struggle for Negro rights under one local leadership in the region, must be made to serve as an example of the need and power of Negro and white unity in promoting the best interests of all the people.

4. That the parliamentary boundaries of the 22nd C.D. and the 11th, 12th, and 13th A.D.'s must become the parliamentary front of the general struggle for Negro rights.

5. That within the region, three sections be constituted, to allow for a breakdown of this concentration on an Assembly District basis in the 11th, 12th, and 13th A.D.'s.

Our decisions on the Harlem region have specific practical lessons for other Party organizations with similar problems. However, the general point we wish to make here is that they serve to point up the principle that Party organization must always be viewed dynamically, as something which must be changed to meet changing political circumstances and objectives. Naturally, flexibility in organization does not mean spinelessness, and constant reorganization is not a cure-all but often an avoidance of grappling with the real problems.

MEANING OF THE POLICY OF CONCENTRATION

Another major result of our study of New York County was the new light it shed on the meaning of con-

centration work and the new organizational approaches which were consequently developed.

We soon began to grasp more fully the meaning of the following long-established organizational principles:

1. To develop a policy of concentration is to develop a political estimate of what is the key to moving the masses into action around a progressive program which, if carried through, would win the workers for that program, would help us to change the relation of forces in a given situation.

2. Concentration is also a system of work for carrying through a well-defined objective already agreed upon. This system of work involves the many questions of distribution of the forces necessary to gain that objective, as well as the determination of the form in which struggle must be carried out to meet the needs of a given community or industry. It also involves a whole host of other organizational measures necessary to carry through the central task of a given Party branch or organization.

What is generally regarded as concentration is only one aspect of it, undoubtedly the most important one, namely, industrial concentration, in which a given factory or a part of a factory is selected as a point on which the Party organization centers its main attention with the aim of reaching certain objectives.

However, this concept of concentration, it was soon realized, must

be expanded. At present, comrades working in branches not located in factory areas generally do not see that they, too, can employ a policy of concentration which can help root the Party in certain working-class communities and thereby contribute greatly to our work in the labor movement. Many clubs do not realize that they can and should select areas for work in which important national groups are located among which the Party remains weak. With a broadened understanding, even clubs working in predominantly middle-class communities would soon grasp the fact that they, too, can adopt a policy of concentration, selecting either an issue or a particular section of their community, or both, vital to effecting a changed relationship of forces in favor of the progressive camp.

In other words, what is not always seen is that the policy of concentration is, in a broad sense, a political orientation, a system of work which can be employed in the community and the factory alike. The lack of this broader understanding has tended to limit the application of a policy of concentration only to industry or to communities in which large factories are located. It has also led to overlooking the fact that industrial concentration can be effectively complemented by applying a special policy of concentration in communities in which there are large working-class populations.

THE COMMUNITY AND INDUSTRIAL CONCENTRATION

An example of the application of this approach is our decision to select another area for concentration, namely the Lower West Side of our County, and to set up a regional organization in that community.

The Lower West Side Region (southwest corner of Manhattan) extends along the most important waterfront dock area, within which live the families of thousands of longshoremen and seamen. Here are located the largest teamsters' sheds in the United States and large railroad yards and railroad docks. The transportation industry is dominant in this area, and was clearly the one to be selected for concentration purposes. Particularly singled out as key to the whole industry was longshore concentration—a concentration within a concentration, so to speak.

Like all other industrial workers, the transportation workers need an opportunity to express their political convictions—and thousands are ready even now for the new people's party. But tens of thousands of them, especially among working longshoremen, are denied the democratic processes normally afforded workers in the labor movement because of the undemocratic rule of "King Ryan," who charters paper locals that rarely or never meet. But even "King Ryan" cannot prevent progressive forces from reaching longshoremen in the communities in which they

live, so as to organize them in struggle for better housing and lower prices, for civil rights and for independent political action.

This choice of concentration does not mean that this area does not have other very important features. For instance, 25,000 Puerto Ricans, 30,000 Italian-Americans, and tens of thousands of Irish—and Yugoslav-Americans live in this community. This meant we had the additional problem of fulfilling our responsibilities to these sections of the population, while not neglecting the main concentration task.

There were, previously, three large Party sections in this whole area. In reorganizing this region of the County, our problem was how to organize the sections so as to center our main efforts on our key concentration task and at the same time continue to decentralize our Party apparatus so that each of the six sections of the newly established region would have a clearly defined part of the concentration job.

This problem was solved in the following manner:

A close examination of the region disclosed that the national groups mentioned above—the railroad yards, the teamster sheds and, of course, the docks—were all in fairly clearly defined areas. It was also found that many of the national groups mentioned represent focal points in the work of winning the longshoremen, seamen, and teamsters for a progressive program. (This relationship be-

tween national group work and industrial concentration is similar everywhere in the County.)

It was decided that the shortest road to successful achievement of the over-all transportation concentration would be to center our work in the national group communities adjacent to the docks by conducting our housing and tenants work, etc., in these communities.

Hence, six sections, with about 200 members each, were created out of the three large sections which existed, each section covering a territory enabling it to concentrate on a specific part of the transportation industry. Thus we now have one railroad concentration section; one section containing mainly Yugoslav-Americans, and many Italian-Americans too; as well as two teamster sections and one Italian concentration section.

Even though each of these sections has specific concentration tasks other than the longshore industry, what is common to all of these sections is that large numbers of longshoremen live in each of them. Each section has a clearly defined purpose for its particular existence, yet each complements the work of all the others; and the sum-total of all their individual tasks sums up to single-purposed concentration on the transportation industry by the region as a whole.

OTHER REGIONS

In addition to the Harlem and the

Lower West Side region singled out for concentration work, four other regions were established:

1. The Washington Heights area, especially the 15th A.D. of the 23rd C.D. (Representative Javits' district) where there are large Jewish-American, Irish-American, and Greek-American communities.

