

How Mr. Jones, Negro Editor, Proposes to 'Save' Liberia

Haywood Declares Plan Would Tighten Grip of Wall Street

By HARRY HAYWOOD

I.

Mr. William N. Jones, one of the editors of the Baltimore Afro-American, in an article appearing in his paper (Aug. 11) takes sharp issue with the Communist estimate of his so-called "Save-Liberia movement." That estimate was made in detail in my report to the Eighth Convention of the Communist Party. (This report was later published in pamphlet form under the title "The Road to Negro Liberation.")

It will be recalled that in this report the plan of Mr. Jones known as the Liberian-American Plan of Co-operation was characterized as an instrument of American imperialism, calculated to tighten the grip of Wall Street and Harvey Firestone on the Liberian people.

Mr. Jones takes vigorous exception to what he terms the "careless statements" which I make concerning his co-operation with George Padmore, expelled renegade from Communism. Jones admits, however, the essential facts: That he had a lengthy conversation with Padmore, and that he and Mr. Padmore agreed quite well on the question of Liberia. He makes much of the fact that this discussion took place, not, as I said, while he was on his way from Liberia to America, but instead while he was on his way from America to Liberia. Now what possible difference can it make to the Liberian masses whether the plans for their betrayal were made on Mr. Jones' trip there or on Mr. Jones' trip home?

Mr. Jones—"Revolutionary Marxist"

Mr. Jones in his article hotly denies that his plan is against the interests of the Liberian masses. He denies that the plan is "in any way linked up with imperialism." He denies that it represents a retreat from the program of revolutionary struggle, or that it means, in practice, support for American imperialism and its native hangers-on. He denies also that as far as the American Negroes are concerned, it is a new and more subtle edition of Garvey's Back-to-Africa program.

But this is not all. Mr. Jones not only denies all these accusations—but he actually lays claim to being a Marxist. "I am a Marxist," he says, "and believe in revolutionary struggle." But in the same breath, Mr. Jones, with apparent naiveté, would have us believe that his Save-Liberia scheme has no connection with politics, whether imperialist or Communist. Oh no, his plan is merely an "emergency measure backed by a group of friends of Liberia," who have as their sole motive "to save it (Liberia) in a grave and impending emergency."

Having made this "defense," Mr. Jones now takes the offensive against his Communist critics. He attempts to divert the question from his own desertion of the struggle for the liberation of the Negro people, by a "subtle" attack on the Communist Party. Thus Mr. Jones will have us know that although a "revolutionary Marxist," friendly to Communism, and having "respect" for at least "some of the principles of the Communist Party and even some of its leaders," (!) he emphatically rejects what he calls the "goose-step tactics" of the Communist leaders in this country. These tactics, he goes on to say, "make it necessary to dot every 'i' and cross every 't' with Moscow ideology." Mr. Jones will not be bound by what he would,

no doubt, term the "dictation of Moscow."

Brushing aside for the time being—because space will not allow us to deal with them in this article—the slanderous implications of this statement, we comment now only upon the gist of Mr. Jones' assertions, which are in effect that he will not accept the guidance and decisions of the world leadership of the revolutionary movement, the Communist International.

"Independent" Mr. Jones

"The very freedom," continues Mr. Jones, "which motivates me in not being a slave to the Republican and Democratic parties, when they fail to represent my ideal, would keep me from being a slave to the Communist Party or any other Party." Mr. Jones, the "revolutionary Marxist," further stipulates that he does "not believe that Communism is the last word in human relations. There will come some movement even better some day than even the dictatorship of the proletariat, as administered by Stalin. When it comes, if I were living, I would not hesitate to turn from Communism to it. In other words, I shall never be a slave to any party." (My emphasis.—H. H.)

We have at the moment no time to analyze all the confusion contained in these statements of Mr. Jones. Let us rather get down to the issues involved in the immediate controversy—that is, to the question of Liberia and how to achieve its freedom. Is it true that Mr. Jones' plan has no connection with politics? That its sponsors are motivated solely by the noble and humane desire to save Liberia? Mr. Jones makes much ado about his "political independence." He will not "be a slave to any Party." From this sublime state of imagined independence, Mr. Jones looks down upon the vulgar strife of parties and classes, from which he feels himself happily detached. Mr. Jones is an independent man!

