

POLITICAL AFFAIRS

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

EUGENE DENNIS, *Editor*; V. J. JEROME, *Managing Editor*

VOLUME XXIV, NO. II

Contents

NOVEMBER, 1945

The London Conference	<i>Eugene Dennis</i>	963
The Soviet Union—Force for World Peace and Democracy	<i>Rob Fowler Hall</i>	974
Joseph Stalin's War Leadership	<i>Robert Minor</i>	985
The People's Fight for Wages, Jobs and Security	<i>Statement of the National Board, C.P.U.S.A.</i>	997
The Fight For Jobs and Wages	<i>Roy Hudson</i>	1003
Labor Achieves World Federation	<i>George Morris</i>	1007
Frederick Engels	<i>V. I. Lenin</i>	1018
Australian Communists Reject Browder's Revisionism	<i>L. L. Sharkey</i>	1026
The Vatican and Problems of Postwar Settlement	<i>D. Melnikov</i>	1037
A National Coalition for Spain	<i>Dolores Ibarruri</i>	1045
The Mission of the Chinese Communists	<i>Mao Tse-tung</i>	1048
BOOK REVIEWS:		
An Indispensable Labor Manual	<i>William Z. Foster</i>	1052
Indian Letters of a Communist Soldier	<i>R. Palme Dutt</i>	1054

Registered 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: \$2.00 a year; \$1.00 for six months; foreign and Canada, \$2.50 a year. Single copies 20 cents.

PRINTED IN THE U.S.A.

309

AUTHORS AND TOPICS

L. L. SHARKEY is the President of the Australian Communist Party. * * * ROB FOWLER HALL is a member of the National Committee of the Communist Party, recently returned from the U.S. armed forces. * * * EUGENE DENNIS, a member of the National Secretariat of the C.P., is the author of *Why America Needs the Communist Party*, just issued by New Century Publishers. * * * ROBERT MINOR is the Southern editor of the *Daily Worker*. * * * ROY HUDSON is a member of the National Committee of the C.P. and President of the Communist Party in Western Pennsylvania. * * * MAO TSE-TUNG is the National Chairman of the Chinese Communist Party. The article in this issue is a chapter from his report to the 7th National Congress of the C.P.C., held in Yenan several months ago. * * * DOLORES IBARRURI (PASIONARIA) is the leader of the Communist Party of Spain. * * * GEORGE MORRIS is the Labor Editor of *The Worker* and author of *Reconversion: 60,000,000 Jobs or 15,000,000 Jobless* (New Century Publishers). * * * WILLIAM Z. FOSTER, National Chairman of the C.P., is the author of the new pamphlet, *The Strike Situation and Organized Labor's Wage and Job Strategy* (New Century Publishers). * * * R. PALME DUTT is a member of the Central Committee of the British Communist Party and the Editor of *Labour Monthly*.

The announced article by Max Weiss on revisionism will appear in the December number, which will also include a review by Alexander Bittelman of Henry Wallace's recent book, *Sixty Million Jobs*, as well as articles on the New York municipal elections, taxation, lessons of the longshoremen's strike in New York, and other pressing issues and problems.

THE
CO

THE
cil of
ber e
Th
ing o
Unite
Britai
ters o
this w
ing si
Axis a
resent
British
comm
decisio
Lon
its hea
now it
politic
don, an
is thic
"atomic
injuriou
beclud
Be t
diploma
register
ment w
It is a d
the exist
stake.

As ag

THE LONDON CONFERENCE

By EUGENE DENNIS

THE LONDON meeting of the Council of Foreign Ministers in September ended without agreement.

This was the first postwar meeting of leading spokesmen of the United States, the U.S.S.R., and Britain, joined by the Foreign Ministers of France and China. Further, this was the first major Allied meeting since the formation of the anti-Axis alliance in which foremost representatives of the American-Soviet-British Coalition failed to reach a common understanding and joint decisions.

London, of course, is notorious for its heavy and depressing fog. But now it can be said that the current political climate in and around London, and above all on the Potomac, is thicker than fog. In fact, it is "atomic" and more dangerous and injurious than sailing blind in either beclouded or typhoon weather.

Be this as it may, the recent diplomatic conference in London registers disunity and basic disagreement within the anti-Axis Coalition. It is a danger signal—a warning that the existence of the Coalition is at stake.

* * *

As agreed upon at Berlin by Stalin,

Truman and Attlee, a Council of Foreign Ministers was established to help implement the accord of Potsdam. Specifically, the initial gathering of the Foreign Ministers was directed to draft a peace treaty for Italy, as well as prepare peace terms for Bulgaria, Hungary, Rumania and Finland. The Council meeting was also to serve as a clearing house and medium for helping co-ordinate postwar cooperation and unity of action of the principal United Nations to preserve the peace and prevent the restoration of German and Japanese fascist imperialism.

The post-conference statements of Messrs. Byrnes, Molotov and Bevin clearly indicate that none of these objectives was realized in London. No agreement was arrived at regarding the next steps required to carry out the Potsdam decisions, procedural or otherwise. No agreement was reached on the disposition of the former Italian colonies, on Trieste, or on the matter of Italian reparations. No agreements were attained regarding postwar settlements affecting the former Axis satellites in the Balkan countries. And, not least of all, no headway was made concerning the Potsdam declaration on Japan, towards establishing an Allied Commission, a Four-Power Control Council, for governing the occupation, the demilitarization, and the reconstruction of Japan along democratic lines.

* * *

What are the reasons for the London fiasco? What is behind this set-

back in Big Three and United Nations relations?

Outwardly, it would appear that the Council of Foreign Ministers was grounded over technical and secondary differences, over differences in interpretation of questions of procedure, or over the issue as to whether the Potsdam agreement specified that the peace treaties with Italy and the Balkan countries were to be drawn up and settled by the Big Three or by the Big Five. At least this is how Byrnes and Bevin initially tried to present the differences which came sharply to the fore at London between the United States and Britain, on the one hand, and the Soviet Union, on the other, with France and China playing the role of Anglo-American satellites.

Along this line, both the State Department and the Foreign Office have subsequently endeavored to embellish the differences over the procedural application of the Berlin accord. Washington and London have sought to present the breakdown of the London Conference as differences over whether the future peace settlement, including the peace treaties between the victory Coalition and the former Axis powers, were to be "dictated" by the three great powers or were to be resolved equally by all the United Nations, large and small. In other words, the United States and Great Britain try to make it appear that the Conference collapsed because these two powers allegedly champion democ-

racy and the rights of small nations, while presumably the U.S.S.R. favors "power politics" and "ignores" the interests of all the United Nations.

Obviously, this is but another instance of the pot calling the kettle black. Obviously, the consistently democratic and anti-fascist policy which the U.S.S.R. steadfastly pursues in all the liberated countries, as everywhere, irritates and confounds the Western financiers, stockholders and coupon-clippers who, in the pre-war period, invested in Rumanian oil and Polish coal, as well as in the I.G. Farben, Mitsui and Mitsubishi industries.

Obviously, the position of the Soviet Union in firmly advocating, in accord with established Soviet policy on the national question, the national freedom of the colonies, as well as self-determination of the mandated territories under interim United Nations trusteeships, creates difficulties for the enslavers of India and Indonesia, as well as for the rulers of Puerto Rico and the mortgagees of the reactionary Kuomintang government in China.

Obviously, the effort of the Soviet Union to have the three great powers heading the United Nations assume postwar responsibilities commensurate with their military and economic strength for collectively guarding the peace, runs counter to the imperialist ambitions of the aggressive American and British finance capitalists. It runs counter to the aggressive plans of the Anglo-American trust

who
natio
but
actio
for t
that
W
Wha
Lond
rock
polic
tion
Fo
faile
not
over
tion
respe
As
situat
mova
tary
by th
Comm
ficial
can a
forces
de-nat
they a
the A
and a
many
dustry
poten
the B
of Sov
of oc
violati
most
cupati
withst

who prate of the "equality" of all nations and the Four Freedoms with but one aim—to obtain freedom of action for their imperialist ventures, for their dependencies and satellites, that is, for themselves.

What are the facts, however? What are the real reasons that the London Conference went on the rocks? And where is the foreign policy of the Truman Administration heading?

For one thing, the Conference failed because there exists a basic and not merely a procedural difference over the interpretation and application of the Potsdam agreement in respect to Germany.

As indicated by the scandalous situation which necessitated the removal of General Patton from military control of Bavaria, as well as by the recent reports of the Kilgore Committee, American occupation officials representing powerful American and British monopoly capitalist forces have been sabotaging the de-nazification of Germany. Equally, they are obstructing the smashing of the Anglo-German-American cartels and are striving to reconstruct Germany with a powerful heavy industry and, hence, with a mighty war potential. All this is in violation of the Berlin accord and is the opposite of Soviet policy in the Russian zone of occupation. Unfortunately, this violation continues to characterize most aspects of Anglo-American occupation policy in Germany, notwithstanding the recent important,

though belated, Allied decisions regarding the confiscation of the I. G. Farben war industries in the Reich.

Secondly, the London Conference came to an ignominious end because the United States, as well as Britain, is moving away from the cardinal principle of American-Soviet-British united action and collaboration. Now that military victory has been won, the dominant monopoly circles in the U.S.A. and Britain consider that joint action and the unanimity of the Big Three are less compelling and, in fact, less desirable. For numerous reasons, Washington and London are not yet prepared to scrap the Coalition but they realize that the further and fullest collaboration of the Big Three for the fulfilment of the Yalta and Potsdam agreements would have to operate in an anti-imperialist way, and thus as an obstacle to their imperialist plans for aggrandizement.

Therefore, under cover of pious phrases regarding the democratic rights of small nations, Washington, as well as London, is seeking a pretext for weakening the solidarity of the Big Three, in fact is looking for a palatable substitute for the American-Soviet-British wartime coalition. The reactionary trusts and their political spokesmen are trying to resurrect the damaging situation which existed in the first weeks of the United Nations Conference at San Francisco. They are striving to substitute a so-called United Nations combination, in reality a reactionary

combination of large and small capitalist states, under American hegemony, in place of the solidarity and cooperation of the Big Three unity which brought about the military destruction of fascism and without which there can be no United Nations. Toward this end, the Hoover-Dewey Republican, Dulles, finds himself in substantial agreement with the Southern Bourbon Democrat, Byrnes.

Suffice it to note that this is not the first time in history when a great capitalist power has endeavored to exploit the small nations in order to advance its own imperialist interests. The costly lesson of the postwar period after World War I, the experience of the bankrupt League of Nations, including the repeated attempts of the Western Powers to utilize the small nations in order to isolate the Soviet Union and to form a *cordon sanitaire*, as well as the harmful consequences of the Pan-American Union under United States dominance—all bear out the short-sightedness of the present course of American foreign policy and the catastrophic consequences which are bound to follow from its pursuit. For the main trend of the Administration's foreign policy—a policy which has been increasingly influenced by the pressure of aggressive monopoly capitalist circles—is one of departure from the wartime path of victory, of American-Soviet friendship and cooperation, as well as of concerted Anglo-American-Soviet

collaboration. Washington's foreign policy is yielding to and is being increasingly geared to an imperialist program of active political and economic interference in the affairs of other nations (China, France, the Balkans, Latin America, etc.), as well as to a more reactionary course in domestic affairs, especially in regard to labor. This drive for American hegemony in world trade, markets and spheres of influence is accompanied by the acquisition of new military and naval bases, by the building up of a colossal postwar military machine, by "atomic" arrogance, and by threats and the actual use of military intervention, e.g., in China.

Moreover, it should be noted that during the London Conference, powerful voices in Britain and France were raised in behalf of forming a "Western Bloc." In this, the reactionary British Laborites and Blum Socialists are lending more than a helping hand.

In some British and French quarters the establishment of such a Bloc is considered and projected as a means of "protecting" England and the West European countries from American economic and political avarice and domination, as a means of resolving the sharpening Anglo-American economic rivalries in Britain's favor. In other circles the proposed Western Bloc is viewed and designed, primarily as an imperialist plan to resurrect a new *cordon sanitaire* against the Soviet

Union

vocate
a W

a Sov

But
Bloc"

Europ

Roun

Yugo

racies

the U

mass

of the

in libe

world

this b

pects

nation

the de

ples a

Fur

emine

peacef

entere

mutua

countr

man

These

the So

with h

is prep

peace-c

benefic

lations

tion an

reactio

commo

unity o

Cont

ings o

French

Union. These circles, the leading advocates of a Western Bloc, claim that a Western entente is needed to offset a Soviet-influenced "Eastern Bloc."

But what is this so-called "Eastern Bloc"? The facts are that in Eastern Europe—in Poland, Czechoslovakia, Roumania, Hungary, Bulgaria and Yugoslavia—new anti-fascist democracies are arising. In these countries the U.S.S.R. has great prestige and mass influence. It enjoys this because of the matchless role of the Red Army in liberating these countries and the world from Nazi tyranny. It enjoys this because the Soviet Union respects the national sovereignty of these nations, encourages and abides by the democratic processes of the peoples and their anti-fascist decisions.

Further, the U.S.S.R. occupies this eminent position of trust, amity and peaceful cooperation because it has entered into pacts of friendship and mutual assistance with these Slav countries against the revival of German imperialism and aggression. These pacts against aggression which the Soviet Union has entered into with her neighbors—and which she is prepared to enter into with all peace-desiring states—are mutually beneficial political and economic relations. These are pacts of cooperation and mutual aid directed against reaction and fascism, and serve the common interests and fortify the unity of all the United Nations.

Contrary to the provocative rantings of the apologists of British, French, and American imperialism,

the relations of the Soviet Union with Eastern Europe are not those of a "Bloc," of "power politics." According to the experiences of contemporary history, the essence of a "Bloc"—in the incontrovertible term—is for states to combine for predatory and aggressive aims. This is alien to the essence of the Socialist State and contrary to the principles and practices of Soviet foreign policy.

And here it should not be forgotten that it was the Soviet Union which, of all the great powers, single-handedly struggled for a policy of collective security against the Munich Bloc. It was the Soviet Union which took the initiative to forge the anti-Hitlerite Coalition and made the decisive contributions to smash the Axis Bloc.

Moreover, it is the Soviet Union today which is struggling to maintain the United Nations and its leading Tri-Power Coalition against the Bloc formations which began to manifest themselves at the San Francisco and London Conferences. It is the Soviet Union, with its pacts of collective security with her East European neighbors, as with France, China and Britain, which implements the Potsdam, Crimea and Moscow agreements, which strengthens the cause of world peace, which obstructs the way to reactionary Bloc formations, including that of the projected Western Bloc—an ill-disguised cover for a renewed *cordon sanitaire*.

It is clear:

Whether or not the authorship of the scheme for a Western Bloc is British, French or Anglo-American; whether or not the orientation of such a bloc is anti-Soviet, anti-American, or both—the fact remains that it is calculated and could only serve to disrupt the unity of the United Nations and its leading coalition. It would and could only help to undermine the postwar peace and sow the seeds for World War III.

* * *

Thirdly, the London Conference ended in a *cul de sac* because the United States and Britain refuse to adhere fully and consistently to either the Berlin or Moscow agreements of the Big Three in regard to Italy or the Balkan countries, in respect to eradicating all vestiges of fascism and in respect to relying upon the democratic forces in these countries. The Anglo-American bloc postpones or refuses to recognize, and hence to reach diplomatic agreements with, most of the democratic-anti-fascist governments that have come to power in these countries. The United States and Britain intervene in a reactionary way in the popular elections and democratic processes in these countries. Alternately, they withhold or withdraw diplomatic recognition or necessary UNRRA aid, and refuse to grant adequate credits or loans on a democratic basis.

Fourthly, the London Conference came to naught because the United

States, supported by Great Britain, refused to consider, let alone adopt, the Soviet recommendation for a concerted American-Soviet-Chinese-British policy towards Japan. The representatives of the U.S.A. arrogantly turned down Molotov's proposal for establishing a Four-Power Allied Control Commission which could effectively administer the occupation and demilitarization of Japan, carry out the punishment of the Japanese war criminals, and insure the dismantling and destruction of the Japanese monopolies and hence of her war economy and war potential.

In rejecting the Soviet proposal for establishing an Allied Control Commission, numerous "exotic" and "isolationist" arguments are advanced. Some opponents of an effective postwar Coalition policy in the Far East claim that victory over Japan was primarily an American "show." They glorify the atomic bomb as the key to victory (and to future American world hegemony!). They deprecate the rôle and the lightning advance of the Red Banner Armies into Manchuria, which effected the swift defeat of the Kwantung Army, Japan's most powerful military unit, and thus hastened in a decisive manner the victory in the Far East.

But quite apart from this consideration, the issue of victory over Japan cannot be isolated from the issue of victory over Germany. The entire central strategy of the coalition warfare was, and correctly so, to

conce
Hitle
decis
mach
tion
Unite
of Ge
of the
could
the re
was t
V-J D
come
theory
No
theory
global
war, t
must
periali
into fo
durabl
hence
quires
the des
especia
U.S.S.R
such po
now to
a long-
ity are
Ther
promise
creating
mission
Control
emphas
ministra
tinue Co
tial to p
anese, a

concentrate the main blows against Hitler-Germany. The Red Army's decisive death-blows to the Wehrmacht are the imperishable contribution of the Socialist State to the United Nations victory. The report of General Marshall on the winning of the war in Europe and the Pacific could not have been made without the record that the Battle of Moscow was the turning point of the war. V-J Day could come only as the outcome of V-E Day. No "atomic" theory can atomize the two.

No imperialistic "atomization" theory can shatter the reality of the global and coalition character of the war, the victory, and the control that must follow the victory. No imperialist opium can drug the world into forgetting that the forging of a durable peace in the Pacific, and hence elsewhere in the world, requires the closest unity of action of the decisive powers in the Far East, especially of the United States, the U.S.S.R. and China. And without such postwar collaboration, extending now to the joint control of Japan, a long-term peace and national security are impossible.

Therefore, the current "compromise" proposal of Byrnes for creating a ten-power "advisory" commission in place of a Four-Power Control authority, only serves to emphasize the opposition of the Administration to carrying out a genuine Coalition policy which is essential to prevent the recurrence of Japanese, as well as German, imperialist

aggression. It demonstrates that the Truman Government, influenced by the imperialist protagonists of an American Century, aims to maintain America's unilateral control over Japan, that it desires to perpetuate the State Department and MacArthur's "soft-peace" policy towards Japan, (a logical counterpart of many aspects of present American policy toward Germany). Obviously, while Washington orients upon weakening Japan in relation to the United States, it seeks to keep intact the feudal-imperialist system in Japan, built around the Emperor. It strives to maintain Japan as a reactionary bulwark against the Soviet Union, as well as a gendarme against China and the other colonial peoples.

These are some of the basic reasons and factors which explain why American-Soviet relations, as well as the relations within the Coalition, have deteriorated since V-J Day. These, too, are the reasons that the London Conference failed.

* * *

America is fast approaching the crossroads. Either we will bend every effort to maintain and strengthen the victory coalition of the United Nations, led by the Anglo-Soviet-American Coalition, or we shall soon be faced with a reactionary, anti-democratic combination led by rampant American imperialism.

Either the American people will insure and consolidate the postwar collaboration of the United States,

the Soviet Union and Great Britain to complete the destruction of German and Japanese fascism and to guarantee the peace—or we shall be confronted quickly with a predatory Anglo-American alliance, under U.S.A. control, directed against the U.S.S.R. and the rest of the world, with France and China as pawns in the game of American power politics.

This is the choice. The London Conference indicates that the sands of time are running out. Either labor and the progressives, in unison with all democratic forces, will pick up the gauntlet now, and boldly answer the challenge—or the Hearsts and McCormicks, the Hoovers and Rankins, the DuPonts and Fords will win the day, completely dominate Administration policy and thus smash the United Nations.

The dangers and difficulties are legion. But the situation is far from hopeless.

The anti-Axis Coalition still exists, despite the growing strains and tensions. It has been seriously weakened, but not broken. Ever more solid ties are being created between the U.S.S.R. and those peace-loving nations and people who aim to complete the destruction of fascism, achieve a stable peace, and enable all nations and peoples freely to determine their own destiny. The power and world influence of the Soviet Union continues to multiply. The new democracies in Europe are weathering the storms of outside, of varied forms of Anglo-

American intervention. Also, the winds of unity and democracy begin to blow firmer in China, despite the reactionary influence of Chungking and Washington. And a new high point in the anti-fascist solidarity and joint action of world labor has been achieved at the historic Paris Congress in the birth of the powerful World Federation of Trade Unions.