2. The 18th C.D. (Representative Marcantonio's district) in which is located the cultural and political center of the New York Puerto Rican population, with several hundred thousand residents; and East Harlem, the largest Italian community in the County, which has long been a seat of strength for independent political movements such as the old La-Guardia coalition, etc.; and, finally, Yorkville.

3. The Upper West Side area, in which the problem is to move the large and important Jewish middle-class community into action on a progressive program so as to undermine the influence of Social-Democracy there; and also to win support for such a program among the Puerto Rican and Irish-American working-class areas.

4. The Lower East Side area, long known for its rich progressive history, which covers the 19th C.D. (Representative Klein's district), and has an important part to play in helping to change the relationship of forces in the field of Jewish work, in winning leadership for the working class within the Jewish movement by winning the workers away from

the *Forward* Social-Democratic influence. (This region also has a large Italian and a Chinese community.)

In all six regions an attempt was made to meet both the parliamentary and electoral problems while at the same time organizing our Party in such a manner as to facilitate the every-day requirements of the struggle for the immediate interests of the people of the community.

MAIN REASONS

It will be useful now to summarize our main reasons for recommending these six areas for concentration.

The following main points were studied in each area: 1) the industrial composition; 2) the national group composition; 3) the electoral boundaries and problems; 4) the area's history, the traditions that have tended to create contiguous communities, etc.; 5) the size of the population, and its relation to the number of Party members in the area.

To analyze these factors correctly was no small task in our County, since, as is known, Manhattan is a very diverse community—in fact, a county made up of a number of separate communities. In many instances this study required almost a block-by-block examination of the community.

Our first major conclusion was the need to decentralize our entire County organization. In view of the hundreds of branches and the ever-increasing number of sections, the County leadership as then constituted

was unable to give adequate daily guidance. This problem was particularly urgent in a period in which our branches must be given a great deal of help in the application of the Party's policy of the united front from below. It was urgent also because there was need for breaking up our branches and sections into smaller, more mobile Party organizations.

Obviously, to have tried to meet this problem merely by enlarging the County leadership would only have created a top-heavy apparatus. "The solution," the Commission stated, "has to be *decentralization* and in a form that will thrust the main weight of County leadership into the Sections, yet a form so constituted as to channel back from the branches to the County the manifold experiences and thinking of the membership in action and of the masses with whom they work."

Consequently, a form of Party organization was decided on which, it was felt, would, on the one hand, help to solve the problem of improving the channels of leadership by decentralizing our County apparatus, and, on the other hand, enable us to promote effectively a policy of concentration, thus answering two burning needs. Hence, the regional form of organization, most of whose features have been outlined above, Hence the decision that, in the Commission's words, "each region of the Party be built as a geographic-political concentration entity into a

full Party organization in the chain of leadership between the County and the branches."

In introducing these new proposals to our membership, reports were made to branch functionaries' meetings held in each proposed region. In order to prevent the development of a conception that the proposed organizational changes would solve all problems, as is often the tendency in discussing such changes, we made the reports in the form of reports on the problem of concentration, which is, in fact, at the base of the whole regional plan. Thus we succeeded in centering the discussion mainly on the content of the proposed regional setup, and only secondarily on its form. The proposed organizational changes were thus seen in their true light—that of furthering a policy of concentration.

At each meeting there were not just nominal but spirited acceptance, and unanimous votes of approval, of the plan. Perhaps the most common remark in the discussions which took place was that the comrades could now see "Party organization as a means of turning the face of the Party outward," instead of as a routine, inner-Party question.

CHANNELS OF LEADERSHIP

In order to put this regional form of organization into effect, the following channels of leadership were worked out:

1. A *transitional* form of organiza-

tion was adopted: a) so that the many new section leaderships and the new regional leaderships could receive the greatest assistance possible and become acquainted with, and adjusted to, their new responsibilities; and b) so that in the period of transition the County leadership, as it acquires experiences with the new setup, can make any necessary adjustments in it.

2. Regional Committees were set up which are politically and organizationally responsible for the life and work of the clubs and sections under their leadership.

3. The Regional Committee, during this period of transition, is composed of the section organizers—all part-time—plus the full-time regional organizer.

4. Temporarily, until such time as the transitional period is over, the regional organizer is appointed by the County Executive Committee and functions as a member of it. Thus we attempt, in effect, to prevent any separation between the County leadership and the regional leadership, viewing the regional leader a County leader in the field.

5. During the period of transition, the section apparatus—membership, finance, etc.—remains directly attached to the County Departments as they have been in the past. Therefore, the Org. apparatus is not yet in the hands of the regional leaderships.

6. All County Departments are being reorganized on a regional basis.

7. Upon completion of the reorganization of the County Departments and at a time when in the opinion of the regional and County leadership the regional leadership is prepared to take over the complete apparatus, the latter should do so, and a complete complement of necessary officers elected to establish a complete, independent political unity in the regions.

8. Many other problems have not yet been worked out, such as the election of regional officers, etc. This can probably be done after the various Party conventions.

WHAT WE HOPE TO ACHIEVE

Naturally, much work will have to be done to achieve the improvement in the content of our work, for which we set up this new type of Party organization; and we know full well that the form of Party organization does not in itself guarantee a higher quality of work. Nonetheless, we think that the following will be achieved.

1. The regional setup will facilitate carrying through a policy of concentration within the sections in the communities and within each of the six regions. By subdividing these over-all regional concentrations into their various parts, we have developed specific concentrations within general concentration objectives which allow for even more specific application of the line of the Party. We are making it possible for all

Party branches, sections, and regions in the county, to engage in concentration work, not confining it, as in the past, only to certain specialized "concentration groups." In this way the problems of the labor movement are of concern to our community branches as well as to the shop and industrial branches.