Let us examine this "non-partisan" position. Let us see where the "independent" Mr. Jones lines up on the question of Liberia.

Mr. Jones innocently claims that his only motive is to save Liberia. Now this problem of saving Liberia is one in which we Communists are vitally concerned. But for whom to save Liberia? For the money lords of Wall Street? Or for the Liberian masses? That is the question.

Mr. Jones lays claim to being a "revolutionary Marxist." Mr. Jones should then know that it is contingent upon a Marxist, in the working out of any program, to base himself upon a precise estimation of the alignment of class forces in a given situation.

Class Forces in Liberia

What is the alignment of class forces in the Liberian situation? There are:

1. The imperialist powers—American imperialism, represented mainly by Harvey Firestone, which at present controls the chief economic and financial resources of the country. We have also British and French imperialism, striving through the League of Nations—to expand their interests in Liberia and increase their share of the plunder.

2. The native upper classes—the small capitalists, occupied chiefly as traders, plantation owners and government officials, aligned with the native chiefs. These classes are represented by the Barclay Government in Monrovia. Their role is that of local policeman, slave-driver, land-thief and recruiter of forced labor for American and other imperialist interests in Liberia.

3. The toiling masses, the indigenous population numbering about 2,000,000, the overwhelming majority in Liberia, suffering under the cruelest yoke of the imperialist

Reveals Link Between Padmore, Renegade, and W. N. Jones

slave-drivers and their native lackeys.

Such is the present relationship of class forces in the so-called "independent Republic of Liberia." Is it not clear that without revolutionary struggle for the overthrow of America and all foreign imperialism, together with their native henchmen, there can be no talk about the freedom of Liberia? Is it not likewise clear that the only force able to carry through this fight are the native toilers, the colonial slaves, who have already engaged in heroic and stubborn struggles against the system of colonial plunder and slavery, the robbery of the native lands, the crushing taxes, the humiliating pass-laws? It is in the hands of these native toilers, supported by the revolutionary movement throughout the world, that the salvation of Liberia rests.

This program of revolutionary struggle by the toiling masses, against foreign imperialism and its native agents, flows out of any honest and realistic examination of the Liberian situation. It is clear that any plan for saving Liberia must first of all give unconditional support to this heroic struggle of the Liberian toilers.

Plan Aids Imperialists

Does the Liberian-American Plan, fathered by Jones and Padmore, fulfill this requirement? Does the plan call for unconditional support of the native toilers of Liberia in their struggle for freedom? Does it call for an uncompromising fight against foreign imperialism? In a word, will this plan, if put into practice, save Liberia for the Liberian masses?

The answer is that the Liberian-American Plan is designed to bolster up a corrupt and tottering native government, whose interests are bound up with the interests of the foreign slave-drivers. The plan plays into the hands of the American imperialists. The plan would tighten the chains of slavery more cruelly upon the Liberian toilers. And by creating illusions about the possible solution of the Negro question in America through Utopian schemes of economic advancement on the African continent, the plan—in this respect a subtle edition of Garveyism—tends to divert the masses of American Negroes from revolutionary struggle against the oppressors.

These contentions we shall prove in tomorrow's article.

(Continued Tomorrow)

Many Socialist Groups Write to Paper in Spain Favoring United Front

MADRID, Spain, Aug. 30.—"Mundo Obrero," Communist newspaper here, daily publishes resolutions from Socialist and reformist workers, expressing their agreement with the proposals made by the Communist Party for unity of action.

These proposals were rejected by the executives of the Socialist Party, the Socialist youth and the reformist trade union federation. Among the organizations accepting the proposals of the Communist Party are the General Workers Union and the Small Holders Union of Caceres, which counts 300 members and is affiliated to the reformist Trade Union Center. The union has called a meeting, and has invited as speakers the leader of the Socialist Party and of the reformist trade unions, Largo Caballero, and Jesus Hernandez of the Communist Party. Besides this,