Even within the borders of our own country the outlook is far from being dark and one-sided. An aroused and anxious citizenry has compelled the Administration to modify in a positive direction some aspects of its contradictory unstable, and "soft-peace" policy towards Japan as well as Germany. MacArthur had to make formal concessions to democratic public opinion, and Patton had to go. And on the inter-related issues of wages, jobs, and security, the current strike movement reflects the growing militancy of the labor and progressive movements within the country.

The forces within the United States favoring the full and speedy realization of the Potsdam agreement and the development of close post-war friendship and cooperation between the U.S.A., the U.S.S.R. and Britain, are powerful. They draw support from all walks of life, primarily from the working people but also from various influential non-labor adherents of Roosevelt's policy of Big Three unity. Furthermore, the strength of the democratic and anti-fascist forces within the camp

of the
com
peac
favor
some
Coal
coop
porta
ing t
peop
mocr
Yet
place
to we
grave
groun
rent
tions
or alo
comin
which
tion d
Wit
ism fe
to spre
The
perialis
Third
than in
the So
Among
ardent
Americ
monopo
the ato
ment of
opoly co
mainten
over the
U.S.A.

of the United Nations, as well as the compelling common interests of the peace-loving nations to secure a stable peace and economic progress—create favorable conditions for surmounting some of the differences within the Coalition, for effecting continued cooperation of the Big Three in important spheres of action, for advancing the unity and mobilization of the peoples for the cause of peace, democracy and national freedom.

Yet there is no room for complacency or optimism. The dangers to world peace and democracy are grave and mounting. There is no ground for illusions that the current crisis in United Nations relations will be resolved automatically, or along lines identical to the overcoming of previous strains and crises which developed within the Coalition during the war.

With victory, American imperialism feels its oats and the Eagle plans to spread its wings.

The most bellicose American imperialists already are talking of a Third World War, with the more than implied assumption of making the Soviet Union the "enemy." Among these circles are the most ardent advocates of establishing an American or an Anglo-American monopoly to "guard" the secrets of the atomic bomb and the development of atomic energy under monopoly control. They consider that the maintenance of unilateral control over the atomic bomb would give the U.S.A. a decisive and irrevocable

military advantage over all states—United Nations or otherwise. And they would like to press this apparent advantage, along with America's vast postwar military and financial power, fully and recklessly before "it is too late." Hence, in the sphere of diplomacy and political relations, they champion a "tough policy" towards the U.S.S.R., as well as Britain; they threaten armed force and prepare accordingly.

However, important sections of American big capital do not orient, as of now, upon launching a new world war in the immediate future. These circles estimate more soberly the enhanced strength of the Soviet Union; they are dubious of the outcome of another world conflict which must inevitably further weaken the world capitalist system as a whole; they recognize the widespread antifascist and peace-loving sentiments of labor and the peoples in the United States and Great Britain, as well as in other lands; they incline toward achieving a period of relatively peaceful and stable world relations. Therefore they favor a measure of Anglo-Soviet-American postwar cooperation. They advocate this because they know that world peace and reconstruction are impossible without American-Soviet collaboration and also because they count on attaining marked economic and political advantages in the period ahead by relying on the power of the dollar and food, on diplomatic and economic pressures, and on the limited use of

armed threats and interventionist acts. Therefore they favor some degree of United Nations unity rather than an immediate policy directed toward all-out military action and violence in world affairs.

Whether or not one monopolist grouping favors an immediate recourse to armed violence on a wholesale scale to achieve its imperialist objectives, or whether other big capitalist groupings favor the so-called "dry method," as well as a limited cooperation of the United Nations—the following is clear:

Today, the decisive sections of American imperialism, despite their differences over methods—which are real and must be utilized by the democratic camp—aim to expand, to extend their "spheres of influence," to isolate and undermine the Soviet Union, to weaken Great Britain, to obtain a stranglehold over the weaker, dependent and smaller nations of Europe, Asia and Latin America, and to make a Greece of every rising democracy. And this program of imperialist interference and aggrandize—ment—if unchecked and not offset by a firm struggle for consolidating the unity of the leading Coalition of the United Nations—could lead only to a neo-Munich and a new world war.

In this trying situation, it is essential for labor and the progressives, and especially for the Communists, to drive home the urgent need for maintaining and reinforcing the unity of the United Nations and its leading Tri-Power Coalition

as essential to complete the destruction of fascism and to promote peace, national freedom, democracy, and greater economic security. It is imperative to make crystal clear the direct responsibility of the Truman Administration, as well as the Republican and reactionary Democratic Bloc in Congress and of the Economic Royalists for the current developments and trends in world affairs which now jeopardize world peace and American security. It is necessary to expose the pro-fascist role of American big capital, of the reactionary monopolies, in trying to safeguard their vested interests in the German and Japanese cartels and trusts. It is essential to expose and combat their efforts to reconstruct Germany and Japan, and all the liberated countries, economically and hence politically, on pre-war patterns, along the lines of the *status quo ante*. And on this basis it is imperative to unmask and oppose the stubborn opposition of American imperialism, and especially its most reactionary sections, to the fulfillment of the Potsdam agreements—a pro-fascist policy which finds its logical counterpart in the offensive of the N.A.M. and the big corporations against the democratic rights and standards of living of American labor and the common people.

Integrally connected with this, all anti-fascist and progressive forces, Communists and non-Communists, must assert themselves, must move forward and develop concerted action

and
ry o
Pot
For t
the c
tions
curity
labor
where
nation
The
first
hour
maxim
shoul
issues
to bri
fluence

and a real crusade resolutely to carry out the Moscow, Crimean and Potsdam decisions and declarations. For this is the road to strengthening the collaboration of the United Nations and to promoting peace and security. And here the organization of labor's joint anti-fascist action, everywhere—locally, nationally, and internationally—is of cardinal importance.

The American workers, in the first place, are called upon in this hour to act to the fullest upon the maxim of Karl Marx that labor should concern itself vitally with issues of foreign policy in order to bring to bear its progressive influence in the foreign-political affairs

of the nation. Today, especially, when international affairs are vitally and decisively bound up, as never before in our country's history, with the people's domestic affairs, labor's struggle against the encroachments of the trusts on the home front must be organically tied up with the struggle against the predatory policies of the monopolists abroad.

If the American people act unitedly and struggle boldly for a democratic anti-fascist policy in both foreign and domestic affairs, America can avert disaster, the United Nations can remain united, and the cause of peace, democracy and social progress will be advanced.

THE SOVIET UNION— FORCE FOR WORLD PEACE AND DEMOCRACY

By ROB FOWLER HALL

(On the Occasion of the 28th Anniversary of the October Socialist Revolution, November 7, 1917.)

IT IS THE TRAGIC IRONY of history that during these autumn weeks when happy mothers and wives and sweet-hearts were welcoming their victorious soldiers home, American finance capitalists and statesmen were busily advancing policies which, if unchecked, will dissipate the fruits of that victory and set the stage for a new world conflict.

Yet this is the grim prospect if the American people permit themselves to forget the real enemy, German and Japanese fascism and imperialism, not yet completely destroyed and quite capable of experiencing a new resurgence, and allow the American imperialists to direct American policy against the Soviet Union which has proved in deeds that it is the staunch friend of all we hold dear. Certainly this is the direction in which American foreign policy is

presently leading. It is a policy of "softness" toward the German lords of industry and finance and the Japanese Zaibatsu, and of "getting tough" with the Soviet Union. It is fraught with disaster for democracy and enduring peace.

In a world, five-sixths of which is dominated by finance capital, peace, at best, is precarious. And if we describe the present world situation as one of peace, we do so conscious that we use the term relatively, in contrast to the world-wide character of the war which ended on V-J Day. For we cannot close our eyes, for example, to Dutch, British and Japanese attacks on the Indonesians or the French war against the Annamites, or American intervention in China. Precisely because peace is relative, precarious and unstable, there is no room for the slightest complacency among the people. This is especially true for the people of the United States, which is the most powerful imperialist country in the world and which holds—to so great an extent—the key to world peace.

The forces of peace are stronger today than ever before. But the maintenance of peace demands the active struggle of the people, led by labor, to check and defeat the reactionary policies of American imperialism and to formulate and enforce a democratic, anti-fascist foreign policy.

PRICE OF VICTORY

The peace which we have today was purchased with labor, suffering and blood. The victory came only

after hard and bitter struggle by the Anglo-Soviet-American coalition, in which the Soviet Union was the decisive factor. For it was the Red Army which first stopped Hitler's Wehrmacht, destroyed the myth of its invincibility, annihilated the greatest part of its fighting forces and gave Britain and the United States time to arm. It was on the basis of these achievements of the Red Army that the co-ordinated blows of the Anglo-Soviet-American coalition annihilated the Nazi armies.

Soviet contributions in human and material resources to the defeat of the Axis were enormous, far greater than those of any other nation. Soviet casualties, military and civilian, were between 15-20 million. Twenty-five million Soviet civilians were made homeless. Six million buildings of all sorts were destroyed, including 40,000 hospitals and medical institutions, 84,000 schools and 43,000 public libraries. Railway losses included 40,365 miles of track (40 per cent of the total) and 15,800 locomotives. Livestock slaughtered or exported by the invaders included 7,000,000 horses, 17,000,000 cattle, 20,000,000 pigs and 27,000,000 sheep and goats.

For these depredations, the Red Army exacted its own bitter toll from the Nazi hordes. It was the Battle for Moscow, where Hitler's war machine was first stopped, which Chief of Staff General Marshall, in his recently published report, calls the turning point of the whole war. From Stalingrad to the Battle of

Berlin, Soviet arms decimated the ranks of the Hitlerites.

The defeat of the Axis armies in Europe, which left Japan hopelessly isolated, desperate, and compelled to fight alone, was the most important single factor in Hirohito's surrender. The Soviet Union had, even before its declaration of war against Japan, made a further contribution to its defeat by immobilizing a million Japanese soldiers of the crack Kwantung army on the Manchurian border. The Soviet declaration of war against Japan, followed immediately by lightning offensives against Japan's best forces, facilitated the final capitulation. The special role of the Soviet Union in Japan's surrender is recognized by Major General Claire Chennault, who declared that it was not the atom bomb but the Soviet Union's entry into the Pacific war which forced Japan to quit.

It is almost a truism, therefore, to assert that victory, won by the unity of the Big Three in which the Soviet Union made the greatest sacrifices and the greatest contributions, can lead to an enduring peace only if there is continued unity of the coalition, i.e., the United States, Britain and the Soviet Union. In this article, we limit ourselves to a discussion of Soviet-American relations, because these relations are most decisive for the unity of the Big Three powers, and are a major factor in helping determine Anglo-American and Anglo-Soviet relations. The search for the real key to enduring

peace points unerringly to the need to strengthen and deepen American-Soviet friendship.

CHAMPION OF PEACE

The American people will find the Soviet Union as indispensable and as dependable an ally in the fight for peace as in the struggle to win victory. Champion of peace is not a new role for the U.S.S.R., whose whole history is the record of a consistent anti-fascist peace policy. In pursuit of this aim, the Soviet Union entered the League of Nations in 1934. Its representative in the League, Maxim Litvinov, gave a guiding principle to the peace forces of the world when he declared, "Peace is indivisible," a principle which the Soviet Union sought to apply in the policy of collective security against the fascist aggressor nations.

Soviet efforts for collective security have been confirmed as correct by the events of the past decade. Soviet action to organize sanctions against fascist Italy to prevent the rape of Ethiopia and Soviet aid to the Spanish republicans are today generally praised by everyone to whom peace and democracy are dear for what they were—necessary steps in the execution of an anti-fascist peace policy. The Soviet-Finnish war which was once vilified as "red imperialism" by the Munichers is now widely recognized for what it actually was—a fully justified action by the Soviet Union to protect itself against a plot for imperialist aggres-

sion against itself, a plot to which the "Little Finland" of Baron Mannerheim lent itself as a ready tool.

All honest people now admit that of all the major powers, only the Soviet Union fought against the Munich pact, and in relation to Munich only the Soviet Union emerges with dignity and with its honor enhanced. The significance of the Munich pact was the betrayal of Czechoslovakia to Hitler by the western capitalist democracies. In return for a "pledge" to refrain from further aggressions in Western Europe, Hitler was given a free hand in his designs against the Soviet land. How this plot missed fire and how it strengthened the Axis for its war for world domination is only too well known today.

If a more recent illustration of Soviet accuracy in determining what is good for world peace is desired, it may be recalled that Molotov fought vigorously against fascist Argentina's entrance into the United Nations. Molotov's defeat in that fight, brought about by the anti-Soviet policy of Stettinius and the State Department in concert with British imperialism, strengthened the pro-fascist elements in Argentina.

Today the Soviet Union insists upon the fulfillment of the Potsdam declaration "to assure that Germany never again will threaten her neighbors or the peace of the world." It insists on the complete economic and military disarmament of Germany and the elimination or control of all German industry that could be used

for military production. To these ends, production of metals, chemicals, machinery and similar items must be rigidly controlled and restricted to Germany's approved post-war peace-time needs. All Nazi institutions and organizations must be dissolved and war criminals brought to judgment. The political structure must be democratized and democratic elements brought forward to replace Nazis within the local governments. "At the earliest possible date," in the words of the Potsdam document, "the German economy shall be decentralized for the purpose of eliminating the present excessive concentration of economic power as exemplified in particular by cartels, syndicates, trusts and other monopolistic arrangements."

It is for this program, already agreed upon by Truman, Attlee and Stalin, that the Soviet Union fights, guided by a warning which Stalin gave a year ago:

After her defeat, Germany will of course be disarmed both in the economic and military-political sense. It would, however, be naive to think that she will not attempt to restore her might and launch new aggressions. It is common knowledge that the German chieftans are already now preparing for a new war. History reveals that a short period of time, some 20 or 30 years, is enough for Germany to recover from defeat and re-establish her might. (Address on the 27th Anniversary of the October Socialist Revolution; November 6, 1944.)

FOR A STABLE PEACE

In Japan, as in Germany, the Soviet Union demands the extirpation of the social and economic roots of fascism and imperialism. Its insistence on a four-power control council for Japan as against the exclusive determination of policy by the United States, is based on its desire for guarantees that Japan shall never again threaten her neighbors or the peace of the world. In Europe and in the Pacific, Soviet policy insists upon the strengthening of the popular, democratic, anti-fascist forces within the formerly occupied countries and in those countries which were once satellites of the Axis. For the colonial peoples, it stands for a policy of independence, which is essential to a stable peace.

Soviet policy in regard to China has been in the strictest conformity with this basic approach. Those who really understood Soviet policy need not have been surprised, as some persons were, at the recent Sino-Soviet pact. The document, providing for Soviet withdrawal from Manchuria and Korea and for joint administration with China of the Chinese Eastern Railroad and Port Arthur, was based on Soviet acknowledgment of the integrity of the Chinese nation. The Soviet action stands out quite sharply in contrast to British retention of Hong-Kong, and to America's intervention in the internal affairs of China through the use of its armed forces to bolster the Chiang

Kai-shek government against the Chinese Communists and other democratic forces in China. The Soviet position on China is indeed a contribution to peace and democracy in the Pacific and is an example for all peace-loving peoples.

WESTERN EUROPEAN BLOC

The Soviet Union opposes the formation of a Western European bloc because it undermines the basis of Big Three unity; because it is a bloc directed against the Soviet Union and, in the designs of some, also against the United States; because it is under new conditions a revival of the essence, if not the form, of the Munich pattern, a trend toward rebuilding a reactionary, militarist Germany, the isolation of the Soviet Union, and encouragement to all the forces of fascism and war.

The program for which Molotov spoke at the London Conference of Foreign Ministers represents a continuation of the consistent anti-fascist peace policy of the Soviet Union, further developed and applied under the new conditions of the postwar world. It is based on the program of Teheran and Yalta and on the agreement at Potsdam, which have the enthusiastic support of the overwhelming majority of the peoples of the world.

But Teheran did not "cancel Munich." If Munich was reversed by the agreements of the Big Three, it remained still very much alive in the

circles of the Soviet-haters where it found a comfortable home. Certainly the ghost of Munich hovered over the conference table at London. When Secretary of State Byrnes and Foreign Secretary Bevin reneged on the Potsdam agreement and under the hypocritical cloak of posing as champions of "pure" democracy (shades of the poll-tax South and India!!) marshalled their sophistical arguments for intervention in the Balkan countries, they were acting in the spirit of Munich.

This same latter-day Munich pattern of thought is responsible for the failure of American forces, in the American zone of occupied Germany, to dismantle German heavy industry and ship equipment to the Soviet Union as reparations, as provided in the Potsdam agreement. It is responsible for the position taken by certain American officials in Germany that the restrictions on German steel production, laid down at Potsdam, should be flouted. No doubt General Patton was acting fully in this spirit when he opposed the de-nazification of German local government and barred participation by anti-Nazi, democratic Germans.

The development of this anti-Soviet orientation in the State Department and in the Truman Administration is a very serious threat to American-Soviet cooperation for peace. An anti-Soviet orientation in foreign policy corresponds with the interests of the big trusts and monopolies and their agents. It is com-

plete
of th
a c
Am
of th
for a
the r
of a
tov,
work
was
from
pion
Am
feren
Th
para
who
not v
role
worl
speak
own
peop
coinc
Gove
who
in
Sovie
pion
contr
of its
its ve
desig
full r
to the
SOCI
Th
to m
tions

pletely at variance with the interests of the American people, who want a continuation of the Anglo-Soviet-American coalition for continuation of the struggle against fascism and for an enduring peace, in short, for the reconstruction and maintenance of a democratic world. It was Molotov, not Byrnes, who spoke and worked for this objective. Thus it was Molotov and not the gentleman from South Carolina who championed the true interests of the American people at the London conference.

This statement is not, of course, as paradoxical as it may sound to those who do not understand, or who do not wish to understand, the special role of the U.S.S.R. in the modern world. A Soviet statesman is able to speak both in the interest of his own nation and in the interest of all peoples because there is a complete coincidence in interests of the Soviet Government and of all peoples who desire an enduring peace in a democratic world. The Soviet Union has been able to champion peace consistently and without contradictions in its policy because of its socialist character. Socialism by its very nature excludes imperialist designs and requires peace for the full unfolding of its great promise to the people.

SOCIALIST SOCIETY

The Soviet Union has been able to make her tremendous contributions to the struggle for peace and

the military destruction of fascism because of the new, socialist society brought about by the October Revolution, the anniversary of which is celebrated on November 7.

It was twenty-eight years ago that the Russian working class, in alliance with the peasants, liberated their country from exploitation and oppression by the Czarist landlords and capitalists, and established the dictatorship of the proletariat, the rule of the working class. The people, led by the working class and the Communist (Bolshevik) Party, abolished private ownership in the means of production and distributed the land of the big estates among the peasantry. The difficulties of civil war, intervention and hostile encirclement were met and overcome. The trying problems of collectivization and industrialization were solved. The people, guided by the working class and the Party, established a socialist system of economy.

Thus, for the first time in the history of mankind, a new society has arisen where the means of production, the factories, mines, mills, banks, land and natural resources are the property not of a small handful of exploiters but the property of the people. The industrial might of the country is operated not for the enrichment of the few, but the welfare and well-being of all. The planned organization of the entire economy is directed toward expanding the prosperity of the people. It has rid the land of unemployment,

crises and poverty. Guided by the principles of socialism, the people of the Soviet Union have achieved real equality through the abolition of the greatest inequalities, the exploitation of man by man, the oppression of peoples and nations.

It was the establishment of the proletarian dictatorship which made possible the rapid transformation of the age-old backwardness of Russian industry and agriculture. The Soviet Union became a foremost industrial nation, producing the machinery and equipment which enabled the Soviet peoples to produce the sinews of war with which to repel and defeat the invader. It was Soviet power, the rule of the workers and peasants, which made possible the transformation of the scattered peasant economy, through collectivization and modern techniques, to the socialist agriculture by which the foods and fabrics needed by the army and the people were provided. It was socialism which eliminated the class antagonisms from Soviet society and made possible the profound moral-political unity of the embattled Soviet peoples. This socialist system of economy was the basis for the genuine equality prevailing among the 89 nationalities who make up the U.S.S.R. and resulted in their fighting as one monolithic defender in the patriotic war of liberation.

Socialism, which made it possible for a backward and predominantly agricultural country to outstrip the world in rate of development, dem-

onstrates its superiority to capitalism also in the postwar stage. Today, when the United States and other capitalist countries face the problems of reconversion hesitantly, amid widespread confusion, and without planning, the socialist Soviet Union is already advancing rapidly on its program of reconversion. In the United States, considerable unemployment is an inevitable accompaniment of reconversion, and monopoly capitalists welcome the prospect of an army of unemployed as a weapon to weaken unions and lower wage scales. In the U.S.S.R., reconversion is being carried through without any unemployment, anticipating that the return of the veterans to peacetime pursuits will permit great gains in wage scales and standards of living. This is possible only because November 7, 1917, made it possible to eliminate the capitalists, the trusts, monopolists and big landlords and substituted planned economy for the benefit of all the people in the place of the anarchy of capitalist production.