2. We have decentralized our community organizations, as follows:

a. We have placed the greater weight of our leadership directly on the organizations in the field, in the new regional committees.

b. We have therefore been able to create many new sections, under the leadership of these regions, which are much smaller and mobile than ever before, each with a clearly defined area of work and an understood central task.

3. We have created new possibilities for improving the leadership of our work in the following way:

a. The County leadership will now be able to decentralize its own leadership and apparatus in order to place more of its leadership in the field through the medium of the regional committees, led by the regional organizers who are part of the County leadership, *i.e.*, members of the County Executive Committee. Thus we hope to prevent any further separation of the County leadership from the branches, and on the contrary create a closer relationship with the sections.

b. Also, since the smaller sections have been formed, we have seen

a large number of new section organizers, organizational secretaries, etc., come forward, thus broadening the leadership of the Party and elevating many new forces indigenous to their communities.

What we are most certain of is that we have not eliminated all problems. A tremendous need exists in every phase of work for personnel capable of giving leadership to these many new sections and regions; and many problems arise from the need for practical results now, even as we only begin to adjust our ways of work to the new organization. We have yet to work out a number of problems, connected with finding specific ways in which to integrate the work of our shop and industrial

branches with our community branches, in which to solve many problems in the national group field and, generally, to apply these concepts of Party organization to branch life.

The solution of these problems will, we feel, be greatly accelerated by the new organizational forms we have adopted, by our deepened understanding of Party organization as being not an end in itself, but a means of turning the face of the Party outward. And we feel that our Party organization will now be able more effectively to fulfill its responsibilities at this moment of decisive struggle between the camp of imperialism and the camp of democracy.

“All previous historical movements were movements of minorities, or in the interest of minorities. The proletarian movement is the self-conscious, independent movement of the immense majority, in the interest of the immense majority.”

Karl Marx and Frederick Engels,
Manifesto of the Communist Party.

FROM THE TREASURY OF MARXISM

THE JUNE DAYS

By Karl Marx

[In April, 1848, after the March revolution in Berlin and Vienna, Marx left Paris for Cologne, where he founded the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung*, which was in existence from June 1, 1848 to May 19, 1849. This was the only paper, Engels states, "which defended the standpoint of the proletariat within the democratic movement of the time, as shown already in its unreserved championship of the Parisian insurgents of [June] 1848."

It was in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* of June 29, 1848, after the defeat of the insurrection of the Paris workers, that, says Engels, "Marx celebrated the vanquished in one of his most powerful articles." It is this article which we reprint below in translation.*]


Cologne, June 28, 1848

THE PARISIAN WORKERS have been crushed by superior force, crushed but not destroyed; they have been defeated, and yet it is their opponents who are really vanquished. The momentary triumph of brute force has been purchased by the annihilation of all the disappointments and chimeras of the February revo-

lution, by the liquidation of all the old republican parties, by the segregation of the French people into two nations—the nation of the owners and the nation of the workers. Henceforward the tricolor republic can have but one color, the color of the beaten, the color of blood. It has become a Red republic.

There is no one with an established republican reputation, no one either from the group of the nationalists or from the group of the reformers, on the side of the people! With no other leaders and no other means than insurrection itself, the people withstood the united strength of the bourgeoisie and the soldiery for a longer period than any French dynasty fully equipped with military apparatus was ever able to withstand the bourgeoisie. To dispel the last illusions of the people, to bring about a complete break with the past, it was necessary that the customary enthusiastic supporters of French insurrectionists—the bourgeois youth, the pupils at the Polytechnic School, the wearers of three-cornered hats—should this time side with the oppressors. It was necessary that the medical students of the University of Paris should refuse their aid to wounded plebeians. Science does not exist for the help of these common

* The translation printed here is from *Karl Marx: Man, Thinker, and Revolutionist* (International Publishers, 1927).



The June Days In Paris, 1848. (From a contemporary print)

folk, for the help of those who have committed the infamous, the unspeakable crime of fighting for their own hands instead of splintering a lance for Louis Philippe or Monsieur Marrast.

The Executive Committee, the last official vestige of the February revolution, has vanished like a mist-wraith. Lamartine's fire-balls have transformed themselves into Cavaignac's war-rockets.

The fraternity of the two opposing classes (one of which exploits the other), this fraternity which in February was inscribed in huge letters upon all the façades of Paris, upon all the prisons and all the barracks—its true and unsophisticated and prosaic expression is civil war, civil war in its most terrible form, the war between capital and labor. On the evening of June 25th, this fraternity was flaming from all the windows of Paris when the Paris of the bourgeoisie was illuminated while the Paris of the proletariat was burning and bleeding and lamenting.

Fraternity lasted just so long as the interests of the bourgeoisie could fraternise with the interests of the proletariat. Pedants of the old revolutionary traditions of 1793; socialist systematisers who begged the bourgeoisie to grant favors to the people, who were allowed to preach lengthy sermons, and were permitted to compromise themselves for just so long a time as was needed for the lulling of the proletarian lion to sleep; republicans who wanted the whole of the old bourgeois system, minus the

crowned figurehead; legitimists who did not wish to doff their livery, but merely to change its cut—these had been the people's allies in the February revolution! Yet what the people instinctively hated was not Louis Philippe, but the crowned dominion of a class, capital enthroned. Nevertheless, magnanimous as ever, it fancied it had destroyed its own enemies when it had merely overthrown the enemy of its enemies, the common enemy of them all.

The February revolution was a decorous revolution, a revolution made by general acclaim, because the oppositions which in it exploded against the monarchy were undeveloped, and slumbered harmoniously side by side; because the social struggle which formed its real background, has as yet won only an airy existence, the existence of a phrase or a word. The June revolution is an indecorous, a detestable revolution because in it substance has taken the place of phrase, because the establishment of the republic disclosed the head of the monster when it removed the sparkling guise of the crown.

"Order" was Guizot's watchword. "Order reigns in Warsaw," said Sebastiani, the Guizotin, when the Poles were crushed by the Russians. "Order!" shouts Cavaignac, the brutal echo of the French National Assembly and the republican bourgeoisie. "Order!" rattles his grape-shot, as it mows down the proletariat.

Not one of the countless revolutions made by the French bourgeoisie

since 1789 was an attack upon order, for they left untouched the dominion of class, the slavery of the workers, bourgeois order—while changing again and again the political form of this dominion and this slavery. But June laid hands upon bourgeois order. Woe, therefore, to June!

Under the Provisional Government it was the proper thing, nay it was essential, it was both politic and agreeable, to tell the "generous-hearted" workers (who, as thousands of official posters declared, "had placed three months' poverty at the disposal of the republic") that the February revolution had been made in their interest, or in their interest above all. But after the meeting of the National Assembly, a more prosaic tone made itself heard. All that was now necessary was, as Monsieur Trelat phrased it, to get labor back to its old conditions. In a word, the workers had taken up arms in February in order to involve themselves in an industrial crisis!

The business of the National Assembly is to make February as if it had never been, at any rate as far as the workers are concerned, for these are to be forced back into the old conditions. But the Assembly finds the task beyond its powers, for no more successfully than a king can a parliament say to a universal industrial crisis, "Thus far and no farther!" Even the National Assembly, in its brutal eagerness to have done with the tiresome February verbiage, failed to hit upon the one measure that was practicable upon

the basis of the old relationships. It conscripted Parisian workers of ages from seventeen to twenty-five into the army, or flung them out on to the pavement; it ordered foreigners out of Paris, exiled them to Sologne, without even paying them what was due to them up to the day of dismissal; it provisionally guaranteed grown-up Parisians a bare subsistence in workshops organised in military fashion, on the proviso that they should take no part in public meetings, that is on the proviso that they should cease to be republicans. Sentimental rhetoric after the February revolution did not suffice, nor yet the brutal activity of the legislature after May 15th. The issue must be decided practically. "Did you, the rabble, make the February revolution for yourselves, or for us?" The bourgeoisie propounded the question in such a way that it could only be answered (in June) with grape-shot and barricades.

Nevertheless, as one of the representatives of the people said on June 25th, the National Assembly is stupor-stricken. It is stupefied when question and answer drench the streets of Paris with blood; the representatives are stupefied, some of them because their illusions go up in gunpowder smoke, others because they cannot understand how the people can dare to defend its own most immediate interests. Nothing, in the view of these latter, but Russian money, English money, the Bonapartist eagle, the monarchist lily, or some other amulet, can account for

so strange a phenomenon! Both sections of the Assembly feel, however, that between them and the people a great gulf is fixed; neither dares to raise a voice on the people's behalf.

As soon as the stupor has passed off, fury takes its place; and, with good reason, the majority expresses its fierce contempt for the pitiful utopians and hypocrites who perpetrate the anachronism of continuing to speak of fraternity. The essential thing is that we should hear no more of this phrase, or of the illusions it harbors in its ambiguous bosom! When La Rochejaquelin, legitimist and chivalrous enthusiast, railed against the infamous way in which people were shouting "Vae victis" (Woe to the vanquished), the majority of the Assembly became affected with St. Vitus' dance, as if bitten by a tarantula. They cried "Woe to the workers" in order to hide that they themselves, and no others, were in truth the vanquished; that either they themselves must perish, or the republic. That was why they cried so convulsively: "Long live the republic!"

Are we to be led astray because this abyss has opened at our feet? Are we to succumb to the illusion that struggles concerning the form of the State are void of content or meaning?

Only weaklings and cowards can moot this question. The clashes that

spontaneously arise out of the conditions of bourgeois society must be fought to the bitter end; they cannot be conjured out of existence. The best form of State is the one in which social oppositions are not slurred over; the one in which they are not forcibly, that is to say, artificially and no more than seemingly, fettered. The best form of State is one in which these conflicts secure free expression, and are thus resolved.

We shall be asked: "Have you no tears, no sighs, no words of sympathy, for the victims of the popular frenzy; are you indifferent to the losses of the National Guard, the Mobile Guard, the Republican Guard, the Line?"

The State will care for the widows and orphans of these men. They will be honored in decrees; they will be given a splendid public funeral; the official press will proclaim their memories immortal; the champions of the reaction will extol them from the east of Europe to the west.

But the plebeians, pinched by hunger, reviled in the newspapers, neglected by the surgeons, stigmatised by all "honest" folk as thieves and incendiaries and convicts, their wives and their children plunged in greater misery than ever, the best among the survivors transported—is not the democratic press fully entitled to crown their sad brows with laurels?

COMMUNICATIONS

ON COMRADE FOSTER'S ARTICLE "THE THEORETICAL WORK OF THE PARTY"

By George Miller

April 23, 1948

V. J. Jerome, Editor
Political Affairs

Dear Comrade Jerome:

It was very heartening to read in the April issue of *Political Affairs* the article by Comrade Foster on "The Theoretical Work of the Party." In emphasizing the importance of theoretical work at this time, and outlining some of the important issues on which theoretical work is needed, Comrade Foster helps to point the way toward solutions of many of the difficult questions that confront the working class in the United States at this time.

In agreeing fully with Comrade Foster's article, I offer here some comments with reference to the theoretical work of the Party as it affects in particular the organized labor movement in the United States.