Many and varied are the demagogic slanders directed at the Soviet Union in the United States. There is, for instance, that of Representative Eugene Cox of Georgia who could not qualify, of course, as an authority on democracy but who should know something of slavery. It is about the latter that he spoke in Congress recently:

... Russian Communism. Why, sir,

such
sand
ous
porti
bomb

So
ion o
the p
the s
Th
adm
mass
Unio
the l
tain
curit
seek
Octo

Ev
lution
cialist
more
demo
talist
tagon
demo
strong
"Dem
contra
ing p
In a
of th
March
the es

...
order
in orde
feel re
sake o
without
cult fo

such slavery would be worse, a thousand times worse, than the instantaneous disintegration which would be our portion if we were destroyed by atomic bombs. (*PM*, October 21, 1945.)

Socialism is "slavery" in the opinion of this fascist because it abolishes the privilege of living in luxury from the sweat of other men's toil.

There is the other objector who admits the economic security the masses have achieved in the Soviet Union under socialism but "deploras the loss of liberty" which, he maintains, has been the price of that security. In vain do such detractors seek to conceal the benefits of the October Revolution!

Even in the early days of the revolution, Lenin emphasized that socialist democracy is "a million times more democratic" than the most democratic bourgeois state. In capitalist countries, where there are antagonistic classes, Stalin once said, democracy is democracy only for the strong, for the propertied minority. "Democracy in the U.S.S.R., on the contrary, is democracy for the working people, i.e., democracy for all."

In an interview with Roy Howard of the *Scripps Howard* press in March, 1936, Stalin clearly defined the essence of socialist democracy:

... we did not build this society in order to restrict personal liberty but in order that the human individual may feel really free. We built it for the sake of real personal liberty, liberty without quotation marks! It is difficult for me to imagine what personal

liberty is enjoyed by an unemployed person, who goes about hungry and cannot find employment. Real liberty can only exist where there is no unemployment and poverty, where a man is not haunted by the fear of being tomorrow deprived of work, of home and of bread. Only in such a society is real, and not paper, personal and every other liberty possible.

The present Soviet Constitution, adopted in 1936, goes far beyond any democratic state document in world history. Because it is based on the socialist ownership of the means of production, it promulgates and guarantees genuine liberty for the people. Establishing the new human rights prevailing in the Soviet Union, it provides:

Right to work — guaranteed employment and payment.

Right to rest and leisure.

Right to maintenance in old age, in case of sickness or loss of capacity to work.

Right to an education.

For women, equal rights with men in all spheres.

Freedom of religion and separation of church and state and freedom not to worship.

Freedom of speech, press, assembly; freedom of street demonstrations and processions.

Universal, equal and direct suffrage by secret ballot.

No other country in the world establishes such rights and implements them by providing the material means for their realization. When

Molotov urged the inclusion of the right to work in the San Francisco charter, stunned and surprised capitalist statesmen fought bitterly.

The Soviet Constitution also symbolizes the peaceful co-existence and fraternal union of many nations in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Czarist Russia, so often described as "the prison house of nations," oppressed and exploited more than 80 nations which made up the Russian Empire. The Soviet power not only lifted this yoke from the neck of the oppressed peoples and gave them complete equality but provided special assistance to facilitate their cultural, economic and social development as free peoples. The Soviet government has worked to remove all vestiges of racial and national prejudices which inevitably remained after generations of national chauvinism, and vigorously punished those who deliberately promoted such backward prejudices. Today in the Soviet Union there is no limitation on rights or privileges or opportunity for a man or woman because of race, color, creed, sex or national origin. The U.S.S.R. is recognized everywhere as the most uncompromising enemy of racial exclusiveness and the champion of equality of peoples and nations.

THE SOVIET UNION AND WORLD LABOR

The working class in the capitalist countries hailed the victory of the

October Revolution and extended aid to the Soviet power in the early, troubled days of the proletarian regime. Workers in many lands protested the intervention by the capitalist powers. Dock workers in the United States and Britain struck to prevent the shipment of arms to be used against their fellow workers in Russia. French sailors of the Black Sea Fleet, under the leadership of André Marty, rebelled rather than open fire on the Russian workers.

In the United States, where diplomatic recognition of the U.S.S.R. was withheld for sixteen years by the capitalist government, workers were the most energetic in urging American recognition.

Russian workers, by the same token, have always fulfilled their proletarian obligation to the workers of the capitalist countries. It was the workers of Petrograd (now Leningrad) who stayed the execution of Tom Mooney with their demonstration outside the American embassy in 1917. The Soviet workers protested the frame-up of Sacco and Vanzetti by the Massachusetts textile barons and extended a warm welcome and aid to a mother of one of the Scottsboro boys, touring Europe in behalf of their defense. In respect to the heroism of the Soviet workers in the war against the fascist Axis armies, this is too fresh in our minds to need retelling here. This international working class solidarity is now further expressed in the participation of the Soviet trade

unions with those of the United States and other capitalist, as well as colonial, countries, in the World Federation of Trade Unions formed recently in Paris.

The Communist Party of the United States, as the party of the working class, was a pioneer in the struggle for Soviet-American friendship. It exposed the interventionism of the American ruling groups in the early days of the Soviet Power and rallied hundreds of thousands of Americans under the slogan of "Defend the Soviet Union!" It carried on an energetic and ceaseless campaign for recognition of the Soviet Union. The Communist Party worked to bring the facts of Soviet achievements, its industrialization program, its collectivized farms, its military might, to the attention of the American people during the 30's when it was almost the only voice consistently raised in the interest of truth. The Party popularized the peace policy of the Soviet Union and worked for American cooperation with the Soviet Union in a system of collective security. It spread the truth about the Soviet trials of the Hitlerite-Trotskyite 5th Column. The Communist Party recognized that the socialist character of the Soviet Union made it the most powerful force in the struggle against fascism and for world peace and democracy, and therefore a much-to-be-desired ally of the U.S.A. in the pursuit of those objectives.

This position has been confirmed

by the record of the coalition war and by the historic service the Soviet Union has performed for the peoples of America and the world.

Although today there is a far greater appreciation among the American people as to the role of the Soviet Union and the need of Soviet-American friendship as the key to world peace and democracy, the reactionary imperialist circles are increasing their campaign of hostility to the Soviet Union, with the aim of driving a wedge between the Soviet Union and the United States.

These forces are in the main the familiar Soviet-haters, the big trusts and their agents, Hearst, McCormack, Patterson and Scripps Howard, who fill the columns of the press and the radio air lanes with vicious lies about the U.S.S.R. They are aided today, as in the past, by the reactionary Social-Democrats, William Green, Dubinsky, Norman Thomas, the *New Leader* crowd, the Trotskyites and their kind.

The Social-Democratic reactionary diehards—agents of the capitalist class within the working class movements—have carried on slanderous campaigns against the Soviet Union from the very date of its birth. They have labored ceaselessly to conceal, distort and vilify the socialist achievements of the Soviet Union, to assist in the organization of conspiracies and plots against the Soviet Union, to prevent fraternal relations between American and Soviet trade unions, and in general to prevent and sabo-

stage the development of Soviet-American friendship.

The Executive Council of the American Federation of Labor, for example, has boycotted the World Federation of Trade Unions on the pretext that the Soviet trade unions, which are affiliated to W.F.T.U., "are not democratic." This completely false assertion comes from a body which includes William Hutcheson, the absolute czar of the carpenters' union, "King" Joe Ryan, who appointed himself lifetime president of the A. F. of L. longshoremen, and similar labor lords.

Damaging Soviet-American relations is one of the objectives of the new un-American Dies committee, which seeks to brand expressions of friendship for the Soviet Union as "subversive" and un-American. It hopes to intimidate all progressive, liberal citizens and thus silence such

expressions. Its attack against the Communist Party has for one of its objectives the Red-baiting of all forces which fight for labor's rights, for the people's democratic advance, and American-Soviet friendship as a guarantee of world peace.

The turbulent history of the world during the past 28 years demonstrates conclusively that Soviet-American friendship corresponds to the most profound and genuine needs of democratic America. Upon the maintenance of that friendship and co-operation which are now seriously threatened hang issues of vital importance to the future of the people of America and the world. World hopes for an enduring peace and for democracy are at stake. While we celebrate the 28th anniversary of the October Revolution, these are issues that the American people, with labor in the lead, must fight out.

JO
W

To co
war s
Joseph
the G
Union
of Ge
casual
book,
Soviet
founda
tempo
war.
New
great
leaders
the so
litical
world
tion. E
that pl
Com
the dec
ment
emerge
power,
state th
the flam
at the
will say
the soci

* Intern
1945, \$1

JOSEPH STALIN'S WAR LEADERSHIP

By ROBERT MINOR

TO COLLECT in a single volume the war speeches and the public letters of Joseph Stalin from the beginning of the German invasion of the Soviet Union in June, 1941, to the surrender of Germany in May, 1945, is not a casual chore of the war's end. The book, *The Great Patriotic War of the Soviet Union*,* will stand as the most fundamental original source of contemporary literature on the great war.

Never before did it happen in a great war that the genius of military leadership stood at the forefront in the social sciences, philosophy, political economy, the Marxist scientific world outlook, and labor organization. But the war of the 1940's saw that phenomenon.

Coming generations will describe the decade of the 1940's as the moment in which a socialist state emerged for the first time as a great power, and proved to be the only state that was indestructible when the flames of medieval reaction licked at the walls of civilization. They will say that the military strength of the socialist state proved to mankind

that civilization will not be destroyed in our age, because the foremost sector of civilization has already crossed the chasm from the anarchy of capitalism into the succeeding stage.

The author of these speeches and letters composed them as a part of the process of leading the most powerful military force that has ever existed, in the largest and bloodiest war of all history. In these speeches were formulated the plans and directives that resulted in a victory so colossal as to affect the national existence of every people and the individual lives of every man, woman and child on earth. And each chapter is a living instrument, hot with struggle, shaped in the midst of life-and-death combat to meet the needs of a particular stage of the gigantic war.

Those who think they already know what contribution the Soviet Union made, the sacrifice and achievement of her people and her soldiers, and the leaders of her incomparable Communist Party, and the skill and courage with which it was done—had better lay aside such an assumption. Read and study this book, phase by phase, follow out the contour of each of the great theoretical questions traced here by a master hand, and each of the fateful polemics over policy between the Allies during the four ghastly and magnificent years. Study them in their sequence, and then again, not in sequence, but by subject matter, where there were differences of policy be-

* International Publishers, New York. 167 pp., 1945, \$1.75.

tween the members of the Anglo-Soviet-American Coalition—including especially the question of the Second Front which will go down into the centuries as the most fateful issue of war policy that has ever up to this time been faced by military men. Study the reasons for the Second Front in strategy, the reasons why it was postponed, and the consequences of its postponement in 1942 and 1943, and the limited (though positive) effects of the landings in Africa and in Italy. Study Stalin's estimate of the colossal effects of the landing finally made on the Normandy coast of Continental Europe on D-Day, June 6, 1944.

In doing this you will reward yourself with the greatest political lesson that your lifetime affords.

WHO IS STRONG?

The first question of every war is the relative strength of the fighting states. The strongest in this war turned out to be the Soviet Union. Stalin reminds us that "in this war Hitler-Germany with her fascist army has proved to be a more powerful, crafty and experienced adversary than Germany and her army were in any war of the past. It should be added that in this war the Germans succeeded in exploiting the productive forces of practically the whole of Europe and the quite considerable armies of their vassal states.

"And if in spite of these favorable conditions for the prosecution of the

war Germany nevertheless finds herself on the brink of destruction, the explanation is that her chief adversary, the Soviet Union, has surpassed Hitler-Germany in strength."

General George C. Marshall, in his current biennial report as the Chief of Staff of the United States Army, strikingly confirms the estimate Stalin gives of the strength of the Hitler-led Axis and, though a little less definitely, of the decisive role of the Soviet military forces in breaking the back of the Hitler machine. Many Americans need the shock of General Marshall's reminder that "Germany and Japan came so close to complete domination of the world that we do not yet realize how thin the thread of Allied survival has been stretched."

Neither the professional soldier's narrowness nor a certain stark imperialism that shows through the windows of General Marshall's report should deter you from finding in the facts he gives, a startling light of confirmation of what is said in the speeches of Stalin made in those "black days of 1942." Says General Marshall:

In good conscience this Nation can take little credit for its part in staving off disaster in those critical days. It is certain that the refusal of the British and Russian peoples to accept what appeared to be inevitable defeat was the great factor in the salvage of our civilization.

Reactionary propagandists who

still
viet
sav
sent
ernn
men
ship
thel
amp
said,
tank
Ame
war,
Sovie
thos
beyon
plane
flown
celled
mach
recor
The
great
war,
Stalin
propo
our ta
Germ
are pu
of tar
their
tank
dustri
Hollar
for th
long a
army,
withou
the blo
superio
Of t

still dispute the strength of the Soviet Union contend that she was saved by the American armament sent to her. After the Soviet Government's wholehearted acknowledgment of the enormous help of such shipments, we must add that nevertheless the U.S.S.R. produced, for example, tanks of a quality, as Stalin said, "superior to that of the German tanks." Stalin did not say, but the American press did, at the end of the war, that the finest of the giant Soviet-made tanks excelled even those we Americans had made, and beyond all comparison. And Soviet planes made in Soviet factories and flown by Soviet fliers, not only excelled the enemy man to man and machine to machine, but made world records.

The socialist State had become a great industrial country prior to this war, with the two Five-Year Plans. Stalin placed the matter in its true proportions, saying, "The quality of our tanks is superior to that of the German tanks. . . . But the Germans are producing a far greater number of tanks because they now have at their disposal, not only their own tank industry, but also the tank industries of Czechoslovakia, Belgium, Holland and France. Were it not for this fact, the Red Army would long ago have smashed the German army, which never goes into battle without tanks and cannot withstand the blows of our units unless it has superiority in tanks."

Of the eight great armament works

that existed in the world,* five were producing at doubled capacity for Nazi Germany, against one in the Soviet Union. The remaining two, the American and British, were at that time sending nothing to the Soviet Union. And the New York *Times*, for example, was expounding editorially the view that the great necessity was to avoid sending any armaments to the Soviet Union because the Germans would get them.

The armament from the United States was, partly for such reasons, not forthcoming until after rivers of blood had been spilt and the Red Army had already slowed the Blitzkrieg. Stalin's call was for the Soviet workers to give "a sevenfold increase in the tank production" of the Soviet factories, and they gave it.

A sense of proportion is given by such facts as presented by General Marshall, paired by those given by Stalin: for instance, that during the two years from July, 1943, to June, 1945, we sent the Soviet Union 4,177 tanks, while the Red Army in three months' fighting in the winter of 1942-43 captured or destroyed 7,000 tanks; and that in two years we sent our Soviet ally 252 pieces of heavy artillery, while in three months it captured 17,000 guns from the Germans. So it is not wholly due to our aid that Stalin could say in November, 1944:

Today the Red Army has not less

* Omitting the Swedish, which I believe partly supplied Germany.

but more tanks, guns and aircraft than the German army. As for the quality of our war material, it is far superior to the enemy armaments in that respect. (P. 133.)

And:

Just as the Red Army achieved military victory over the fascist forces in singlehanded struggle, so the workers in the Soviet rear won economic victory over the enemy in their lone fight against Hitler Germany and her associates. (P. 133.)

SECOND FRONT

But not all is scholarly in General Marshall's report, nor does its thesis regarding the greatest of the monumental questions that arose in the war compare favorably with that of Stalin. We take now the great question of the Second Front. We remember Stalin's call to the Red Army on May 1, 1942:

See to it that 1942 becomes the year of the final defeat of the German fascist troops and the liberation of Soviet territory from the Hitler beasts. (P. 55.)

General Marshall now brings forward some facts of the same period which, though not altogether new, help to clarify the history of the matter. The General's facts show that the policy voiced by Stalin coincided with plans agreed upon between the U.S., Britain and the Soviet Union. The agreement was for the establishment of a Second Front in Western Europe not later than 1943, and

under certain conditions in the summer of 1942.

In April, 1942, there was a British-American conference in London and an agreement based on the view "that the final blow must be delivered across the English Channel and eastward through the plains of western Europe." That was the time when, says General Marshall, "the Red Army was slowly falling back under the full fury of the German assault, and it was accepted at the London conference that everything practicable must be done to reduce the pressure on the Soviet lest she collapse and the door be opened wide for a complete conquest of Europe and a probable juncture with the Japanese in the Indian Ocean.

"In the discussions at this conference, a tentative target date for the cross-Channel operations, designated by the code name ROUNDUP, was set for the summer of 1943. However, the immediate necessity for an emergency plan was recognized. It was given the code name SLEDGEHAMMER and was to provide for a diversionary assault on the French coast at a much earlier date if such a desperate measure became necessary to lend a hand toward saving the situation on the Soviet front."

It was after this necessity for an emergency plan for the establishment of the Second Front in western Europe in 1942 had been recognized in April, that the whole enormous force of the Soviet Union was set, as indicated by Stalin's call of May 1,

for
blow
fall
W
the
Alan
Gene
ton
SLED
UP,
Medi
Ge
that
Cont
this
Wash
mum
upon
in 19
mom
Sovie
Tot
ish o
North
classi
Mosco
which
sions,
2,000-
millio
come
Gen
the S
the S
for 19
that t
the N
the fa
only t
bilty
Europ

for the joint delivery of the death-blow to Hitler in that summer and fall of 1942.

Why didn't it happen? "In June, the Prime Minister and General Sir Alan F. Brooke, chief of the Imperial General Staff, returned to Washington for a further discussion of SLEDGEHAMMER and ROUND-UP, and a possible operation in the Mediterranean."

General Marshall makes it clear that not only the invasion of the Continent in 1942 was cancelled by this Anglo-American meeting in Washington, but *also* even the minimum alternative course agreed upon—the invasion of the continent in 1943—was silently ditched at the moment of the greatest crisis on the Soviet front.

Tobruk had been lost by the British on the relatively small front in North Africa. Cairo was suddenly classified as more important than Moscow; the secondary African front which held some 20 German divisions, as more important than the 2,000-mile Soviet front where seven million men were deciding the outcome of the war.

General Marshall does not say that the Soviet Union was notified that the Second Front was off, not only for 1942, but also for 1943, but only that the decision was made to mount the North African assault, "accepting the fact that this would mean not only the abandonment of the possibility for any operation in Western Europe that year, but that the neces-

sary build-up for the cross-Channel assault could not be completed in 1943."

The full gigantic load fell upon the Soviet forces at Stalingrad. They carried it. That they carried the load successfully and without hesitating at the terrible cost is adequate proof that the Soviet Union was fully prepared to deliver the knockout blow in the East if her Allies' assurance of the Second Front in Western Europe had been realized.

As is often the case among generals, a whole vast theory of the German strategic purpose in the advance on the Soviet front is given seemingly to supply the gap in understanding why the sudden change was made and the Second Front postponed at the moment of its highest need—not for one year, but two.

Napoleon said there are always two reasons for everything: One is the good reason, and the other is the real reason. It seems to me that General Marshall gives the "good" reason rather than the real one.

The truth is that the German military leaders, even Hitler included, were not so simple as to fail to see that they must at all costs concentrate upon and capture Moscow; and, having failed in their frontal attack, the diversion toward the Volga had still that main objective. They were to draw the Red Army reserves away from Moscow in order to make the kill.

Unfortunately, General Marshall rejects this truth and still accepts

a false version of the main objective of the German summer drive of 1942, more or less the German newspaper version at the time. And upon this mistaken estimate of the real German strategic purpose, hangs a false justification of the failure of the U.S. and British forces to attempt in the spring and summer of that year the Second Front in Western Europe. Marshall says correctly that "the immediate objectives were to deprive the Soviet Union of her vital industries and raw materials by cutting the Volga at Stalingrad and seizing the Caucasian oil fields." But then he goes wrong, I think, as to the *main* purpose of the great 1942 effort, saying:

Beyond these concrete objectives was evidently the Napoleonic dream of a conquest of the Middle East and India by a gigantic double envelopment with one pincer descending from the Caucasus through Tiflis and the other from North Africa across Egypt, Palestine and the Arabian desert.

The Germans were not such fools as to be heading for the Arabian desert, leaving Stalin between them and Berlin.

Without denying that such an envelopment and a conquest of the Middle East and India would ultimately have followed a German victory at Stalingrad (and would certainly have had great importance if and when it came), we say, nevertheless, that General Marshall is here overlooking the basic and the decisive

feature of the German strategy in attempting the Stalingrad campaign, which was to encircle and capture Moscow. And in doing so, he is adopting an estimate of the tempo altogether too slow for the terrific speed of events of that year.

Certainly, if the Red Army had broken at Stalingrad, and if Moscow had been captured, and if the Soviet Union had been defeated in the war—the Germans and Japanese *would* have met in the Indian Ocean. So would they have met in London and Kansas City. But the point is not consequences, but of the main strategic objective.

Stalin's estimate, made in November, 1942, on the eve of the decisive battle of Stalingrad, is borne out by history. It was this:

What was the main objective of the German fascist strategists when they launched their summer offensive on our front? To judge by the comments of the foreign press, including the German, one might think that the main objective of the offensive was to capture the oil districts of Grozny and Baku. But facts decidedly refute this assumption. Facts show that the German advance toward the oil districts of the U.S.S.R. is not the main, but an auxiliary, objective.

What, then, was the main objective of the German offensive? It was to outflank Moscow from the east; to cut it off from its Volga and Urals rear and then to strike at the city. The German advance southwards, toward the oil districts, had an auxiliary purpose; not only, and not so much, to capture the

oil of
ser
Mos
the
This
grou
the C
not i
· · ·
the C
surro
year

Up
of th
of th
other

If t
appr
sists
have
diver
south
front.
the r
drive
also i
Hitler

Aft
1942
ond E
velope
Stalin
out wi
were
able r
eastern
periori
tions."

Beca
Front i

oil districts as to divert our main reserves to the south and to weaken the Moscow front, and thereby facilitate the success of the blow at Moscow. This, in fact, explains why the main group of the German forces are now in the Orel and the Stalingrad areas, and not in the south.

. . . In short, the main objective of the German summer offensive was to surround Moscow and end the war this year [1942]. (P. 59.)

Upon the correctness of judgment of this great battle depended more of the fate of mankind than any other single battle in modern history.

If the Red Army had followed the appraisal that General Marshall insists upon even to this day, it would have fallen into the German trap, diverting its main reserves to the south and weakening the Moscow front. However, they understood the main purpose of the German drive and held Moscow while they also inflicted the mortal blow upon Hitler at Stalingrad.

After the blood-soaked summer of 1942 had passed without the Second Front, and as the struggle developed toward the Stalingrad battle, Stalin, on November 6, 1942, pointed out why the Germans and their allies were "able to muster all their available reserves, transfer them to the eastern front and create a big superiority of forces in one of the directions." The answer was:

Because the absence of a Second Front in Europe enabled them to carry

out this operation without any risk. . . .

Let us assume that there was a Second Front in Europe as there was in the First World War, and that this Second Front diverted, let us say, 60 German divisions and twenty divisions of Germany's allies. What would have been the position of the German troops on our front today? It is not difficult to guess that their position would have been deplorable. More than that, it would have been the beginning of the end of the German fascist troops, . . . (P. 61.)

Stalin explained that "of the 256 divisions which Germany now has, no fewer than 179 are on our front." To these had to be added 22 Roumanian divisions, 14 Finnish, 10 Italian, 13 Hungarian and one Slovak and one Spanish division—"a total of 240 divisions" of Hitler's forces concentrated on the Soviet front.

"Hence," said Stalin, "instead of 127 divisions, as was the case in the First World War, we, today [November, 1942], are facing no less than 240 divisions, and instead of 85 German divisions [as in the First World War] we have 179 German divisions fighting the Red Army.

"This is the chief reason and ground for the tactical successes the German fascist troops gained on our front this summer. . . ." He added that "twice as many troops are facing our front as was the case during the First World War." (P. 63.)

Not that Stalin failed to give a positive and high evaluation of the African and Italian campaigns. On

the contrary, . . . "no one but first-rate organizers could carry out such serious war operations as the successful landings in North Africa, across the ocean, as the quick occupation of the harbors and wide territories from Casablanca to Bougie, and as the smashing of the Italo-German armies in the western desert being effected with such mastery." (P. 164.) He foresaw correctly "a certain relief in pressure on the Soviet Union," and declared ". . . the initiative has passed into the hands of our Allies, the campaign changes radically the political and war situation in Europe in favor of the Anglo-Soviet-American coalition. The African landing," he said, "creates the prerequisites for establishment of a Second Front in Europe nearer to Germany's vital centers which [N.B.] will be of decisive importance for organizing victory over Hitlerite tyranny." (P. 165.)

Stalin persisted in affirming that "in view of the absence of a Second Front in Europe, the Red Army alone bears the whole burden of the war." (P. 76.)

But the Teheran Conference in December, 1943, was, as Stalin said, "not held for nothing." He said, "The decision of the Teheran Conference on a joint blow at Germany from the west, east and south began to be carried out with amazing precision. Simultaneously with the summer operations of the Red Army on the Soviet-German Front, the Allied forces launched the invasion of

France and organized powerful offensive operations which compelled Hitler-Germany to wage war on two fronts."

Stalin was unreserved in pointing out the far-reaching and conclusive effects of the Second Front when it came. On November 6, 1944, just five months after the American-British landing in Normandy (June 6, 1944), Stalin showed that as under the more favorable conditions created by the Second Front "as many as 120 divisions of the Germans and their allies have been routed and put out of action" by the operations of the Red Army; that "in place of the 257 divisions that faced" the Soviet Front in 1943, "only 204 German and Hungarian divisions" remained facing the Soviet armies, and of these only 180 divisions were German.

"There can be no doubt," he said, "that without the opening of the Second Front in Europe, which holds as many as 75 German divisions, our troops would not have been able to break the resistance of the German forces and knock them out of the Soviet Union in so short a time.

"But it is equally indubitable that without the powerful offensive operations of the Red Army in the summer of this year, which held as many as 200 German divisions, the forces of our Allies could not have coped so quickly with the German forces and knocked them out of central Italy, France and Belgium. The thing is to keep Germany gripped

in this vise between the two fronts. That is the key to victory."

And future generations of Americans, British, Frenchmen and Canadians will say with pride that this key to victory was finally taken in hand, and the most truly sacred democratic world alliance of peoples was to this degree realized.

AFTER THE BATTLE THE JACKALS COME

But at the end of the war some do not regard the victory as one of democracy; they see only its less decisive aspect, as a victory of the giant American finance-capital. They see, not the strength of world democracy that has been multiplied a hundred-fold, but the strength of the giant American corporations that has been multiplied tenfold on the profits of the war in which 40 million people died, including over 264,000 American boys, some mine, some yours. In the hands, or under the pressure, of these people our foreign policy is rapidly being transformed from that of the war of liberation into one of active imperialist aggressiveness everywhere, with efforts to form a huge anti-Soviet alignment headed by United States imperialism—a course which can lead only to a new world war.

The so-called secret of the Atom Bomb has become the center around which the battle over foreign policy turns. Scientific discovery of the means of release of atomic energy is said to have its highest value for use

against the great Socialist State and against the rise now beginning of the peoples of Asia; and to that end it is said to be held secret as the exclusive property of the greatest of all imperialist states.

This is the reappearance, in American imperialist plans, of the boast of Adolf Hitler as to what he would achieve with the "Secret Weapon."

Far be it from us to disparage the importance of so great a technological discovery as the atom bomb. But we will not be fooled by distortions being borrowed by these imperialists from our "technocrats" of a few years ago. Hitler laughed at the role of *men*. By command of technological secrets the paranoiac would set aside the political importance of the masses. Technology would rise above men (though Hitler, by the very necessity of his own system, had to drive out of Germany on anti-Semitic grounds some of the scientists indispensable to the development of highly advanced German technique). The material forces of production, so decisive in the development of society, consist first of all of *men*.

Command of the means of release and use of atomic energy is dependent, not on someone's keeping a secret, but on the stage and form of development of the industrial system in modern nations. Those who study the facts of this war as Stalin gives them will see that the Soviet stage of development has given the Socialist land leadership of the entire

world in many branches of scientific achievement. In physics, the Soviet Union is a world leader, and it is doubtful whether an exchange of knowledge between the Soviet Union and the United States would not result in our learning more about the release and use of atomic energy than the Soviet Union would learn from us.

So much for the *stage* of development. Now as to the *form* of development of the Soviet industrial system. The form of development, the socialist form, is what enabled the young Soviet Republic to advance in 25 years in a degree comparable to England's advance in 200 years or America's in 125 years. The advantage will be even more striking in the case of atomic energy. Why? There is no clear dividing line between the development of military use of atomic energy and that of general industrial application of the same energy. The military development is dependent upon the development in industry.

THE POLITICAL ATOM

What these people do not understand is that in 1917 Russia achieved the splitting of the *political* atom.

That splitting of the political atom irrevocably affected the course of the whole of mankind.

The democracy produced by the smashing of the "atom" of class relationships—by smashing the mode of production by which a property-

less working class is bound in dependence to a class of private owners of the means of social production—differs from that of a capitalist society.

The release of democratic energy of the masses of the Workers' State displayed in this war—the amazing solidarity of the socialist population engaged in its own defense, the unprecedented military achievements of the Red Army—this is the result of the process of splitting the political "atom" of class bondage.

The introduction into a socialist country of full and general use of such a scientific technological achievement as atomic energy as a source of power—raising beyond all previous heights the productivity of labor, will result immediately and wholly to the benefit of the entire people. A socialist state cannot but want such a technological advance to be devoted exclusively to peaceful industry and the unmeasured gain in happiness of its people.

But in a capitalist society, for certain spokesmen of such a society, the military application of the colossal advance in science is a more spontaneously welcome thought. The military use of atomic energy represents an enormous strengthening of *offensive* war technique, as against the *defensive*, and the first effect in our country is a sudden inflaming of aggressive imperialist foreign policy, an effort to transform the spirit of "people's war" with which we have just won the greatest victory in all his-

tory, into its opposite—into an aggressive, cynical, brutish chauvinism, an isolationism of the blustering, would-be conquering overlord.

Those American reactionaries who in the beginning above all things wanted the Germans to attack the Soviet Union, held as their greatest desire the defeat and destruction of the Soviet Union through a victory of Nazi Germany. Bear this in mind while reading Stalin's clear analysis of the non-aggression pact with Germany signed by the Soviet Union in August, 1939, after the refusal by Britain, France and Poland of joint military action with the U.S.S.R. against Germany. Bear in mind the Dewart press with its pronouncement through its favorite columnist that it would be "preferable" for the United States to go down to defeat rather than cooperate with the Soviet Union; and Roy Howard's shout of joy, "What a break for us!" when the German attack on the Soviet Union was expected. What they were applauding was the expected conquest and extermination of the Socialist State and the spread of the German Nazi State from the North Sea to the Pacific and to within sight of Alaska's shore.

Those pro-fascist warmongers and the rabid imperialists whom they represent are now pressing forward to make their program the program of our land.

Stalin's speech of November 6, 1941, discusses usefully "the German policy of playing up contradic-

tions and intimidating with the specter of revolution," by which the Nazis "seriously hoped to create a universal coalition against the U.S. S.R., to draw Great Britain and the United States into this coalition and, preliminary to that, to frighten the ruling circles of these countries by the specter of revolution. . . ."

Think over this remark:

It turned out that the German policy of playing up contradictions and intimidating by the specter of revolution has exhausted itself and no longer fits in the new situation; and not only does not fit, but is moreover *pregnant with great dangers* for the German invaders, for *under the new conditions* of war it leads to exactly the opposite result. (P. 21. My emphasis—R.M.)

The Germans "played up the contradictions between classes" in France, Holland, Belgium and Yugoslavia, for instance, and the contradictions "between these countries and the Soviet country . . ."

What result did the Germans get from this?

Mr. James F. Byrnes, Secretary of State, is now "playing up the contradictions between classes" in Western Europe, seeking to rally all of the privileged classes and reactionary groups, with the golden club of American wealth and much talk of contradictions "between these countries and the Soviet country."

It will again lead to "exactly the opposite result."

But such men with such a policy

could set the world afire again—and the only preventive is a vast rallying of labor and the great majority of the American people against the fast-moving imperialist adventurers and

for the solidification of the Anglo-Soviet-American coalition and the cementing of Soviet-American friendship which is so vital to our national welfare and to the peace of the world.

STAT

AMER
high
secur
out
impo
just a
fight
come
catast
try.

In
Amer
own
terests
of the
for a
gram
which
sives.
impor
Admi
even t
fight
to a la
failure

Eve
search
progra
tions
tion w
gro p
the st
nation

THE PEOPLE'S FIGHT FOR WAGES, JOBS AND SECURITY

STATEMENT BY THE NATIONAL BOARD, COMMUNIST PARTY, U.S.A.

AMERICAN LABOR is fighting for higher wages, for jobs and job security, for fair employment without which full employment is impossible, for price control, for a just and equitable tax program. It is fighting to increase the national income and thus to prevent economic catastrophe from engulfing the country.

In fighting for this program, American labor is battling, not in its own interests alone, but in the interests of the overwhelming majority of the American people. It is fighting for a program which is not the program of labor alone. It is a program which is supported by all progressives. It is a program which, despite important omissions, the Truman Administration has itself advanced, even though it has refused so far to fight for its realization and is thus to a large degree responsible for the failure to realize it.

Everyone who is not blinded by the search for profits can see that this program is in the interests of all sections of the population. Its realization will benefit the farmer, the Negro people, the small businessman, the storekeeper. It will benefit the nation as a whole because it will

raise purchasing power and thus improve the prospects for increasing production and employment.

But big business is attempting to hide this elementary truth from the people.

Big business, which enriched and strengthened itself during the war, is resisting the program of labor and the people. It wants to continue the mad orgy of profiteering which enabled it to increase profits from more than four billion dollars in 1939 to almost ten billion dollars in 1944. If big business is allowed to perpetuate its Roman holiday of profiteering, our country will be led straightway to catastrophe. The basis will be laid for the worst economic crisis which the world has ever seen.

Big business is trying to carry through its program by reducing the take-home pay of the workers, despite the fact that technological improvements have enormously increased the productivity of labor. At the same time, big business is exerting enormous—and, so far, effective—pressure on Congress to wreck the legislative program of labor and the people.

Already, the guts have been torn out of the program put before Con-

gress by President Truman. The proposal for increasing unemployment insurance to \$25 a week for 26 weeks has been pigeon-holed. The Full Employment Bill has been completely emasculated. The Fair Employment Practices Committee, already greatly weakened by reduced appropriations, is being sabotaged and prepared for complete extinction. The proposal to raise the minimum wage is under savage attack.

At the same time, big business, which during the war got Congress to pass a profit insurance law in the form of guaranteed tax rebates, is now pushing through Congress a tax relief law for the rich which is scandalous and indecent.

A heavy share of the responsibility for the reactionary accomplishments of Congress rests on the Truman Administration which has refused to insist upon, or fight for, the program it has advanced.

Labor and the people, however, are not accepting this lying down. Led by the organized labor movement, the people are fighting back. Labor is on the move all over the country for higher wages to maintain take-home pay, for a higher minimum wage, for a permanent Fair Employment Practices Committee, for effective price control, for an equitable tax policy that will place the burden of taxation where it belongs—on the shoulders of the rich.

Labor's fight for this program has in all fields met the most bitter and provocative opposition of big busi-

ness. This has resulted in the outbreak of a number of strikes in various industries. These strikes are characterized by the great militancy and solidarity of the workers involved. Even where the strikes are not directly for economic demands, or are a result of company or company union provocation, they show the great restlessness and discontent of the workers, their desire for higher wages and job security.

The employers and their subservient press are attempting to distort the meaning of these strikes. They are attempting to cover up their own responsibility for these strikes, their own responsibility for unplanned reconversion. They are attempting to divert the anger of the people from their own selfish refusal to part with a single penny of their swollen wartime profits to raise the wages of the workers.

* * *

Through expensive full-page advertisements in the nation's press, big business is attempting to whip up an anti-strike hysteria in an effort to set the veterans against the labor movement, to pit Negro against white, to mobilize the farmers against the workers, to set the city middle classes against the labor movement. It hopes in this way to stampede public opinion and thus make it easier to defeat labor's just demands, to defeat all progressive legislation, and to pave the way for new repressive anti-labor and anti-popular legislation.

Unfortunately, labor has not yet

made the basic issues involved in this great struggle clear to the people. It has not made clear the criminal responsibility of Big Business and its Congressional stooges for the situation which now exists. Nor has labor made sufficiently clear the share of responsibility which President Truman and his Administration bear for failing to check the drive of Big Business and its reactionary Congressional stooges.

Despite the efforts of the employers and their kept press to whip up an anti-strike hysteria, the actual facts are that the number of workers involved in these strikes is as yet relatively small. At no time since V-J Day have there been more than 3-400,000 workers involved in strikes. Even a good proportion of these were not actually on strike but were either locked out by the employers, as in the case of Ford, or indirectly affected by strikes, as in mining. The number of workers actually on strike represents only a small fraction of the millions who were thrown out of jobs by big business when war contracts were terminated. And yet, with the most callous disregard for the truth and with utter contempt for the needs of labor and the nation, Congress has used the pretext of this small number of strikers to justify its refusal to pass President Truman's proposal for increasing unemployment insurance benefits.

The number of workers actually on strike now is comparatively small. But, despite labor's earnest desire to

settle issues without resort to strikes, the potential development of strikes is very great as a result of the arrogant and provocative attitude of the employers. The main issue around which these struggles are developing is the maintenance of the war-time take-home pay. This issue expresses itself in various forms—the demand for 52 hours pay for 40 hours work, for a flat \$2 a day wage increase, or for a thirty percent wage increase.

These demands are being put forth by unions in every section of the organized labor movement. An outstanding feature of these demands is the fact that they are being raised as national demands, although unevenly in the different sections of the labor movement. The movement is spearheaded by the Big Three in the C.I.O.—the steel, auto and electrical unions. Other C.I.O. unions are also raising national demands; for example, the unions in the rubber, farm equipment, oil, clothing, fur and leather industries. The maritime workers have just won an important national wage demand. In addition, the railroad unions have raised national wage demands.

While no A. F. of L. unions have presented wage demands on a national scale, important mass local unions and federations have raised them, as, for example, the west coast metal workers, the west coast lumber workers, and the east coast long-shoremen.

While the main demand in the

strike of mine supervisors and foremen is for union recognition, the miners who are staying out of the pits in solidarity with that strike are increasingly demanding that the U.M.W.A. reopen contract negotiations on a national scale for wage increases, a demand which the Lewis machine is callously ignoring.

The policy of big business is to resist labor's demands to the utmost, taking advantage of its own war-time profits and the government guarantee of its postwar profits, to engage in a reconversion sit-down strike while waiting for the savings of the workers and their unemployment insurance benefits to run out. This is callously stated in the September 18 issue of the Munn Automobile Newsletter:

Perhaps the only solution is a policy of sitting tight and waiting until the economic pinch forces workers to realize they must stay on the job or starve. At the moment there is no disposition on the part of management to become frantic over labor unrest. A watching waiting policy is the general rule.

Big business is attempting to act unitedly on a national scale in resisting the wage demands of labor in order to prevent a favorable settlement in one industry from becoming a precedent which will strengthen labor's hand in other industries. This is clearly seen in the refusal of the oil industry to agree to the compromise proposal of Secretary of Labor Schwollenbach, accepted by the

Oil Workers Union, for the granting of an immediate 15 per cent wage increase and the arbitration of further increases between 15-30 per cent.

* * *

Big business is resisting labor's demands for wage increases behind the specious plea that wage increases will result in inflationary price increases. This is unparalleled hypocrisy. The employers are attempting to conceal the fact that it is they who are spearheading the drive to smash price controls, that it is their policy of the artificial maintenance of high prices through monopoly control and trust arrangements which is responsible for the high cost of raw materials, food stuffs and finished products. They brazenly plead poverty and inability to pay for wage increases. But the whole world knows that for them the war was also an orgy of profit-making and treasury looting.

While it is clear that the question of price increases do not enter into contract negotiations which must be signed irrespective of the price policies of the government, labor cannot be indifferent to the efforts of big business to raise prices. Price increases will take away in higher cost of living everything that labor can win in increased wage scales. Labor must reject the efforts of the employers to make it a partner in asking for price increases and must take the lead in mobilizing the people against price increases.