As in other fields of work, Browderism infected and watered down the ideology of the trade union movement. This was the more dan-

gerous for the labor movement because of the fact, as analyzed by Comrade Foster in his article* on "Marxism and 'American Exceptionalism,'" that the labor movement in the United States has generally been weak and backward with respect to ideological and political orientation. The historical tendencies of "economism," or in its more vulgar form, "business unionism" or "Gomperism," that permeate sections of the American labor movement, require the keenest vigilance and the best kind of ideological and theoretical work by progressives in the labor movement, and particularly by Communists.

It seems to me that it is imperative at this time to improve the theoretical understanding of Communist and progressive forces in the labor movement and to broaden and deepen the work in the unions because of four particular reasons:

1. The employers in the United States, through all their propaganda agencies and through the government, are conducting a concerted campaign of obscurantism, confusion, and distortion, which, it is clear, is having its effect on the popu-

* *Political Affairs*, September, 1947—Ed.

lation and on sections of the working class. The propaganda of the employers has to be met by all kinds of means, but among the most important is the ideological, theoretical understanding which must be developed widely among the workers, particularly the organized workers.

2. The main basis of the campaign of the bourgeoisie is the intimidation of the people and the exaggeration of the strength, stability, and power of the bourgeoisie. This can only be coped with if there is developed among the workers a better understanding of the real world relation of forces of today, the historical necessities that operate, the contradictions besetting the bourgeoisie, and the role of the working class. It is on these points that only the Communists and Communist theory provide an answer.

3. There are many tasks confronting the unions, and these tasks multiply in number from day to day and grow in complexity. Tendencies in the labor movement to attack problems too much from a tactical, pragmatic approach make the solution of daily problems much more difficult, if not impossible. Theoretical and ideological development, by deepening the understanding of long-range factors and objectives, will help in the solution of day-to-day problems.

4. The offensive of Social-Democracy in the United States is reaching new levels, and this can only be met by applying and developing the principles of Marxism-Leninism.

There are two directions in which, it seems to me, improved theoretical and ideological work would be helpful. The first is in connection with current and new problems. Among those in this category of particular concern to organized labor are the following: Questions connected with the current inflation, including developments in productivity and rate of surplus value, analysis and information connected with the relative impoverishment of the working class in the United States and, more particularly, with the *absolute impoverishment* of the working class. This latter subject is of tremendous importance to the labor movement because the employers and their agents in the ranks of labor are constantly trying to prove the *absolute improvement* in the condition of the American working class. Other current questions include more effective investigation and analysis of the impact of the Administration's war policies on the conditions of the workers and what effect military expenditures will have in determining the specific features of the economic crisis. Another subject of importance is the question of more careful and explicit investigation and examination of the relationship of the organized workers to other groups in the population, particularly the white-collar people and the farmers.

In addition to the above "current" questions, and many others of that type, there is the necessity of renewing and refreshing our understand-

ing of the fundamentals of Marxism-Leninism. It is not that these fundamental questions have to be re-opened, since they are already incontrovertibly established, but they have to be reviewed and restudied so that they can be better applied in today's circumstances. Among such subjects on which study would be especially appropriate and helpful for the labor movement today are: The fundamental question of the role of the trade unions, the role of the state, the classical Marxist-Leninist works on political economy, the experiences of the Parties throughout the world in combating Social-Democracy in the labor movement, and other subjects.

Finally, and a subject toward which all the above matters contribute, there is the improved understanding and new lessons that must be learned in connection with the role of the Communists in the progressive coalition, which Comrade Dennis singled out as an important question in his report to the recent National Committee meeting. Obviously, the progressive coalition, which depends basically on labor, will grow and be effective and have permanent value to the extent that Communists are able to develop and clarify and carry out their special role and responsibilities in the coalition, and particularly in the labor movement.

As one unionist, I feel very deeply the need for the kind of approach and work by the Party as set forth

in Comrade Foster's article. I have found recently, too, that because of all current developments, more and more of the Communists and progressives in the ranks of organized labor are ready and eager to take steps to improve the theoretical and ideological work in the labor movement.

This should be a consistent policy and objective. However, it seems to me that some concrete steps can be taken. Among these would be:

1. The continuation and expansion of the publication of the good ideological and theoretical material that *Political Affairs* is now carrying, and persistent work to increase the circulation of *Political Affairs* among unionists.

2. Organized and consistent attention to the distribution and reading of other Party material, beginning of course with the *Daily Worker*, but including current pamphlets, writings by Marx, Engels, Lenin, and Stalin, *New Times*, and *For a Lasting Peace, For a People's Democracy*.

3. The organization on a wider scale of study groups, schools, etc., among trade unionists.

4. The effort to provide frequent opportunity at meetings of unionists to discuss, not only "practical" questions, but fundamental economic and political subjects.

5. The holding of conferences of trade unionists around selected political and economic questions.

6. The encouragement of the exchange of views on such questions

by trade unionists through correspondence or articles in the *Daily Worker* and *Political Affairs*.

Comrade Foster's article is a most important one and sets forward tasks that are not easy; but the path he outlines is, I think, invaluable for the trade unions. The main thing is to overcome and dissipate the tendency of unionists to become preoccupied in a narrow way with immediate and "practical" tasks. Not that such tasks can be ignored, but rather there should be developed a method of work and an ideological approach

through which these tasks can be handled as part of a dynamic Communist mode of action. It was Stalin, I believe, who recommended to the Russian Party that they should seek to achieve the combination of Russian breadth and American practical work. Perhaps, we in the labor movement in the United States are overboard a little bit on the "American practicality" side and need to develop on our part some equivalent of Russian "breadth."

Comradely yours,

GEORGE MILLER.