The labor movement must understand these objectives, policies and

tactics
no ill
not a
ditch.
could
it can
tude o
serious
of its
determ
that t
may be
breaki
The
in the
progra
extrem
fights
The
have re
danger
wage in
legislat
people.
dangere
fight fo
diminis
big str
the inc
would l
a devel
ment m
on all f
possible
economy
with a
fight for
this con
ize the
Presiden
tration o

tactics of big business. It must have no illusions that the employers will not resist their demands to the last ditch. The most fatal mistake labor could make would be to assume that it can win its demands by an attitude of mere bluff without the most serious and widespread mobilization of its full membership for the most determined struggle, bearing in mind that the arrogance of big business may be responsible for further strikes breaking out.

The prospects for substantial gains in the developing struggle for the program of labor and the people are extremely favorable, provided labor fights correctly and unitedly.

The events of the past few weeks have revealed that there exists a great danger of separating the fight for wage increases from the fight for the legislative program of labor and the people. Nothing could be more dangerous than the illusion that the fight for this legislative program has diminished in importance because big struggles are breaking out on the industrial field. Big business would like nothing better than such a development. The labor movement must, under penalty of defeat on all fronts, combine in the closest possible manner its fight on the direct economic field for wage increases with a hundred-fold increase in the fight for its legislative program. In this connection it must sharply criticize the continued abandonment by President Truman and his administration of his own program and his

capitulation to the fight of reaction against this program.

Similarly, labor should understand that international developments are closely connected with all domestic issues. The reactionary home policy of big business is tied up with its reactionary drive for imperialist domination of the world. Hence, labor must pay increasing attention and not, as has unfortunately happened, less attention to combatting the reactionary foreign policies of the State Department headed by Byrnes and to fighting against the abandonment of Roosevelt's foreign policies by President Truman and his administration.

The big lesson of everything that has happened is the imperative necessity of labor to wage its fight in such a manner as to achieve the maximum unity—unity within the C.I.O., unity of C.I.O. with A. F. of L., the Railroad Brotherhoods, the miners, unity of labor with the farmers, the Negro people, the veterans. Only in this way can labor and the people achieve their program.

The C.I.O. has an especially heavy responsibility in fighting to achieve this unity. If the Big Three in the C.I.O.—the steel, auto and electrical workers—act unitedly, they can overcome employer provocations as well as provocations from John L. Lewis and other disruptive elements in labor's ranks—the Trotskyites and the Social-Democrats. If they act unitedly they can give a greater national character to their separate wage demands

and establish a unified approach and collective national leadership in the fight for their wage and other demands. If they act unitedly, they can achieve the fullest mobilization of the membership of the various unions in support of the wage demands that are being advanced and in preparation for any struggles which the employers may force upon the unions. In this way, the greatest discipline can be established in labor's ranks, with every local struggle becoming part of the general struggle.

The Communist Party and its membership, as an organic part of the labor movement, gives its fullest support to the struggles of labor and the people. It fights most determinedly for unity of labor and the people. That is why the employers attempt to destroy such unity by first of all attacking the Communists and by raising the Hitler "Red-scare."

That is why the new Dies Committee has begun to work again. That is why the struggle against Red-baiting is not the exclusive concern of the Communists; it is the most vital concern of the entire labor movement.

Labor must bring its program to its own membership through the fullest mobilization of all its unions from top to bottom. It must bring its case to the people through mass meetings on a city and community scale. It must speak to the people over the radio. It must draw into its struggle all sections of the population. It must lead broad people's delegations to Congress.

Labor's program is in the interest of the nation! It must be realized to save our nation from catastrophe and disaster!

National Board,
Communist Party, U.S.A.

October 18, 1945.

LA
FO
WA

ORG
tain
ings,
trical
to al
A
come
work
take-
dize
000,00
ards
prosp
busin
There
wage
decisi
this o
of the
sion p
The
will
attemp
by rec
earnin
The
the w
also t
labor
Presid

LABOR'S FIGHT FOR WAGES AND JOBS

By ROY HUDSON

ORGANIZED LABOR'S fight to maintain the workers' take-home earnings, spearheaded by the Steel, Electrical and Auto unions, is of concern to all anti-fascist forces.

A reduction in the national income, as a consequence of the shorter work-week resulting in reducing take-home earnings, would jeopardize the national objective of 60,000,000 jobs with rising living standards for the workers and greater prosperity for the farmers, small business men and the middle class. Therefore, the struggle to win the wage demands of the workers is a decisive phase of the struggle to win this objective and is the cornerstone of the fight for a people's reconversion program.

The C.I.O. has made it clear that it will uncompromisingly oppose the attempts of big business to cut wages by reducing the level of take-home earnings established during the war. The responsibility of the C.I.O. to the workers demanded this. It is also the responsibility of organized labor to all the people that endorsed President Roosevelt's election pro-

gram. It is a duty that labor owes to every man and woman in the armed forces who expected to be able to return after victory to a job in a prosperous America.

This is doubly true at a time when forces whom people look to for leadership are retreating or abandoning the fight for a people's reconversion program. The objectives endorsed in Roosevelt's election have been embodied in a number of proposed Government measures, as well as in President Truman's message. But not a single one of these measures has been put into effect—primarily because President Truman and others so far have retreated in the face of the attacks of monopoly capital and their spokesmen in Congress. All that would be needed to convert the setbacks suffered already at the hands of big business into a debacle would be for labor to compromise and yield in its wage fight.

If the people are rallied behind labor, the unity established in the wage fight can also result in winning back some of the ground lost on the Full Employment Bill, the \$25-26 weeks legislation, the tax program, and other measures necessary to meet the problems of reconversion.

To win this fight, however, organized labor must first of all be united as never before in support of a common program and leadership. That unity does not yet exist; but the basis for it has been established, because the Steel, Auto, and Electrical Workers' unions have come forward with common demands and

have opened negotiations at the same time. If these powerful unions, basing themselves on a common program and acting simultaneously suffer a setback, this will clearly make the struggle more difficult for the entire labor movement. If the leadership of these powerful unions had followed the example of the A. F. of L. Executive Council or John L. Lewis, the labor movement would have been without a program and leadership around which to rally. Although the action of the C.I.O. under the leadership of Murray prevented this calamity, the labor movement generally has not yet been fully mobilized to gain the objectives for which the leadership has already come forward. Every local union, A. F. of L. and C.I.O., throughout America should endorse the demands of the Big 3 and stand ready to back up any effort needed to secure the wage demands of the workers in the auto, steel and electrical industries. The workers in other industries, in prosecuting the fight for their own demands, should do so in a manner to reinforce the position of the Big 3 and they should display skill in meeting provocations aimed at weakening the fight on the decisive front.

Labor must mobilize all its strength for any action necessary to win its just demands. It should leave no doubt in anyone's mind that it is prepared to answer the present arbitrary position of monopoly capital with strike action if that becomes necessary. The workers in

the steel, auto, electrical, and other industries will enter into such big strike struggles as a last resort, but if compelled to, will not fail in their duties to the interests of labor and also of the nation.

The present hard-boiled attitude of big business, encouraged by its victories in Congress, emphasizes that such major strikes may develop in spite of labor's desire to avoid them. The nation must know that the final decision on this question does not rest in labor's hands. It depends upon whether or not monopoly capital maintains its present adamant position. And the responsibility for changing this attitude of the employers does not properly lie on the shoulders of labor alone.

The hypocritical cry of big business that a "speedy reconversion is threatened by labor strikes" is a smoke screen to hide its conspiracy to provoke strikes as a means of weakening the trade unions and shattering the unity of the anti-fascists, thereby enforcing an imperialist program of increased profits at the expense of the people of America and the world. Non-labor forces in the progressive camp must recognize and face this fact, which needs to be stressed in the light of the strikes that already prevail and that are in the offing and in view of the coming conference of labor and management which is being convened by the Government.

No group of citizens has a greater desire than the workers that the in-

dustri
ductio
even
will n
becom
an en
sion,
recon
met i
maxim
big bu
ment-
trained
ing sp
bor. I
to defe
hinder
for the
in a
prospe

Inste
strike,
fascists
the pl
major
its res
to do
ment i
for th
which
nearly
into m
reaction
major
plished
gle of
bor.

A nu
to acco
interest
up of r

dustries be converted to peace production as speedily as possible. However, under certain conditions strikes will not delay reconversion but may become absolutely necessary to put an end to the saboteurs of reconversion, those who seek to prevent the reconversion problems from being met in a manner that will provide maximum employment. The aim of big business is not maximum employment—but maximum profits to be attained by cutting wages, by introducing speed-up and by weakening labor. If it becomes necessary to strike to defeat these aims, then labor is not hindering reconversion, but fighting for those policies that alone can result in a maximum employment and prosperity for the common people.

Instead of telling labor not to strike, it is high time that other anti-fascists do something to help defeat the plans of Big Business to force major strikes. If labor alone shoulders its responsibility, if other forces fail to do their duty, and if the Government is not compelled to fight firmly for the reconversion policies to which it is committed, then it is nearly certain the country will drift into major strikes. If the attack of reaction can be defeated without major strikes, this will be accomplished only through the joint struggle of all anti-fascist forces with labor.

A number of things are necessary to accomplish this. Everyone seriously interested in preventing the slowing up of reconversion as a result of em-

ployer-provoked industrial strife, should face the issues. First, Congress must be compelled to change the position it has taken on the tax program, unemployment legislation, the Full Employment Bill and other reconversion measures. If the Government and Congress yield to Big Business, why should Big Business yield in the negotiations with its workers? If the contrary becomes the case, then business will be confronted with some additional arguments beyond the threat of a strike.

Secondly, the policies of the Government must be made to conform to the true national interest. The least the Government can do when the workers are forced into strikes is to declare that it will act to enforce the laws that prohibit the recruiting of strike-breakers and to prevent operation of plants with the strike-breakers. The Government took the first step to entering the strike-breaking business in the oil strike, and this must be stopped. Where the needs of the armed forces really require action on the part of the Government to insure uninterrupted production, the management must be removed entirely during the period of Governmental operation and all profits during this period should go to the State or the workers. The Government must guarantee that the final settlement arrived at through collective bargaining or arbitration shall be retroactive.

It is not enough to clamor that "speedy reconversion requires a

peaceful settlement of disputes." It must be recognized and accepted that any program to achieve this must provide:

a. Any attempt of the Government to enforce compulsory arbitration, through legislation or threats, must be condemned and defeated.

b. Labor's fundamental right to strike cannot be denied or restricted.

c. Guarantees must be established that the just demands of the workers receive the consideration they deserve, which can be accomplished only if the final judgment as to whether or not the demands of the workers have been met rests with the workers.

d. Any attempt to establish a ceiling on wages as the basis for settlement of disputes must be opposed. Any efforts on the part of the Government to cooperate in the settlement of disputes must be based upon helping to achieve the national objective of maintaining and increasing the purchasing power of the people, which means first of all, no reduction in the weekly take-home earnings established during war production.

e. Arbitration, Governmental or otherwise, will be accepted by labor only where the workers' right to accept or reject any award is recognized; when the issues to be arbitrated and the body to act as ar-

bitrator are agreed to by labor. Another condition the workers will insist upon in the reconversion period is that arbitration can be considered only when the employer's willingness to grant wage increases has been clearly established, and where the issue in dispute is the extent to which the demands of the workers can be met.

f. The uncompromising stand of the U.E. and other unions against the demands of big business for increase in prices must be reinforced by the rest of labor and the people to insure that the government does not yield to the monopolies.

The decisive question is whether labor should be allowed to shoulder the whole brunt of the struggle on the outcome of which the interest of the people as a whole depends, or whether small business, the middle class, and the farmers should join with labor in bringing a halt to the surrender of President Truman and Congress to monopoly capital. Labor in conjunction with all the progressive forces in the nation can and must compel the adoption of those measures necessary to meet the problems of reconversion in a manner that will insure a maximum of employment with rising living standards and prosperity for the people as a whole, and not just for those who are already rolling in wealth.

LAR
WO

THE
derati
ferenc
Octob
ganize
its em
nation

Neve
ers o
broug
nation
000,000
every
cept th
bor—w

By c
nation
which
the bir
claime
the he
That i
membe
other l
are onl

A ce
ing cla
appea
strife-to
conditio
hastene
nationa
bor mo

LABOR ACHIEVES WORLD FEDERATION

By GEORGE MORRIS

THE LAUNCHING of the World Federation of Trade Unions at a conference in Paris September 25 to October 8, marks a new high in organized working class strength and its emergence as a powerful international force.

Never before have so many workers of as many countries been brought together into a single international body of labor. Some 75,000,000 workers of 69 countries—every existing major labor body except the American Federation of Labor—were represented.

By comparison, the defunct International Federation of Trade Unions which faded out of existence with the birth of the new international, claimed some 24,000,000 members at the height of its existence in 1921. That included more than 8,000,000 members of pre-Hitler Germany and other labor movements which today are only beginning to revive.

A century-long tradition of working class internationalism may have appeared lost at times during recent strife-torn years. But it is the stormy conditions of recent years that have hastened and matured labor's international bond and outlook. The labor movement came out of the First

World War sharply divided into two major camps led by Social-Democrats and Communists. As is now known, the persistent rejection by Social-Democratic leaders of Communist unity pleas, facilitated the victories of fascism. But, with the W.F.T.U. conference, labor enters the present postwar stage far stronger and basically united. Therein is the main significance of the changed situation and the possibility which it opens for the working class.

THE I.F.T.U.

The new labor International is a tremendous advance over past international labor organizations in all major respects. This is especially evident if we take into account the causes for the past division in labor ranks. The I.F.T.U. was essentially a trade union arm of Social-Democracy, resting on the organizations in dominant imperialist European countries. In its heyday, the leaders of I.F.T.U. organizations were also labor lieutenants of the ruling imperialist groups of their respective countries. The partnership between Social-Democratic leaders of the German unions and the industrialists and Junkers of Germany was the keystone of the I.F.T.U.

This policy of collaboration with reaction paralyzed the main I.F.T.U. affiliates. Those in the German unions who called for resistance against ruthless exploitation of labor and the companion drive of rapid rearmament of the Reich, were expelled or removed from positions of leader-

ship. The situation was the same in most other affiliates of the I.F.T.U.

During its main period of life the I.F.T.U. had practically no affiliates in colonial or semi-colonial lands. I.F.T.U. leaders rested mainly on the policy of obtaining a few concessions from the big powers at the expense of the great mass of unorganized super-exploited peoples of subject lands.

The I.F.T.U. was hardly effective as an international body even in its days of greatness. The attachment of its affiliates to the policies of the ruling capitalist groups of their respective countries made it impossible to agree on anything more than generalities and platitudes at international conferences. I.F.T.U. conferences reflected more often the conflicts between capitalist-controlled governments than the common aims of the workers represented.

Hence, of necessity, a great part of the world's labor movement was forced to unite its strength in an international of progressive unions. The Red International of Labor Unions, with headquarters in Moscow, existed from 1921 to the middle 'thirties, by which time most of its sections succeeded in merging with their counterparts in the I.F.T.U.

Arrangements for affiliation of the Soviet trade unions with the I.F.T.U. were well on the way to successful completion in 1937. But A. F. of L. affiliation was consummated in time to swing the balance of votes on the I.F.T.U.'s executive committee

against admitting the U.S.S.R.'s powerful labor movement. In view of the A. F. of L.'s stubborn refusal to get into the I.F.T.U. for some 15 years, there was hardly any other reason for the belated affiliation than the objective of keeping Soviet labor out of the international family of trade unions. A. F. of L. affiliation strengthened the most reactionary elements within the I.F.T.U.'s leadership and forced as a condition for entry the adoption of rules that left the labor international even less effective than it had been. The change provided that only a unanimous decision could make policy effective.

Reporting to their 1937 convention, A. F. of L. leaders felt satisfied that this change insured the "autonomy" of affiliates. It certainly did, with a vengeance; for the I.F.T.U. did not take a single effective step throughout the eight years that followed although it was the period of the betrayal of Ethiopia and Spain, of Munich, and of Hitler's chain of conquests and the entire war.

In some individual countries, as in France and Czechoslovakia, the belated achievement of labor unity strengthened the working class considerably. It was too late to stop fascism, but it was nevertheless a factor in strengthening the resistance movement and labor's postwar influence in those lands. But that sort of unity was blocked on an international scale.

As for colonial and semi-colonial

countries, the I.F.T.U. did little to encourage the development of unions in China, India, Indonesia or other lands in Africa and Asia.

BORN OUT OF STRUGGLE AGAINST FASCISM

It took the costly experience of the years since the Munich betrayal to drive home the lesson of world labor unity. Even after all the blood and tears the process was not an easy one. The renewed effort to bring about international labor unity began in the summer of 1941, shortly after Hitler's hordes invaded the Soviet Union. This came first through the establishment of the Anglo-Soviet Trade Union Committee and then through efforts of the British laborites to bring in the A. F. of L., with whom they have had a somewhat fraternal relationship for a half century. Since then we have had a chain of delay maneuvers, with the A. F. of L. making the demagogic claim that Soviet Union are "state dominated" and not worthy of association with "free labor." Meanwhile the most conservative circles in the British Trade Union Congress, among them Sir Walter Citrine, appeared only too willing to appease the A. F. of L. with delays on definite steps to launch the new movement. Each delay only stiffened the reactionary A. F. of L. leaders. They added new objections. C.I.O. participation was out of the question and they would have nothing to do with a movement in which the affiliates of the Latin American

Federation of Labor (C.T.A.L.) headed by Vicente Lombardo Tolezano took part. The climax of their position came during the San Francisco United Nations conference when arrangements to launch the W.F.T.U. were finally made. The A. F. of L. then disputed the right of American labor leaders to consult with those of other nations on matters which they regarded as solely in the province of the State Department.

A. F. of L. procrastination was not without point; for it was developed with an eye upon various elements in Europe or elsewhere who the A. F. of L. hoped would become allies in a renewed effort to build a reactionary anti-Soviet bloc. In this respect, much of the advice to A. F. of L. leaders on international policy came from their Social-Democratic associates—the group led by David Dubinsky of the International Ladies Garment Workers Union and émigré Social-Democrats from Europe. These groups assured the A. F. of L.'s top leaders that Social-Democrats of Europe would soon become a decisive factor and revert to their former policies. They set hopes on splitting Italian and French labor and on re-establishing the former Social-Democratic base in Germany and Austria.

As is now known, all those hopes and plans were just empty sales talk. When first steps were made for Anglo-Soviet-American labor unity there was not a legal labor union on the European continent west of the

line of farthest German penetration of the U.S.S.R. Today there are some five million unionists in the Balkan lands, a like number in France, and millions more in Poland, Italy, Czechoslovakia, Norway and other parts.

Far from becoming a base for reactionary alliances, those new labor movements have become a new source of militant and progressive pressure for the international conference. Most European Social-Democrats, as is now evident, have not followed the path of division mapped for them by the old-line Social-Democrats in America and Europe. Europe's Social-Democratic rank and file was too close to the bloody scene to allow anything like that again.

Nevertheless, even at the opening of the conference in Paris, Sir Walter Citrine, secretary of the British unions, raised the threat that his union would not affiliate if certain amendments were not accepted for the proposed W.F.T.U. constitution. The conference heard demands for absorption of the staff members of the expiring I.F.T.U. and election of Walter Schevennels, its secretary, as secretary of the new international federation and for headquarters to be set up in a place other than Paris. A series of other proposals, including one that the executive committee have a right to change the constitution, indicated that hesitancy to definitely launch the new organization still existed.

The debate that followed showed

that the British delegates drew almost no support from any others. The delegates were no longer in a mood to delay. After some minor concessions to Citrine's demands, the British delegation, too, was brought into line. Of course, differences are deeper than the organizational matters raised by Citrine. The British reflected to a degree the policy of the Laborite government. As was shown at the London Conference of Foreign Ministers, Laborite policy was in essence no departure from the policy of the Conservatives.

WORLD LABOR HAS A COMMON AIM

But there was a great contrast in the simultaneous Paris and London conferences. The traditional pressure of imperialist interests asserted itself at London to wreck that parley. But at Paris it was the traditional working-class internationalism that asserted itself, because the W.F.T.U. is based on the one class that is most capable of expressing world unity. The very essence of the Paris deliberations expressed the objective of bringing the influence of the working class more strongly upon the world political scene. The demand for representation of the W.F.T.U. in the United Nations Organization is one aspect of this struggle.

A study of the composition of the Paris conference indicates quite plainly that the weight of working-class influence in the world today is

far greater than it has ever been. But until now this weight was neither concentrated nor brought to bear with full potential strength. The majority of the men and women at the Paris conference were a definite and direct influence in the governments of their respective countries—not through occasional membership in ineffectual “advisory” bodies as in the United States—but through actual cabinet positions and even leaderships of governments. This was true, of course, in the first place, of the delegates of the 27,000,000-strong Soviet trade unions. Sir Walter Citrine, who is among those often critical of the Soviet Union, took note of this quite eloquently in his reply to George Meany, secretary-treasurer of the A. F. of L., who, as fraternal delegate to the Blackpool convention of the British Trades Union Congress in September, delivered a tirade against the Soviet trade unions.

In his sharp reply to Meany, Citrine pointed to the difference in social systems in the U.S.S.R. and other lands and questioned any labor leader's right to charge that the Soviet trade unions do not look after the rights of their members. He said:

“I think it would be an excellent thing if the British government [which was already Laborite] were able to plan the production, consumption and the general economic life of the country in the way in which it is done in Soviet Russia.

“I don't think there are no mistakes

made in Russia. But nobody can say it isn't a good thing to plan these days. It would be a good thing if British unions were taken into confidence on the highest level as are the Russian unions.”

But this war has brought into existence many new governments in which the working class has become the major influence, thanks to collaboration between Communists and Socialists, as in Italy, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Austria, Norway, the Balkan countries and to an extent France. Nor should the working-class influence be overlooked in China (mainly through the Communists) in India's nationalist movement, and within a large number of Latin American lands.

As for the British Labor government, despite its policy that finds so much favor in Tory circles, it will be forced at least to reckon with the demands of its labor movement.

The W.F.T.U., unquestionably, rests on a base that has great effective influence on world developments and even greater potential power as the full effect of the defeat of fascism asserts itself.

The new international federation shows other qualitative advances over its predecessor. Its birth comes on the wave of an unprecedented working-class militancy. In many countries the resurgence of unions sprang up with the feelings that have long been pent up under fascism. The underground resistance movement, in which workers were the principal

participants, has left its mark upon the rapidly rising unions.

Furthermore, when the I.F.T.U. was launched in 1919, the political organizations of labor consisted mainly of Social-Democratic parties, with the Communist movement only beginning to emerge. Today, the Communist organizations are powerful and well established in many countries, especially throughout Europe. The Social-Democratic organizations either suffered a great decline or a change in quality. In most cases they have become favorable to unity with Communists and to friendship with the U.S.S.R.

The other most important factor is the great rise of unionism in the colonies and the so-called "backward" countries. A large percentage of the delegates came from India, China, Latin American, and Near Eastern and African countries. George Meany, himself a strong upholder of "master race" unionism in the A. F. of L., could not help but express his displeasure, when he spoke before the Blackpool convention, at the large number of delegates from British African colonies who had come to the earlier London W.F.T.U. conference.

It seemed inconceivable to him that the trend to unionism could be so fast among the "backward" colonial workers.

The defeat of Japanese imperialism has opened the floodgates for rapid growth of labor unionism in China, Korea, India, Indonesia, Indo-

China, the Phillipines, and the rest of the "Greater Asia" sphere. The presence at the conference of delegates both from the Chungking and Yen-an (Communist-led) unions which are now united in the Chinese Federation of Labor, foreshadowed an early growth of membership to millions.

The acid test for a labor international is its championship of the cause of the colonies against imperialism. The heavy representation from colonial and economically backward countries, already evident, will be a big factor in keeping the W.F.T.U. to the path of true internationalism.

THE RESULTS AT PARIS

Summarizing the factors which make the strength and power of the new organization "exceedingly great," Vassili Kuznetsov, leader of the Soviet delegation, told the Paris Conference: "The international labor movement has various means at its disposal to compel governments and employers to reckon with it. What has to be done now is to employ those means effectively."

It was hardly expected, of course, that after years of sharp differences and conflict, the varied tendencies assembled at Paris would now find themselves in sudden agreement on all issues. There were still some differences, largely expressed on organizational matters. But the conference, in the course of two weeks of sessions, arrived at unanimous

decisions on all important matters because there was agreement on the basic issues and there was a will to unity among the principal leaders. In this respect, a very important role was played by Sidney Hillman, who was in a position to put forward solutions and compromises on many problems.

The results of the conference should wipe out all suspicions of "Soviet domination" and like hangovers from past conflicts that the foes of the W.F.T.U. have exploited. Citrine was elected President for a two-year term and Louis Saillant, of France, general secretary. The British delegates were determined to back Schvennels' election. They came around to agreeing on Saillant's election without qualification for a year, but finally yielded to his unanimous reelection for two years. In like manner, they yielded on Paris being the headquarters. Saillant is one of France's most dynamic labor leaders and headed its resistance movement. As holder of the key post, he will well symbolize the new international's spirit.

The original draft constitution was altered in a number of places to give greater representation to smaller affiliates and ease the burden upon unions of low-wage countries.

Members of the executive of 26 are distributed as follows: U.S.S.R. 3; U.S. and Canada 3; Britain 2; France 2; Latin America and West Indies 2; Near East and Middle East 1 (Egypt, Palestine, Syria, Lebanon,

Iraq, Iran, Arabia, Turkey, Cyprus); China 1; Australasia 1 (alternating between Australia and New Zealand); India and Ceylon 1; Africa 1; Scandinavia 1 (Sweden, Norway, Finland, Denmark, Iceland); Western Europe 1 (Holland, Belgium, Luxembourg, Switzerland, Ireland); southern Europe 1 (Italy, Spain—a provision being made against admittance of Franco Spain); central and eastern Europe 1 (Czechoslovakia, Austria, Hungary, Poland); south-eastern Europe 1 (Romania, Bulgaria, Yugoslavia, Greece, Albania); trade departments 3—each department being entitled to propose one candidate from nominations submitted by unions associated with such departments. The W.F.T.U. general secretary will also be a member of the executive committee.

The following were elected to the Executive Committee: Kuznetsov, Mikhail Tarasov and Mme. Bassova for the U.S.S.R.; C.I.O. President Philip Murray, Hillman and Pat Conroy of the Canadian Congress of Labor for North America; Citrine and Ebby Edwards for Britain; Jouhaux and Benoit Frachon for France; A. E. Monk for Australasia; Chu Hsueh-fan for China; Brian Goodwin for Africa; Vicente Lombardo Toledano and Lazaro Pena for Latin America and the West Indies; Giuseppe Di Vittorio (Italy) for Southern Europe; A. Zapodocky of Czechoslovakia for Eastern and Central Europe; E. Kupers (Holland) for Western Europe; Eiler Jensen

(Denmark) for Scandinavia; Djuro Salaj (Yugoslavia) for Southeast Europe; El Ariss (Lebanon) for the Middle and Near East; S. A. Dange and E. K. Mukerji will alternate for India and Ceylon. With the General Secretary and three representatives of trade departments to be chosen, this will comprise the entire Executive Committee.

At the first meeting of the Executive Committee, seven vice-presidents were named who, together with the two top officers, will make up an Executive Bureau of nine. They are Jouhaux, Kuznetzov, Hillman, Tolodano, Kupers, Chu Hsueh-fan and Vittorio.

Two assistant secretaries were named "to serve under the direction of the general secretary" and Hillman, reporting for the constitution committee stressed that "there is to be a single management—no division of authority."

Taking into account the British request that the executive committee be empowered to make constitutional changes if circumstances require it within the next two years, the conference agreed that such step could be taken only if supported by a two-thirds majority of the general council, with each country or group of countries casting, on a roll call, the vote to which they were entitled at the Paris conference.

Thus, the door was still left open to the A. F. of L. to affiliate and receive representation.

Among the resolutions passed was

one instructing the executive to name a commission to go to Germany and Japan and "make a full investigation of economic and social conditions, the progress made in the liquidation of fascism and the possibility of reconstruction of free, democratic trade unions." The executive is also to work for W.F.T.U. representation in an advisory capacity on the Allied Control Commission in Europe and the occupation authority in Japan.

The executive committee was further instructed to work for an opportunity for the W.F.T.U. to "fully and effectively express its views on the peace treaties now under discussion" and to secure for the W.F.T.U. representation on "all other international agencies hereafter established for the purpose of dealing with the problems of peace and reconstruction." A commission to go to Germany was immediately named.

The conference recommended the establishment of a commission to investigate economic and political conditions in colonial and semi-colonial countries. Other resolutions called for a complete break of economic relations with Franco-Spain and Peronist Argentina; establishment of a commission to investigate into charges that rights of self-determination are being suppressed in Indonesia, Puerto Rico and other countries. One resolution called for an "indefatigable fight" by the W.F.T.U. upon race discrimination.

Other resolutions called for economic development of "backward"

lands without exploitation of their peoples; for a fight upon monopolies and cartels and for a commission to investigate charges that the Anti-Fascist Federation of Greek Trade Unions was not allowed to send a delegation to the Paris conference.

PARIS AND AMERICAN LABOR

How will the results of the Paris conference affect the American labor movement? Unquestionably the link American labor has with the W.F.T.U. will have a profound influence upon the thinking of American organized labor. In countries with stronger Socialist background and Communist influence, internationalism is not an issue in the trade unions. It still is in the United States. The A. F. of L., with the aid of the reactionary press, especially the Hearst papers, is fighting hard to prevent the firm developments of internationalism among America's workers. As we have seen, even the ineffective I.F.T.U. was objectionable to the A. F. of L.'s top bureaucracy until the aim of keeping out the Soviet trade unions became a consideration.

What few experiences American labor had in international relations were sidetracked by A. F. of L. leaders and historians. Such experience suggests too strongly a horizon that extends far beyond the narrowness of the economic problems to which A. F. of L. members have been generally held.

The United States has benefitted greatly from even the thin threads that linked our very weak labor movement of Civil War days with the then newly formed International Workingman's Association of which Karl Marx was leader. It was Marx who inspired the demonstrations in England against that country's preparations to enter our Civil War on the side of the slaveowners. Recognizing this tangible example of working-class international solidarity, Lincoln then wrote that "the strongest bond of human sympathy outside of the family relation should be one uniting all working people of all nations and languages and kindreds."

American labor's contribution to the world of the idea of May Day as the day of solidarity for workers of all lands, has been drowned out in A. F. of L. Labor Day speeches about the identity of capital-labor interests.

Some A. F. of L. leaders have developed international aspirations since they ventured out beyond U.S. borders to strengthen an anti-Soviet bloc in the I.F.T.U. They have maneuvered to lead in the rejuvenation of the I.F.T.U., so as to enable it to become again a labor base for reaction. Advised and encouraged by old line Social-Democrats here, they sought allies in covered up leftovers of fascism in the reoccupied lands, old discredited imperialist tools in countries below the Rio Grande and among some British labor conservatives. When their failure became

certain shortly before the San Francisco United Nations Conference, they rediscovered that even the concept of internationalism is wrong and illegal. An A. F. of L. statement declared on March 16:

"As citizens we have a right and duty to express our views to our President, but to negotiate with citizens of other nations on the terms of international political and economic commitments goes far beyond the legitimate functions of trade unions or the privileges of citizenship."

George Meany, in his address at the Blackpool T.U.C. convention, said that a union may have a right to criticize or commend its own government, "But," he added, "we emphatically do not believe that any international trade union gathering has any such right in so far as our country is concerned." He denounced the W.F.T.U. as a "super-state of labor designed to influence the economic and political affairs of all nations of the world."

When all this is coupled with the A. F. of L. Council's statements viewing the atom bomb as a weapon for American world supremacy and in support of the anti-Soviet trend in British and American foreign policies, we can see the real pattern. The A. F. of L. top leaders are simply expressing more openly their traditional partnership with the most reactionary monopolist circles. What interest would they have, therefore, in joining or supporting an interna-

tional which is working for United Nations unity as a condition for peace and progress?

People of other countries and Americans not too close to labor problems often take A. F. of L. policy as an expression of the membership. The truth is that international problems have always been suppressed in the A. F. of L., in some instances by a constitutional ban upon them. A. F. of L. leaders do not have support of the members on questions of international relations. The lower affiliates are never even asked to pass upon statements issued in their behalf. The top leaders speak for the A. F. of L. membership simply by default; the members have not yet developed an interest in those problems to a point of even seriously examining the statements issued in their name, by the William Greens and Matthew Wolls. The primary problem, therefore, is one of arousing all unionists to think and act on issues affecting international security.

The historic contribution of the C.I.O. spelled the end of this aloofness from questions affecting international relations. The C.I.O. established American labor's tie to world labor on a constructive basis. But above all was the crucial test of relations with Soviet labor. The C.I.O. exchanged delegations with the Soviet trade unions and, on the visit of the Americans to Moscow, moved for the establishment of the American-Soviet Trade Union Committee. Similar steps have been taken with

Fren
labor
ficia
Amer
terna
time.

We
of ac
section
and t
educ
class
is beg
Wall
Amer
devel
ments
gle b
gressi
reachi

The
shoul
viciou
when
is onl
tion t
They
with
narrow
predor
New
Paris
ammu

French labor, and the recent British labor convention moved for an official link with the C.I.O. Latin-American unions have been fraternally linked to the C.I.O. for some time.

We have, indeed, entered a period of active relations between a large section of American organized labor and the workers of the world. The education of the American working class in the spirit of internationalism is beginning in earnest. The Chinese Wall which for many years kept American workers in the dark as to developments in other labor movements is breaking down. The struggle between reactionaries and progressives in the labor movement is reaching a higher plane.

The difficulties in this struggle should not be minimized. The viciousness of A. F. of L. statements when they denounce the W.F.T.U. is only indicative of their determination to give no quarter on the issue. They will strengthen their alliances with monopoly groups and exploit narrow craft economism which is still predominant in the A. F. of L.

Nevertheless, the results of the Paris conference should furnish fresh ammunition for the growing minor-

ity within the A. F. of L. that is struggling for affiliation with the W.F.T.U. All maneuvers to delay formation of the new organization fell flat. Only the A. F. of L. among major labor organizations, is out of it. Furthermore, the cry that the Soviet unions want to dominate the W.F.T.U. was shown up as ridiculous. The U.S.S.R.'s unions, with more than a third of the total W.F.T.U. membership, received only three out of 26 seats on the general council and a voting strength far below their proportionate strength. The conservative groups in Europe's labor movements went along on all major decisions.

Even in the C.I.O. the problem is not simple. The general membership is only formally aware of the C.I.O.'s link with the W.F.T.U. The meaning of international trade union unity has not yet been driven home to the millions. A great deal in that respect may be expected when the delegates from Paris and the U.S.S.R. deliver their reports to the membership. This should offer a tremendous opportunity to educate both C.I.O. and A. F. of L. workers on the significance of the historic steps that have been taken.

FREDERICK ENGELS

By VLADIMIR LENIN

Frederick Engels was born in Barmen, Germany, 125 years ago (November 28, 1820) and died in London fifty years ago (August 5, 1895). He was two years younger than Karl Marx, whose closest friend and collaborator he remained from the time they met in 1844 till the latter's death in 1883. Co-founder with Marx of Scientific Socialism, Engels spent a full half-century in developing and advancing the great liberating science of the working class—Marxism.

Vladimir Lenin was born 75 years ago (April 22, 1870). He began to write on economic and political questions almost at the same youthful age as Marx and Engels. The accompanying article, on the occasion of the death of his great teacher, Lenin wrote when he was 25 years old and published it together with contributions by Plekhanov and others in the "Worker Collection"—a forerunner of the famous "Iskra." Like Engels, who continued the work of Marx, Lenin, already a trained Marxist when Engels died, carried on for the next thirty years the scientific work begun by his two illustrious predecessors.

Frederick Engels can forever remain a guide in the struggle against alien ideologies and revisionist caricatures of Marxism. His and Marx's writings, as well as those of Lenin

and Stalin, are replete with warnings against those who would attempt to dilute our theory or divert the workers from the path of the class struggle. It is well to remember on this anniversary that Engels was one of the greatest minds of the 19th century and that he left a heritage which will forever remain a source of enlightenment and inspiration to the workers of the world.

—The Editors.

Oh, what a lamp of reason ceased to burn,

What a heart had ceased to throb!

IN LONDON, on August 5, 1895, Frederick Engels breathed his last. After his friend Karl Marx (who died in 1883), Engels was the most remarkable scientist and teacher of the modern proletariat in the whole civilized world. Ever since fate brought Karl Marx and Frederick Engels together, the lifework of both friends became their common cause, to understand, therefore, what Frederick Engels has done for the proletariat, one must clearly master the significance of the work and teaching of Marx in the development of the contemporary labor movement. Marx and Engels were the first to show that the working class with its demands was the necessary outcome of the modern economic order, which, together with the bourgeoisie, inevitably creates and organizes the pro-

* From a well-known verse by Nekrasov written on the death of the famous revolutionary publicist of the 'fifties and 'sixties, Dobrotvorskiy.

letariat. They have shown that it is not the well-meaning attempts of some noble-minded individuals that will deliver humanity from the ills which now oppress it, but the class struggle of the organized proletariat. Marx and Engels, in their scientific works, were the first to explain that socialism is not the fancy of dreamers but the final aim and the inevitable result of the development of the productive forces of modern society. All recorded history up till now was the history of class struggle, the change of domination and the victory of one social class over another. And this will continue until the bases of the class struggle and class rule—private property and anarchic social production—have ceased to exist. The interests of the proletariat demand the overthrow of these bases, and therefore the conscious class struggle of the organized workers must be directed against them. And every class struggle is a political struggle.

These views of Marx and Engels have now been made their own by the whole proletariat fighting for its emancipation, but when the two friends in the 'forties took part in the socialist literature and social movements of their time, such opinions were something quite new. At that time there were many people—talented and mediocre, honest and dishonest—who, carried away by the struggle for political freedom and the struggle against the autocracy of kings, police and priests, did not see

the antagonism of interests between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat. These people did not even admit the idea of the workers coming forward as an independent social force. There were, on the other hand, many dreamers, some of them men of genius, who thought that it was but necessary to convince the rulers and governing classes of the injustice of the modern social order, and it would then be easy to establish peace on earth and general well-being. They dreamt of a socialism without struggle. Finally, almost all the socialists of that day and the friends of the working class generally considered the proletariat only an *ulcer* and observed with horror how, with the growth of industry, this ulcer was growing too. All of them, therefore, contemplated how to stop the development of industry, together with the proletariat, how to stop the "wheel of history." Contrary to the general fear of the growth of the proletariat, Marx and Engels placed all their hopes on its continuous growth. The greater the number of proletarians, the greater will be their power as a revolutionary class, and the nearer and more possible the coming of socialism. In a few words, the services rendered by Marx and Engels to the working class may be expressed thus: they taught the working class to know itself and become class-conscious and they substituted science for dreaming.

This is why the name and life of Engels should be known to every

worker. This is why we must give in this volume (the aim of which is, as in all our publications, to awaken class consciousness in the Russian workers) an outline of the life and activity of Frederick Engels, one of the two great teachers of the modern proletariat.

Engels was born in 1820 in Barmen, in the Rhine province of the Prussian kingdom. His father was a manufacturer. In 1823, Engels was forced by family circumstances to enter one of the Bremen commercial houses as a salesman, before completing his course at the *gymnasium*. His commercial occupation did not prevent Engels from working on his scientific and political education. While still at the *gymnasium* he came to hate autocracy and the arbitrariness of officials. His studies of philosophy led him further. The teaching of Hegel dominated German philosophy at that time, and Engels became his disciple. Although Hegel himself was an admirer of the autocratic Prussian state, in whose service he was occupying the post of professor in the Berlin University, the *teaching* of Hegel was revolutionary. The faith of Hegel in human reason and its rights, and the fundamental proposition of the Hegelian philosophy that a constant process of change and development is going on in the universe, had led those of the students of the Berlin philosophy, who did not desire to reconcile themselves with the actual state of things, to the

idea that the struggle with the actual state of things, the struggle with the existing wrong and ruling evil, is equally rooted in the universal law of eternal development. If all things develop, if one set of institutions is replaced by others, then why should the autocracy of the Prussian king or the Russian tsar—or the enrichment of an insignificant minority, or the domination of the bourgeoisie over the people—continue forever?

The philosophy of Hegel spoke of the development of the mind and ideas; it was *idealistic*. From the development of the mind it deduced the development of nature, man, human and social relations. Marx and Engels, while maintaining Hegel's idea of the eternal process of development,* rejected the preconceived idealistic outlook. Turning to life, they saw that it is not the development of mind that explains the development of nature, but on the contrary, mind must be explained from nature, from matter. . . . Contrary to Hegel and other Hegelians, Marx and Engels were materialists. Casting a materialistic glance at the universe and humanity, they perceived that just as material causes lay at the basis of all phenomena of nature, so also the development of human society was conditioned by the development of material productive forces. The relations in which men

* Marx and Engels pointed out, many a time, that they, in their intellectual development, are very much indebted to the great German philosophers, particularly Hegel. "Without German philosophy," says Engels, "there would have been no scientific socialism."

stan-
tion
isfact
pend
prod
relati
be fo
social
and
Th
force
upon
see th
prod
jority
trates
cant
the b
this o
the v
befor
need
social
mode
realiz
this f
its int
prolet
his ac
in En
indust
mover
servic
which
Here,
the fa
the sh
were
erty a
But h
person

stand to each other in the production of things necessary for the satisfaction of their human needs depend upon the development of the productive forces. And it is in these relations that the explanation is to be found of all the phenomena of social life, human aspirations, ideas and laws.