"Capital organizes and regulates the labor within the factory for the further oppression of the worker, in order to increase its own profit. But in social production as a whole, chaos remains, and grows, bringing on crises when the accumulated wealth finds no purchasers and millions of workers perish or go hungry, not finding work."

V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Russian Ed., Vol. XVII, p. 248.

BOOK REVIEW

CORNFORTH'S CRITIQUE OF "MODERN" PHILOSOPHIES

By Harry K. Wells

SCIENCE AND IDEALISM, An Examination of "Pure Empiricism" and Modern Logic, by Maurice Cornforth. International Publishers, New York. 1947. 268 pages. \$2.50.

Maurice Cornforth's *Science and Idealism*, through its scholarly and lucid analysis of the pure empiricists and the logical positivists, provides the means for exposing these self-styled friends of science who are in reality to be ranked among its deadliest enemies. It shows that in fact they are faithful lackeys of the capitalist class and hostile to the struggle of the people for a better future. To paraphrase Lenin, the philosophies of Bertrand Russell, Wittgenstein, and Carnap are to science what the kiss of Judas is to Christ. They betray science into the hands of religion by ultimately deserting to the camp of idealism.

In *Materialism and Empirio-Criticism*, Lenin, at the turn of the century, exposed the positivists, Mach and Avenarius, as anti-scientific, anti-materialist apologists for moribund capitalism. He said then that "there is nothing in their teaching but a paraphrasing of subjective idealism." In the intervening years capitalism has plunged

deeper and deeper into the general crisis of the system as a whole. Its philosophers have kept pace. As the crisis advanced, their views became progressively more decadent, taking the form of ever more devious techniques by which to cover up their basic subjective idealist position. It is Cornforth's special task to bring the analysis up to date.

* * *

Cornforth carries the analysis back to the roots of subjective idealism in Locke and forward to its obscurantist forms in Russell, Wittgenstein, and Carnap. He shows, in the clearest way, how Locke's half-hearted materialism was exploited by Berkeley and Hume to establish subjective idealism, and how, with this deformation, the task set for philosophy by the recently triumphant capitalist class—to limit science and thereby make room for religion—was brought to successful completion. So successfully was this bourgeois task carried out by Berkeley and Hume that the modern "logical" philosophies are in fact merely complex variations on the theme, designed to be less openly subjective and therefore more effective in inculcating against the cumulative truth of science.

Cornforth starts out by clearly defining materialism and idealism. Materialism is "that trend in philosophy which champions scientific knowledge as against supernatural beliefs." (P. 14.)

Science is a social activity which produces ideas corresponding to the objective material world. Its basic position is that there is a material world independent of the consciousness and that it can be known, but only by organized scientific methods. "Therefore on the basis of science we reach an ever-expanding and deepening *knowledge* of the objective world and of our place in it, which banishes all superstitions, ghosts and supernatural forces, and which is a weapon for the liberation of mankind and for the control of both natural and social forces in the interests of humanity." (P. 17.)

Idealism, on the other hand, is "that trend which, in a direct or indirect way, defends supernatural beliefs against scientific truth." As science expands knowledge, it threatens those myths and superstitions which constitute that spiritual force of repression on which, together with its material force, the ruling class depends to maintain itself in power. Thereupon, idealist philosophy "hastens to the rescue of the threatened traditional ideas. And by so doing it serves to obscure the understanding of the significance of science and of the possibilities which the utilisation of science opens up for the people." (P. 14.)

Capitalism, from the seventeenth century on, required both science and religion: science to develop the technology essential to commerce and manufacture; religion to buttress the class structure of society, as a form of "social security" for the capitalist class. Bourgeois philosophy from Bacon to Carnap, as Cornforth points out, reflects these contradictory demands. The "progression" is from the materialism of Bacon to the openly subjective ideal-

ism of Berkeley and the agnosticism of Hume, and on to the successive efforts by the positivists to camouflage solipsism through a bewildering display of sleight-of-hand techniques.

Cornforth brings out the fact that the whole development of empiricist philosophy, from the "English Empiricists" to contemporary logical positivism, has been the development of a philosophy to reconcile science and religion. He shows in a series of brilliant chapters that this can be done only by "demonstrating" that science does not give knowledge of the objective material world, but rather is concerned solely with the analysis or the ordering of subjective experience. If science is not concerned with truth about the objective world, it is not incompatible with superstition; and it follows that men are "free" to believe in the myths and superstitions which are among the powerful supports of any society based on exploitation.

Science is the social effort to gain verified knowledge of the world in order to change it in accordance with the material interests of mankind. But religion, as Cornforth says, "is rather a system of unverified ideas conditioned by the need to reconcile people with the world as it is." (P. 256.) Science is revolutionary; religion is preservative of the class structure of society. Bourgeois philosophers, as Cornforth clearly demonstrates, have the task of reconciling the irreconcilable. As the general crisis of capitalism deepens, as the working class and its scientific materialism press more closely, this task of reconciliation becomes more difficult for the intellectual lackeys of the capitalist class. Hence the modern forms of empiricism and positivism are com-

pelled to resort to confusing, equivocal terminology, phrases, and catchwords designed to disguise the fact that these forms are essentially only a repetition of the older subjectivist theories of Berkeley and Hume. Cornforth does a brilliant job of exposing the logical positivists. He shows how they dispute endlessly about "elements," "aspects," "elementary propositions," "logical syntax," "protocol language," "physicalistic language."

Cornforth sums up his penetrating analysis of these "logical" schools by saying that "they are all so much scholastic make-believe, which bears no relationship to the real world, and to the real problems of life and knowledge." Their essence is "to confuse and deny the objective content of scientific knowledge. . . ." (P. 261.)