The development of productive forces creates social relations based upon private property, but now we see that the same development of the productive forces deprives the majority of their property and concentrates it in the hands of an insignificant minority. It destroys property, the basis of the modern social order; this development itself tends toward the very aim which the socialists put before themselves. The socialists need but understand which of the social forces is, by its position in modern society, interested in the realization of socialism and imbue this force with a consciousness of its interests and historical tasks. The proletariat is that force. Engels made his acquaintance with the proletariat in England, in the center of British industry, in Manchester, whither he moved in 1842, entering into the service of a commercial house of which his father was a shareholder. Here, Engels did not merely sit in the factory office but walked about the slums in which the workers were cooped up and saw their poverty and misery with his own eyes. But he did not confine himself to personal observations. He read all

that had been discovered before him concerning the position of the British working class and made a careful study of all the official documents that were accessible to him. The fruit of his studies and observations was the book which appeared in 1845: *The Condition of the Working Class in England*.

We have already mentioned above the chief service of Engels as the author of *The Condition of the Working Class in England*. There were many, even before Engels, who described the sufferings of the proletariat and showed the necessity of helping it. Engels was the first to say that the proletariat was *not merely* a suffering class, but that it was the shameful economic position in which the proletariat finds itself which inexorably drives it forward and forces it to fight for its final emancipation. And the fighting proletariat *will help itself by its own efforts*. The political movement of the working class will inevitably lead the workers to the consciousness that there is no way out for them except socialism. On the other hand, socialism will be a power only when it becomes the aim of the *political* struggle of the working class. Such are the main ideas of Engels' book *The Condition of the Working Class in England*, ideas, now owned by the entire thinking and fighting proletariat, but which at that time were quite new. These ideas were enunciated in a book, attractively written and full of the most authen-

tic and terrible pictures of the distress of the British proletariat. That book was a terrible indictment of capitalism and the bourgeoisie. The impression created by it was very great. Engels' book began to be referred to everywhere as the best picture of the conditions of the modern proletariat. And, in fact, neither before nor since 1845 did there appear so striking and truthful a picture of the distress of the working class.

It was only in England that Engels became a socialist. In Manchester he entered into relations with the workers of the British labor movement and began to write for the English socialist publications. In 1844, on returning to Germany via Paris, he became acquainted in that city with Marx, with whom he had already previously entered into correspondence. In Paris, under the influence of the French Socialists and French life, Marx also became a socialist. Here the friends jointly wrote a book entitled *The Holy Family, or a Criticism of Critical Criticism*. In this book, which appeared a year before *The Condition of the Working Class in England* and of which the greater part was written by Marx, are laid the foundations of that revolutionary materialistic socialism, the chief ideas of which we expounded above. *The Holy Family* is a humorous nickname for the Bauer brothers, philosophers, and their disciples. These gentlemen preached criticism, which stands above any reality, above parties and

politics, rejecting all practical activity, and only "critically" contemplates the surrounding world and the events which take place in it. The Messrs. Bauer judged the proletariat disdainfully as an uncritical mass. Marx and Engels decidedly attacked this absurd and harmful tendency. In the name of the worker—a real human personality, downtrodden by the ruling classes and the government—they called not for contemplation but for a struggle for a better order of society. They considered, of course, the proletariat as the power that is capable of waging such a struggle and that is interested in it. Even before the appearance of *The Holy Family*, Engels published in the *German-French Annals* of Marx and Ruge, the *Critical Essay of Political Economy* in which he considered, from the point of view of socialism, the main phenomena of the modern economic order as the necessary consequence of the rule of private property. The intercourse with Engels undoubtedly contributed to the decision of Marx to make a study of political economy, the science in which his works produced a whole revolution.

Engels lived in Brussels and Paris from 1845 to 1847, combining scientific pursuits with practical work among the German workers in Brussels and Paris. Here Marx and Engels came into contact with the secret German "Communist League," which commissioned them to expound the main principles of social-

ism el
the fa
mun
printe
little b
ber of
to the
ganize
the ci
The
of all
spread
Europ
back
Rheni
selves
Neue
publis
friend
lution
Rheni
the u
ple ar
tionar
know
Neue
presse
grant
sian
Engel
armed
three
the r
Switz
Ma
city.
more
holde
Manc
in th
in M

ism elaborated by them. This is how the famous *Manifesto of the Communist Party* of Marx and Engels, printed in 1848, originated. This little booklet is worth a whole number of volumes: its spirit gives life to the movement of the entire organized and fighting proletariat of the civilized world.

The revolution of 1848, which first of all broke out in France and then spread to other countries in Western Europe, brought Marx and Engels back to their native land. Here, in Rhenish Prussia, they found themselves at the head of the democratic *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* which was published in Cologne. The two friends were the soul of all the revolutionary democratic aspirations in Rhenish Prussia. They defended to the utmost the interests of the people and of freedom, against the reactionary forces. The latter, as is known, gained the upper hand. The *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* was suppressed. Marx, who during his emigrant life lost his rights as a Prussian subject, was banished, while Engels took part in the people's armed uprising, fought for liberty in three battles, and after the defeat of the rebels escaped to London via Switzerland.

Marx also settled down in that city. Engels soon after became once more a clerk and afterwards a shareholder of the commercial house in Manchester in which he had worked in the 'forties. Up to 1870 he lived in Manchester while Marx lived in

London, which did not, however, prevent them from maintaining a most lively intellectual intercourse: they corresponded almost daily. The two friends exchanged their views and knowledge in this correspondence and continued, in collaboration, to elaborate scientific socialism. In 1870, Engels moved to London and their common spiritual life, full of strenuous labor, was continued till 1883, the year when Marx died. Its fruit was, on the part of Marx, *Capital*, the greatest work on political economy of our age, and on the part of Engels—a whole number of large and small works. Marx worked on an analysis of the complicated phenomena of capitalist economy. Engels, in works written in a very easy and frequently polemic style, elucidated the more general scientific questions and various events of the past and present, in the spirit of the materialist conception of history and the economic theories of Marx. Of these works of Engels, we will mention: a polemical work against Dühring (here are analyzed the most important questions in the domain of philosophy, natural science and social science),* *The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State* (translated into Russian, published in St. Petersburg, 1895), *Lud-*

* This is a wonderfully rich and instructive book. Unfortunately only a small portion of it is translated into Russian, containing an historical outline of the development of socialism—*Socialism, Utopian and Scientific*. [All of the books by Engels, referred to by Lenin in this paragraph, are now available in English, published by International Publishers, New York.—*The Editors.*]

wig Feuerbach (Russian translation with notes by Plekhanov, Geneva, 1892), an article on the foreign policy of the Russian government (translated into Russian in the Geneva *Social-Democrat*, Nos. 1 and 2), some remarkable articles on the housing question, and finally, two small but very valuable articles on the economic development of Russia (*Frederick Engels on Russia*, translated into Russian by Vera Zaslulich, Geneva, 1894). Marx died before completing his great work, *Capital*. However, there was a rough draft, and Engels, after the death of his friend, undertook the heavy labor of working up and publishing the second and third volumes of *Capital*. In 1885 he published Volume II and in 1894 Volume III. (He did not succeed in working up Volume IV.) A great deal of work was required on these two volumes. The Austrian Social-Democrat Adler rightly remarked that by the publication of Volumes II and III of *Capital* Engels erected in memory of the genius that had been his friend, a majestic monument on which he, without intending it, indelibly carved his own name. These two volumes of *Capital* are, indeed, the work of both Marx and Engels. Ancient legends tell of various touching examples of friendship. The European proletariat may say that its science was created by two scholars and fighters, whose relations surpass all the most touching tales of the ancients concerning hu-

man friendship. Engels always—and on the whole, justly so—placed himself behind Marx. "With Marx," he wrote to an old friend, "I always played second fiddle." His love for Marx when the latter was alive, and his reverence for Marx's memory after the latter's death, were infinite. This stern fighter and strict thinker possessed a deeply loving soul.

After the movement of 1848-49, Marx and Engels, in exile, were not occupied with science alone. Marx in 1864 formed the International Workingmen's Association and led it during the course of a whole decade. Engels too took an active part in its affairs. The work of the International Association, which, according to the idea of Marx, united the proletarians of all countries, was of tremendous significance for the development of the labor movement. The unifying role of Marx and Engels continued even after the International Association came to an end in the 'seventies. Moreover, it may be said that their importance as spiritual leaders of the labor movement was constantly increasing insofar as the movement itself was growing incessantly. After the death of Marx, Engels alone continued to remain the counselor and leader of the European socialists. His advice and directions were sought both by the German socialists (who, despite government persecution, rapidly and uninterruptedly increased in numbers) and the representatives of backward countries, such as Spain

jards, Roumanians and Russians, who had to think out and weigh their first steps. All of them drew upon the rich treasures of knowledge and experience of old Engels.

Marx and Engels, both of whom knew the Russian language and read Russian books, took a lively interest in Russia, followed with sympathy the Russian revolutionary movement and maintained connections with Russian revolutionaries. Both of them were *democrats* before they became socialists, and the democratic feeling of *hatred* toward political despotism was strongly developed in them. This direct political feeling together with a profound theoretical understanding of the connection between political despotism and economic oppression, as well as their rich experience of life, made Marx and Engels uncommonly responsive, particularly in regard to *politics*. Therefore, the heroic struggle of a small handful of Russian revolutionaries with the mighty tsarist government found the most sympathetic echo in the hearts of these tried revolutionaries. The inclination, on the contrary, of turning, for the sake of supposed economic advantages, from the immediate and important task of Russian socialists—the winning of political freedom—naturally appeared in their eyes as suspicious and was even considered by them a betrayal of the great cause of the social revolution. "The emancipation of the proletariat must be the work

of the proletariat itself"—this is what Marx and Engels constantly taught. But in order that it may fight for its economic emancipation, the proletariat must win for itself certain *political* rights. Besides this, Marx and Engels clearly saw that a political revolution in Russia would be of tremendous importance also for the labor movement in Western Europe. Autocratic Russia was always a bulwark of the entire European reaction. The uncommonly favorable international position in which Russia was placed by the war of 1870, which for a long time put Germany and France at loggerheads, only increased, of course, the importance of autocratic Russia as a reactionary force. Only a free Russia that requires the oppression of neither the Poles, Finns, Germans, Armenians nor that of other small peoples, and does not need the constant incitement of France against Germany—only a free Russia will enable modern Europe to breathe a sigh of relief from the military burdens, will weaken all the reactionary elements in Europe and increase the power of the European working class. This is why Engels, for the sake also of the success of the labor movement in the West, ardently desired the establishment of political freedom in Russia. By his death, the Russian revolutionaries have lost their best friend.

Eternal memory to Frederick Engels, the great champion and teacher of the proletariat!

AUSTRALIAN COMMUNISTS REJECT BROWDER'S REVISIONISM

By L. L. SHARKEY

President, Australian Communist Party

THE RECENT EVENTS in the Communist movement of the United States, the mistakes that have been made there, and the efforts of the comrades to rectify their position, have a direct bearing on the policies which we Australian Communists are now discussing in preparation for the forming of correct perspectives and policies at our coming National Congress.

Jacques Duclos revealed, and the American Communist leadership has now accepted his view, that the Communist Political Association has been following a line of propagating a theory which represented a "false theory of social evolution in general" and resulted in practice in the revision of Marxism-Leninism and the dissolution of the Communist Party of the United States.

The "false theory of social evolution" was clearly expressed in the speeches of Earl Browder on the sub-

ject of the Teheran Conference and particularly in his book on Teheran.

ASSUMPTIONS FROM TEHERAN

On Teheran, Browder based theories that "everything was changed," that the colonies would be liberated and industrialized by the capitalist monopolies by agreement and without struggle, that if the workers collaborated with the capitalists in the postwar period and carried through a "no strike" pledge the capitalists would voluntarily "double living standards" and provide 60,000,000 jobs, that peace would be guaranteed and there would be such an economic development and "rosy" future for the masses that Socialism could more or less be relegated to the museum.

A condition for this was that in no country should there be the raising of the issue of Socialism by the workers, nor even nationalization of key monopolies, particularly in the U.S.A., nor any demand that would in any way "tease the (monopolist) beast."

Communist Parties, as eyesores to the capitalists, were to be dissolved in order to put the monopolists in the humor to "double living standards." Marxism-Leninism still had a role to play in the educational field, the minor one of enlightening the capitalists as to the methods whereby wonders were to be achieved and the necessary miracles performed.

Browder's statements were supplemented by a pamphlet by Robert

Minor in which the cardinal teachings of Marxism-Leninism on the dictatorship of the proletariat and armed struggles were likewise renounced. The criticism of Jacques Duclos has dissolved these pretty bubbles into thin air.

The question arises, whether, in rejecting the false concepts of Earl Browder, the Communists reject the decisions of the Teheran Conference, the world organization for peace established at the San Francisco Conference, the rehabilitation of devastated areas, industrialization of backward countries, the application of the Atlantic Charter in regard to the independence of the nations and participation in postwar reconstruction plans while capitalism is still in existence over a large part of the world?

IS WAR INEVITABLE?

Have the Communists, in rejecting Earl Browder's false theory of social evolution, gone over to a standpoint of the inevitability of war? Will they cease to participate in plans to cushion or avert economic breakdown, and see the future as merely a new depression followed by a new world war, which should be accepted fatalistically, as inevitable?

No, such a mechanical outlook is alien to the spirit of Marxism-Leninism, which is active and creative, and understands that within the strength of the masses and a united labor and democratic movement lies the power needed for the struggle to avert such catastrophes.

The Communists would be the last to deny, however, that if the masses fail and the reaction, the monopolists and fascist sympathizers gain the day in America and the countries of the British Empire, then the world will be in peril of repeating the history of war-depression-war which has marked the path of capitalism since the beginning of this century in particular.

Mankind again would be headed for the abyss if the anti-Sovieteers had their way. But to recognize the danger and where it lies is not to accept it as inevitable but, on the contrary, to sharpen our weapons for the political struggle against the forces which personify the danger.

THE FEAR OF ANOTHER WAR

Earl Browder, contemplating this possibility, appears to have panicked; at any rate, he suffered a complete ideological collapse. He said a new world war would mean "ruin" and "the end of civilization," and saw the way to avoid the danger as "pacification" or "appeasement" of the reactionary monopolists and a tailing behind the liberal bourgeoisie, instead of as the further growth and unity of the mass movement for peace and security, the further strengthening of the Communist Party and of the democratic forces unleashed by the historic victory over fascism and the struggle to control monopolies and to nationalize them. True, a new war would be a catas-

trophe more gigantic than this war, but not "the end of civilization."

We reject Earl Browder's exaggerated conclusions around Teheran; but the Communists are among the firmest supporters of the world organization for peace and security and the most vigorous opponents of war in the future as we have been in the past.

Rejecting the idyll of a capitalist-worker economic paradise providing "doubled standards of living" by means of class-collaboration, the Communists remain in the vanguard of the fight for postwar reconstruction, for homes, jobs and improved living standards and freedom for the individual.

THE STRUGGLE FOR PARTIAL PROGRAMS

An immediate program of a constructive character, meeting the urgent needs of the masses, is as much a part of Marxism-Leninism as dialectics, surplus value or any other cornerstone of Marxist-Leninist theory and practice. If the workers did not struggle for partial programs, for reforms, they would become degraded wretches past hope of redemption, Karl Marx himself wrote in *Value, Price and Profit*. Our views as to what constitutes a postwar program are outlined in the draft policy, "Jobs, Peace, Freedom," now under discussion and amendment by Party branches and which will be submitted to our coming 14th National Congress.

Therefore, as always, we support all measures, economic, political and organizational, for the maintenance of world peace and to secure homes and jobs for the people, while rejecting the Browder concept that this is assured by class collaboration with the monopoly capitalists and reliance on the goodwill of the liberal wing of the bourgeoisie.

We rely on the strength of a united and conscious labor movement, cooperating with all other democratic forces in struggle against the imperialists and pro-fascists, as the best guarantee of peace and reconstruction.

STRUGGLES AGAINST MONOPOLY GROUPS

Also, we believe that postwar reconstruction can be achieved by means of serious political struggle against the most powerful and reactionary monopoly capital groups, by the nationalization of key industries and strict control of prices and profiteers, raw materials and essential public utilities and services, whereas Browder rejected not only nationalization, but any form of control of monopolies.

All of this demands a strong, independent Communist Party, a united labor movement and a genuine national unity of the workers, soldiers, middle-class and the toiling farmers.

If, then, the laws of capitalism, as revealed by Marxism-Leninism, remain in full force, does this mean

that there will be new economic crises in the future, instead of the "rosy future" and long period of capitalist expansion, internally and as a world system, predicted by Browder?

There can be no doubt that the capitalist countries will experience economic crises in the future as in the past.

No "diplomatic document" between States can overcome that fundamental feature of capitalism; while international efforts may cushion, mitigate or delay it, eventually the basic laws of capitalist production and the market will assert themselves. *No Marxist could ever believe otherwise and remain a Marxist.*

UNEMPLOYMENT IN THE U.S.A.

Already, in the United States, the unemployed queues are forming as industries are being re-adjusted to the new situation created by the end of the anti-Nazi war. Capitalism also experiences periods of boom and there is the likelihood of a boom period in the postwar, created by the demand for capital goods in the devastated areas and the shortage of all kinds of consumption goods, including foodstuffs and agricultural products.

Our immediate postwar program is aimed at fighting against possible immediate recrudescence of mass unemployment. That is its main urgency and significance for the working class.

Has capitalism, taken as a world system, been strengthened by the

anti-fascist People's War, as assumed by Earl Browder? The very fact of the destruction of such mighty imperialist powers as Germany, in the first place, Japan and Italy, obviously weakens on all sides the power of world imperialism.

IMPERIALISM AFTER THE WAR

In addition, in many countries of Europe the most powerful trusts are being nationalized. The land-owning aristocracy in East Prussia, Poland, Hungary, etc., are being expropriated and their former possessions divided among the peasantry.

Capitalist relations are not abolished, but the new democracy in Europe is, nevertheless, fundamentally different from the "orthodox" bourgeois democracy we know in Australia, namely, a Parliamentary system dominated by the trusts and finance capitalists whose power remains intact.

In Europe, there are being established States which represent a democracy of the working class, peasants, and middle class, based on the expropriation of the big bourgeoisie in town and country. That must be fully appreciated. Browder believed these countries should remain capitalist; we never shared that view. Imperialism, therefore, has been dealt severe blows in those countries, including France.

Then there is the added strength and prestige of the Soviet Union and the increased strength of the national revolutionary movements in the col-

onies. Above all, the resurgence of a united labor movement, as expressed in the establishment of the World Trade Union Federation and the new position of leadership held by the labor movement in the anti-fascist governments.

All this has weakened the position of imperialism and the foundations of capitalism itself.

AMERICAN IMPERIALISM STRENGTHENED

At the same time, American imperialism has become stronger and emerges as the most powerful capitalist country in the world. One would not say the British Empire has emerged much stronger, although it has greater market possibilities now that German competition has been destroyed. The greater strength of the U.S.A. and the colonial movements limit its strength to a degree.

So much attention has been focused on the policy divergences between the Soviet Union on the one hand and Britain and America on the other that the antagonism between the latter two is often overlooked. Nevertheless, the struggle for positions, markets and domination of vital strategic points between them is acute.

The American ruling class has no intention of helping British capitalism maintain its world position by refraining from using its own enormous advantages and its superior military strength. Quite the contrary.

Lenin's analysis of imperialism gives the answer to that and not Browder's futile idea that these two would liberate the colonies and amicably divide the world market between them.

This does not "inevitably" mean war between them, but it does mean rivalry and political and economic struggles, and perhaps "revolutions" in various satellite countries as in the past; neither does it exclude war. This, too, means a weakness in world capitalism and strengthens the position of the democratic forces in relation to it.

The conclusion is that world capitalism has been weakened, not strengthened, by the defeat of the fascist powers.

WHAT IS REVISIONISM?

The criticism of Jacques Duclos revealed revisionism and liquidationism in the U.S.A. Communist movement. What, then, is meant by revision and liquidation?