The book divides readily into three parts. The first, some 96 pages, is a clear and concise discussion of the rise of pure empiricism from Bacon and Hobbes, through Locke, to Berkeley and Hume, thence to Kant, and on to the modern, Machian positivists' attempt to conceal that subjective idealism which is a logical consequence of pure empiricism.

The second is the 130 pages devoted to a searching analysis of the more recent logical schools in the positivist tradition of Mach. Of necessity, Cornforth has to go into the technicalities, the fine distinctions, the subtle maneuverings of these "up-to-date" enemies of progress. Though it is not easy reading for the layman unversed in the peculiar jargon of philosophical obscurantists, it is a potent weapon, particularly for students, scientists, and intellectuals in all fields in the struggle

against advanced forms of idealism. Cornforth has done an heroic job of cutting through the details to get at the bourgeois, anti-scientific essence of these viciously obscure doctrines.

The third section of the book comprises the last two chapters, "The Interpretation of Science" and "The Conclusion." These chapters summarize the argument in clear and simple language. They constitute a highly effective contribution in the present struggle for science and materialism against the superstition and idealist mythology of moribund capitalism.

Cornforth points out that the social significance of the "logical" schools, as of Berkeley and Hume, is that they "disguise and cover up the really revolutionary character of science." The revolutionary character of science consists in the fact that it is the only method "for finding out the truth about the world," and "the application of science can mean abundant food, shelter, health, rest, culture and happiness for every human being—the planning of social progress for mankind." Materialism defends science as "knowledge of nature which gives power over nature." But the "logical" doctrines and the doctrines of pure empiricism "deny the objectivity of scientific knowledge—and leave the way open for the deception of the masses by religious, idealistic and anti-scientific illusions." (P. 262.)

Finally, Cornforth sees logical philosophy "as the philosophy of the cautious middle-class 'intellectual,' of the professional, technical or scientific worker, who genuinely wants as an individual to accept and use science, but who does not want to commit himself on funda-

mental issues or to be involved in great social controversies." (P. 262.) This characterization of the kind of philosophy represented by Russell, Wittgenstein, and Carnap as "the philosophy of the cautious middle class" is clearly inadequate. Positivism and pure empiricism, while they assuredly do immobilize the middle-class intellectual, are not middle-class philosophies. Rather, they are degenerate philosophies of the capitalist class in its monopoly moribund stage. They are designed to undermine science, and particularly dialectical materialism, in the interest of the ruling class, not the middle class. They spread scepticism and agnosticism, obscurantism and irrationalism, in the service of reaction and imperialist domination. At an advanced stage of decay, capitalism more than ever dreads the force of reason and science, and compels its philosophers to invent anti-rational, anti-scientific doctrines.

In characterizing the logical philosophies as philosophies of the middle class, Cornforth is confusing their origin and one of their social functions with their essence. Certainly, the men who invent such philosophies are middle-class, and certainly one of their functions is to immobilize that class. But the essence of these philosophies is necessarily related to the fact that they are ideological weapons of monopoly capitalism in its struggle against the working class. The logical philosophies are ruling-class, not middle-class philosophies.

Cornforth brings out forcefully the fact that the history of modern philosophy is the history of the development of materialism as the only adequate philosophy of science. He also shows

that, in so far as the capitalist class uses idealism as a weapon with which to attack science and materialism, the history of modern philosophy is the history of the struggle against idealism in all its forms. The seventeenth and eighteenth century materialists carried on an heroic and eminently progressive struggle against idealism, as Cornforth points out in his treatment of Bacon and Hobbes.

* * *

But what Cornforth does not bring out sufficiently is the fact that these early materialists were severely handicapped in this struggle by certain weaknesses and limitations in their philosophies. They were mechanistic materialists.

In failing to make a thorough analysis of the limitations of mechanistic materialism, Cornforth leaves little revolutionary role for dialectical materialism. The history of philosophy, then, tends to become, an *evolutionary* struggle between materialism and idealism, whereas, in point of fact, dialectical materialism alone eliminates the weaknesses in mechanistic materialism, and so at once cuts the ground from under subjectivism in all its forms. This marks a great qualitative advance, a radical transformation, in the development of science and materialist philosophy. Such a transformation can be achieved only by the philosophy of the working class which sees men, not as passive observers, but as active agents in changing the world.

Solipsism, open or veiled, is the ultimate form of modern attempts to undermine science and make room for fideism. Such being the case, it is of first importance to understand the inadequacies and mistakes in the mate-

rialism of Bacon, Hobbes, and the limitations of the science which seriously hampered them in their struggle against idealism.

And yet it is here that Cornforth does not make a thorough analysis. Instead of tracing the errors of seventeenth century British materialism, he concentrates on Locke's theory of knowledge, whereas in point of fact, Locke adroitly exploited the mechanical theory of knowledge of Bacon and Hobbes; particularly the latter. As Lenin pointed out, Diderot recognized the discrepancy between a materialist world view and the Lockean sensationalistic theory of knowledge, even though he failed to provide a solution—a solution which could be achieved only with the rise of the modern working-class movement and its philosophy, dialectical materialism.

The British materialists were mechanists. They had no place in the material world for the self and for consciousness. The observer was a passive recipient of atomic experiences. It was therefore but a single step to conclude, as Locke did, that we do not know objects directly, but that we know immediately only our own sensations and ideas.

Bourgeois philosophy in general attains to a view of the world, as made up of isolated atoms, or atomic objects, in merely external mechanical relation. Moreover, these metaphysically conceived atoms, whether material (as with Newton, Bacon, and Hobbes), or sensational (as with the pure empiricists), or verbal (as with the various "logical" schools) are "given" and unchanging in substance. Hence, bourgeois philosophy can continue to *think* in formal logic, or logical formalist terms. Throughout bourgeois philoso-

phy (with rare exceptions, e.g., Hegel) a thing is what it is, it is static. Such a world view has not place for process, interrelation, or man as an active agent of change.

For the past few decades there has been occurring a revolution in physics which rejects the atomic mechanistic world view. "Modern physics," said Lenin, "is in a state of confinement; it is giving birth to dialectical materialism." It puts process and interrelation in the place of static mechanism and isolated atoms. But its method is inadequate. Contemporary physics is searching for a method which is there for the taking. In their refusal to accept dialectical materialism, bourgeois physicists are trying to force their way, as Lenin said, "through an open door."

Progressive as mechanistic materialism was in the period of ascending capitalism, it nevertheless, even from the beginning, contained inconsistencies which hampered it in its struggle against idealism. These inconsistencies sprang, not only from the undeveloped state of science, but also from the very nature of the tasks and aims of the bourgeoisie. Only the working class could develop a thorough-going materialist philosophy which could carry forward a successful struggle against idealism in all its forms. Dialectical materialism marks a revolutionary advance in the development of materialist philosophy. This qualitative leap was made possible through the development of the working class. And in the last analysis, idealist philosophy will be overcome and finally eliminated, not through theoretical solutions of the problems alone, but through the accomplishment of the historic mission of the working class.

It is important to understand the criticism of Cornforth. But it is also important to realize that Cornforth has made a genuine contribution. His analysis of Russell, Wittgenstein, and Carnap, as well as his clear and concise treatment of Berkeley, Hume, and Kant, are potent weapons in the struggle against decadent capitalist ideologies. The book should be read and reread by all Marxists in conjunction with a study of Lenin's *Materialism and Empirio-Criticism*.

Cornforth's *Science and Idealism* is most welcome in this country where we are exposed to the virus either of logical positivism or of pure empiricism of the Dewey brand. If in addition to arming us against these lackeys of imperialism, it goads us into doing the long overdue exposé of Dewey's pseudo-radical empiricism, an exposé for which Cornforth has helped lay the foundation, it will have accomplished an additional worthy mission.

“In proportion as the exploitation of one individual by another is put an end to, the exploitation of one nation by another will be put an end to. In proportion as the antagonism between classes within the nation vanishes, the hostility of one nation to another will come to an end.”

Karl Marx and Frederick Engels,
Manifesto of the Communist Party.

BOOKS RECEIVED

- Gene Debs: The Story of a Fighting American.* Herbert M. Morais and William Cahn (International Publishers). New York, 1948. 128 pp. 65¢
- Turning Point in China. Mao Tse-tung* (New Century Publishers). New York, 1948. 24 pp. 10¢
- Marshall Plan: Recovery or War? James S. Allen* (New Century Publishers). 1948. 64 pp. 15¢
- Literature of the Graveyard.* Roger Garaudy (International Publishers). 1948. 64 pp. 25¢
- Treason in America: The Record of the Un-American Activities Committee.* Albert E. Kahn (Progressive Citizens of America). New York, 1948. 32 pp. 10¢
- Academic Freedom in a Time of Crisis.* A Report by the New York Teachers Union, Local 555, U.P.W.A.-C.I.O. New York, 1948. 32 pp. 10¢
- Woman Against Myth.* Betty Millard (International Publishers). New York, 1948. 24 pp. 10¢
- UNESCO and the Defenses of Peace.* Waldo Gifford Leland (Stanford University Press). 1948. 36 pp. \$1.00
- Tre Minacce alla Democrazia Italiana.* Palmiro Togliatti (Communist Party of Italy). Rome, 1948.
- Balkan Politics: International Relations in No Man's Land.* Joseph Roucek (Stanford University Press). 1948. 198 pp. \$3.50
- Why Be a Doormat.* Stanley B. Ryerson (Labor-Progressive Party). Toronto, 1948. 16 pp. 10¢

Read the June Issue and Subscribe to

MASSES & MAINSTREAM

June Contents

- Silence Is Treason.....by *Samuel Sillen*
Problems of Marxist Culture.....*George Lukacs*
The Railroad Life: a story*Howard M. Phillips*
Task Force A.D.A.....*Herbert Aptheker*
Seaman's Notebook: drawings*Forrest Wilson*
Auden: Poet of Anxiety.....*Samuel Greenberg*
California Close-Up*Virginia Gardner*
Three Poems*Thomas McGrath*
Persimmon Seed: a story*Yoshio Abe*
Books in Review: reviews by *Howard Fast, W.E.B. DuBois,*
Barbara Giles, Jose Yglesias, and Joseph
Starobin
Art: Philip Evergood.....*Joseph Solman*
Theatre: Three Comedies.....*Isidor Schneider*
Drawings by *Blaustein, Evergood, Gropper, Karlin*

Price: 35 cents. Subscriptions: \$4.00 per year.

Checks should be made payable to national distributors:

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

GENE DEBS

The Story of a Fighting American

By Bill Cahn and Herbert Morais

Written by a distinguished historian and a veteran trade union pamphleteer, here is a "best-selling" biography of one of the truly great figures in American labor history: Gene Debs. It tells Debs' fighting story, the story of his fight against the railroads, of his fight for industrial unions, of his fight for independent political action by trade unionists, of his fight for peace and defense of the Soviet Union.

Gene Debs: The Story of a Fighting American has all the "makings" of a bestseller in the labor movement.

PRICE 65 CENTS

NOTES FROM THE GALLOWS

By Julius Fuchik

"Fuchik's book is a document testifying to the greatness of man's spirit. . . . For literary form it is a gripping story; for meaning and content, it is a work of great profundity. It is the embodiment in living human images and deeds of the ideology and outlook of the most advanced part of mankind, the part to which the future belongs. . . . Fuchik's book, like his life, is permeated with this philosophy of life triumphant."

—*New Times*.

128 PAGES; PRICE: \$.60

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