Lenin defines revisionism in Vol. IV, *Selected Works*, p. 151, as

... The attempts of a certain section of the Party intelligentsia to liquidate the existing organization of the Russian Social-Democratic Labor Party and substitute for it an amorphous association within the limits of legality at all costs, even if this legality is to be attained at the price of an open renunciation of the program, tactics and traditions of the Party.

Liquidation does not necessarily

mean a complete organizational dissolution, but the renunciation of the "program, tactics and traditions of the Party." The organization could continue as an opportunist ghost of a workers' party. And that was largely the position into which the American comrades had allowed themselves to drift.

The discussion in the U. S. organization reveals: loss of trade union positions, falling off in dues payment to a serious extent, record low circulation of the Party press and Marxist-Leninist literature, lessening of mass activity by the branches, accompanied by the calling off of a series of mass meetings, radio talks and issuance of leaflets during the election campaign, cancellation of recruiting, and a proposal for the liquidation of the Party organization entirely in the Southern states.

Party members studied the "popular" writings of Browder and others and disregarded study of the Marxist classics. Such was the morass into which Browder's opportunist theorizing led the U. S. Communists.

WHAT LENIN SAID

Revisionism was defined by Lenin as follows in Vol. II, *Selected Works*, p. 709:

A natural complement to the economic and political tendencies of revisionism was its attitude to the final aim of the Socialist movement. "The final aim is nothing, the movement is everything"—this catch-phrase of Bernstein's expresses the substance of revisionism better than many long arguments.

The policy of revisionism consists in determining its conduct from case to case, in adapting itself to the events of the day and to the chops and changes of petty politics; it consists in forgetting the basic interests of the proletariat, the main features of the capitalist system as a whole and of capitalist evolution as a whole, and in sacrificing these basic interests for the real or assumed advantages of the moment.

And it patently follows from the very nature of this policy that it may assume an infinite variety of forms, and that every more or less "new" question, every more or less unexpected and unforeseen turn of events, even though it may change the basic line of development only to an insignificant degree and only for the shortest period of time, will always inevitably give rise to one or another variety of revisionism.

Revisionism of Marxism and liquidation of the Party in principle was the historical crime of the Germans and Second Internationalists, headed by Bernstein and Kautsky, which was so often and so scathingly denounced by Lenin.

What was the outcome of revision and liquidation on the part of Kautsky, Bernstein and the Second International? History supplies a most convincing answer: the defeat of the revolution in all countries except Russia (where Lenin and Stalin had successfully combatted the revisionists, including the traitor Trotsky) at the end of the last war; the going over of the Second International to the side of the counter-revolution and

the subsequent temporary victory of fascism throughout Europe. Such were the dreadful fruits of revisionism for the labor movement and the people of the world: millions were slain by fascists.

Jacques Duclos makes it abundantly clear that the victory of Browderism in the Communist Parties would have led to a catastrophe similar to that caused by the triumph of Bernsteinism in the Second International.

BROWDER ON AUSTRALIA

Crassly revisionist was the outcome of Browder's theory in relation to the objective of the labor movement and his attempt to apply it to Australia.

In a letter addressed to myself Earl Browder applied his "postponement of Socialism" theory to Australia as follows:

Australia, I believe, presents enough established facts to demand the conclusion that, so long as at least the Teheran-Yalta concord lasts, it will remain in the capitalist sector of the world.

What are the facts upon which this judgment is based? First, that Australia shares to a high degree those characteristics which make the U.S.A. the capitalist pole of the world; together with Canada, she is an outstanding example of rapid expansion of basic production plant.

Second, that Australian economy is closely geared in with that of the U.S.A., and has not sufficient independent base to make possible a divergent course even if a majority desired it.

Third, Australia's geographical position plus her high production potential

is highly favorable for securing her full share of the world markets which must be developed as the pre-condition for the lasting peace projected by Teheran-Yalta. . . . In my judgment these three factors are alone sufficient to establish as a practical certainty that Australia will remain a capitalist country for so long a time as the U.S.A. is able to retain a firm capitalist perspective.

. . . The practical tasks in Australia, if this analysis is correct, may be summed up in the organization and training and education of the working class in the solution of all the problems of the nation, to make it capable of becoming the ruling class some day.

SOCIALISM TO BE POSTPONED

Socialism is postponed indefinitely; "some day," somehow, in some mysterious fashion, in the midst of the capitalist paradise of "doubled standards of living," the people would decide to change to Socialism. Roughly, I would say, this would coincide with the Second Coming.

To be noted is his point that Australia's economic base does not allow of an independent development even if "a majority wanted it." This is but a version of the Trotskyite "Socialism cannot be built in one country" ideology with which the Trotskyites strove to hide their betrayal. While production is high enough to ensure a "rosy" capitalistic future, it is not high enough to permit of Socialism! Recall Stalin's sardonic rebuttal of Kautsky, in *Leninism*, when he sought to cover the betrayals of the Socialist Revolution by Social-De-

democracy, by declaring that the failure had to be blamed on the low level of "the productive forces."

On the other hand, note the statement "she (Australia) is an outstanding example of rapid expansion of basic production" and emphasis on "her high industrial potential."

THESIS REJECTED BY AUSTRALIAN PARTY

The Australian labor movement was condemned by Browder to passivity and helplessness until such time as the Americans got tired of their capitalist utopia.

Is it any wonder that when I submitted this self-contradictory, Kautskyite "organized capitalism" nonsense to the Political Committee of our Party it was rejected out of hand as a perspective for the Australian labor movement?

How do we visualize Socialism? We understand that our whole policy for peace and security is itself a preparation for Socialism, a struggle for an immediate program that meets urgent mass needs and prepares, by uniting and raising the political level of the masses, for the transition to Socialism.

Seen in this light, we do not regard victory, in the anti-fascist People's War, the strengthened position of the Soviet Union and of the international labor movement, the weakened position of world imperialism nor Yalta, and "the peaceful co-existence of the Socialist and capitalist systems" as factors postponing So-

cialism; on the contrary, we regard all this as creating a favorable world situation in which Socialism can be realized.

This does not mean that we put everything aside and concentrate on a slogan of "Socialism now."

THE PRESENT ISSUES

The issue in the coming Australian Federal elections will not be to elect a Labor and Communist majority to establish Socialism forthwith; the elections will be fought on the issue of postwar problems: whether there will be a postwar reconstruction planned in the interests of the masses or whether the "Free Enterprisers" will gain control and create a paradise for capitalists and a hell for the masses, accompanied by a reactionary foreign policy leading to new war. Such is the immediate struggle. Victory in this struggle would make the labor movement the leader of the nation and thus pave the way for Socialism.

HASTENING SOCIALISM

How long this period may last no one knows. Nobody can set a date for Socialism's coming. We can hasten its advent by building the Communist Party, by uniting the forces of the labor and democratic movements and by means of correct policies.

It cannot be considered accidental that such a thorough-going revisionist theory originated in the United States, where capitalism is strongest

and industrially the most developed, any more than it is accidental that no mass labor party has yet developed there and that America possesses the most reactionary trade union bureaucracy in the A. F. of L. leadership.

A PREVIOUS ERROR

It is proving more difficult to establish a mass Communist Party in the U.S.A. than elsewhere, and this is not the first time that the Communists there have taken a wrong turning. Lovestone, a former Secretary, developed the theory of American "exceptionalism" in relation to the economic crisis of 1929-32, asserting that the great economic and financial resources of American capitalism would limit, or even preclude, the possibility of an economic crisis. On this basis the analysis of the Communist International foreshadowing the economic crisis was repudiated by the majority of American Communists.

This theory of "exceptionalism" was embraced in Australia by the Kavanaghite right wing in our Central Committee, which brought about a strenuous struggle against opportunism, which I led, ending in defeat for the right wing at the Party Congress. Lovestoneism was defeated in the U.S.A. by Foster and Browder with the assistance of the International.

The factional struggles within the American Party were more prolonged and bitter than in most other countries. All this reflects the pres-

sure of the huge U.S. trusts upon the labor movement and the dominance of bourgeois ideology, which infiltrates into the working class ranks and disrupts the labor movement.

That is why the revisionism of Browder, which also reflected the new position of American imperialism as the dominant capitalist power, cannot be regarded as an accident.

AUSTRALIAN POLICY ON BROWDER?

It has been asked why our Central Committee, which, Jacques Duchesne pointed out, openly rejected the Browder liquidation theory, did not launch an attack on the policy of the American Political Association also?

I reported to the Central Committee on Browder's speech announcing the "changes" and characterized it as a "retreat and compromise" which I then regarded as arising from the internal and external role and relationships peculiar to America.

Marxism-Leninism accepts as a truism the need for temporary retreats and compromises. Lenin indicated that the N.E.P. in the Soviet Union was a temporary retreat and compromise with the capitalist elements in Soviet economy at the time.

I stated I could not agree with Browder's reference to Marxist "formulas" being obsolete, nor his phrase about shaking hands with Morgan. J. P. Miles supplemented this by criticizing Browder's acceptance of the "free enterprise" slogan and other

AUS

com
madU
mit
appl
woul
the l

MIG

Ne
could
which
stand
saidLat
from
der's
pampThese
view
litical
know
oppos
convic
icy wA
litical
policy
tralia.
feelin
when
withWe
correc
broth
sultin
other
owing
fact th
pro-B

comrades criticized various points made by Browder.

Unanimously, the Central Committee agreed that this policy had no application to Australia, in fact would be disastrous to the Party and the labor movement here.

MIGHT HAVE BEEN JUSTIFIED

* Nevertheless, we thought that there could be conditions in the U.S.A. which would justify it from the standpoint of Marxism-Leninism and said this in our public statements.

Later, we received further material from the U.S.A., including Browder's book on Teheran and Minor's pamphlet to which I have referred. These gave us a more comprehensive view of the theories of the new Political Association. We had no knowledge of the basis of Foster's opposition, but these two documents convinced us that the American policy was non-Marxist.

A proposal was made at the Political Committee that we adopt a policy similar to Browder's in Australia. J. C. Henry summed up the feeling of the Political Committee when he said: "I read these proposals with feelings of horror."

We, however, did not consider it correct yet to open an attack on a brother party without, at least, consulting the Communist parties of other countries. This was difficult owing to the war conditions and the fact that the easiest to contact were pro-Browder. That was the position

when we received from America a copy of the article of Jacques Duclos.

AUSTRALIAN POLICY MAINTAINED

In the meantime we pursued our own policy. The December meeting of the Central Committee re-affirmed our policy and leading comrades emphasized deliberately the Socialist objective of the Party in order to make clear the difference between our and the American policy.

In this period also was published *Government Enterprise in Australia*, the whole line of which was in open opposition to Earl Browder's theories.

Nevertheless, there were undoubted tendencies towards the percolation of some of these theories, particularly the economic ones, into our Party. It is necessary now carefully to review our thinking in order to make sure these are rooted out. Tendencies to revise this or that part of the Party program are not new to us.

Revisionist tendencies have shown themselves in a desire on the part of some to throw Marx out of the Marx School and substitute "popular," agitational lectures, and to confine the curriculum to "practical" subjects without study of Marxist-Leninist theory.

Our youth work has evidenced this revisionist tendency on a number of occasions, when proposals were made to delete reference to Socialism, the class struggle, the labor movement, etc., and to concentrate purely on

spirit, recreation and entertainment and "practical" subjects of discussion. There have been proposals to "broaden" our Press by deleting Party policy and confining it to tabloid news-reporting.

There have been a number of denials of the validity of Marxism in regard to agriculture and land nationalization. These kind of acorns grew into oaks in the U.S.A. and resulted in a political catastrophe for the American Communists.

MARXIST-LENINIST TEACHING ESSENTIAL

We are all for broadening and popularizing the Party's appeal and for studying practical questions and for the production of the greatest volume of simple agitational material for the masses; but all this must be combined with Marxist-Leninist training of the Party membership, and the workers, as far as possible, and the presentation of the fundamental aims of the Party policy.

The defeat of the Browderite revisionism is a new vindication, a triumph for Marxism-Leninism. It demonstrates anew that we must not depart from Marxism-Leninism, and

must ever apply it to our problems in order to solve them correctly.

We must study Marxism-Leninism and master it in order to avoid mistakes and opportunism, and in order that the membership, can, if necessary, correct the leading organs. It is, and always remains, the compass that guides our Party. That is one of the major lessons of the American developments.

Our Party Congress, while rejecting revisional and liquidationist tendencies, will formulate a policy for international peace, for jobs, homes and economic security for all toilers, for improved living standards, social amenities and cultural opportunities for the masses, for labor and national unity. It will plan a course towards the nationalization of key monopolies and the Socialist education of the masses.

The realization of such a program implies a serious and decisive struggle with the monopoly capitalists and their reactionary, political parties and stooges.

Such is the kind of perspective and program which our Congress will undoubtedly place before the labor movement and Australian democracy.

THE
AN
OF
SE

Not
in a
dioc
whic
of R
peac
for a
of E
pres
Unit
the
men
mon
fall,
San
Cath
raise
citi
"serv
tion.
Cath
Bish
the l
a sin
In

* P
Mosco

THE VATICAN AND PROBLEMS OF POSTWAR SETTLEMENT*

By D. MELNIKOV

NOT LONG ago a message was read in all the Catholic churches of the diocese of Liverpool, England, in which it was suggested that the Pope of Rome ought to take part in the peace conference. This was the signal for a persistent campaign on the part of English Catholic circles for the presentation of a place among the United Nations to the Vatican when the problems of the postwar settlement come to be discussed. In the month preceding Germany's downfall, and especially on the eve of the San Francisco Conference, the Catholic newspapers in England raised this point again and again, citing in support of it the Pope's "services" to international cooperation. No less insistent were American Catholic circles, who formed a Bishops' Committee for Publicizing the Pope's Peace Plan, which headed a similar campaign in America.

In the light of these facts, the ques-

tion naturally arises: what are the Vatican's postwar plans? We are all familiar with the Vatican's policy both before and during the war of the freedom-loving nations against Hitler Germany and her allies. This policy was not a particular source of credit to the Vatican. It certainly was not calculated to enhance its prestige among the masses of the freedom-loving nations who bore such grievous trials, hardships and privation during the war. It was not on the side of the fighters of fascism that the peoples saw the Pope, but rather in the opposite camp. In the period preceding the war the Vatican invariably supported in all countries the reactionary forces which nurtured the Nazi beast and made it possible for it to plunge Europe into the most bloody of wars. And during the war the Vatican's deliberate and consistent policy was to save fascism from defeat and destruction; it wove intrigues against the unity of the Allied Great Powers and mooted plans for a "negotiated peace." What blessings, then, does the Vatican intend to confer on mankind, now that the world is confronted with the important and by no means easy problems of the postwar settlement?

* * *

Although no detailed public statement has been made of the Vatican's postwar plans, it is fairly easy to construct from the numerous reports in the press, and from a number of utterances, acts and expressed opinions of the Pope and his represen-

* From *New Times*, No. 3, July 1, 1945, Moscow.

tatives the picture of the postwar arrangement of the world as conceived by the high dignitaries of the Vatican. The central idea of this conception is to turn Europe back to the "good old times" when the loathsome fascist monster first crept into the political arena and began to prepare with impunity for the realization of its incredibly villainous plans. The reversion of Europe to the times when fascist or pro-fascist reactionary regimes existed in a large number of countries is one of the principal desiderata of the Vatican's postwar program. Luigi Sturzo, well-known Italian conservative publicist and Catholic leader, writing recently in *Foreign Affairs*, outlined the principles of the Vatican's policy as follows:

There is a presumption that the world is moving along its old paths, even when it has been turned upside down by a war as universal and destructive as this one.*

This same thesis was expounded in a book by the Vatican publicist Guido Gonella: *A World to Reconstruct. Pius XII on Peace and Reconstruction*. Gonella says that one of the main principles of the Pope's postwar plans is the "Christian maxim: love our enemy," and indicates that the aim of Vatican policy is to "restore the disturbed equilibrium." In this connection the author proclaims the principle of

* Luigi Sturzo, "The Vatican's Position in Europe," *Foreign Affairs*, January, 1945.

"equality" of victors and vanquished, which, as we know, has been advocated in a number of the Pope's messages.

Evidently, the Vatican is little troubled by the fact that these "principles" are incompatible with the interests of the nations which are working for enduring peace, and run sharply counter to the aims of the United Nations as expressed in the historic decisions of the Crimea Conference. The Catholic reactionaries make no secret of their violent disapproval of this Conference. Commenting on its decisions, the *Osservatore Romano*, the Vatican organ, repeated Goebbels' fabrication that the United States, Great Britain and the Soviet Union were out for a "three-power dictatorship."

"Although the Yalta declaration is not the final instrument for the reorganization of Europe," the newspaper wrote, "the impression is gained that it favours the permanent control of the three big powers over the future situation in Europe and its political life, which does not harmonize with the principles of equality and cooperation."

Towards the end of April this newspaper expressed its complete solidarity with the declaration of the American bishops of April 14, which contained a violent condemnation of the Crimea Conference decisions. The newspaper remarked that this declaration "expresses the views of the Vatican."

The Catholic reactionaries, headed by the Vatican, reject the plans of postwar settlement sponsored by the United Nations, and in opposition to them set up their own plan, which is designed to undermine the foundations of peaceful intercourse among the nations. This plan, as Professor Salvemini, well-known Italian liberal, rightly remarked recently in the *Nation*, "undoubtedly extends to all countries of the world." The Vatican's postwar plan provides, in the first place, for complete "remission of sins" for the Hitlerite brigands and for the creation of a strong German military state, which might become the bulwark of reaction in Europe. The English *Catholic Herald* stated on August 20, last year, that the fundamental problem for England and the United States is to assist Germany in restoring her political equilibrium and unity as quickly as possible.

If one bears in mind the fierce campaign this newspaper conducted against the demand for unconditional surrender, against the crushing of Germany, against reparations, and in favour of a negotiated peace with the German fascist marauders, there cannot be the slightest doubt as to what it means by "restoring the political equilibrium" of Germany. At the same time the Catholic reactionaries frankly favour the preservation of Germany's war-economic potential and disapprove of her economic disarmament. Catholic newspapers in various countries gave

wide publicity to a statement issued by English, Scottish and Welsh bishops on February 22, this year, in which they said that "economically, no less than morally, a vindictive peace would harm the victor nations." Though somewhat rhetorical, this statement is an unambiguous remonstrance against all measures for the economic disarmament of the German aggressor who twice in the lifetime of one generation plunged mankind into the holocaust of a world war.

Kaas, a German Catholic leader living in exile in America, recently published a program for the postwar settlement of Germany which, he states, was discussed during his negotiations in the Vatican. It envisages the establishment of a "Christian order" in Germany, the reduction of the period of occupation to a minimum, and the participation of the "new Germany" together with the Allies in the postwar rehabilitation of Europe.

But we now know well enough that all the sponsors of plans for the preservation of the economic base of German imperialism use as a mask the cry of "participating in the rehabilitation of Europe." We know that Krupp, the leaders of the German chemical trust, and other fascist magnates, have all suddenly become zealous advocates of "participating in the rehabilitation of Europe." It is not surprising therefore that the Vatican's program is fully to the liking of the German im-

perialists, who are anxious to restore their economic base. At the beginning of this year the French journalist Tabouis stated in *Pour la Victoire* that the aim of the Vatican was "to strengthen the Catholic elements within Germany and to promise them unlimited Church assistance." She remarked that "the Pope is indirectly becoming the guarantor of a less harsh future for Germany."

"Such a position," she said, "will enable the Reich's financial and industrial circles . . . to hope for aid from the Vatican."

Facts reported from Germany by foreign correspondents indicate that reactionary Catholic circles in that country, encouraged by the stand taken by the Vatican and the reactionary Catholics in Britain and America, have intensified their activities, and come out with frankly anti-Allied statements and schemes. McLean, correspondent of the *Chicago Sun*, recently reported from Bad Nauheim that sermons were preached in a number of churches in Western Germany "remarkably similar" in character, containing vicious attacks on the San Francisco Conference. Francis Daniel, New York *Times* correspondent, reported that a plan for a German "liberal-Christian democratic state" had been conceived by the Rhine industrialists who had played so prominent a part in the Hitler state. It is not difficult to detect a resemblance between the plans of the German imperialists,

who are now lying low, and the intentions of reactionary circles of the Catholic Church.

This was borne out after Germany's defeat by such definitely political acts of the Vatican as the extension of its protection to most important German reactionaries. It was reported on June 1 that the Pope had received Prince Ruprecht of Bavaria. Reuter's Rome correspondent, commenting on this report, recalled the fact that at an earlier visit Prince Ruprecht made to the Pope, in November 1944, "it was considered likely that they discussed the future of Bavaria, a Catholic region where monarchist feelings are believed to be still much alive." The correspondent further remarked that Ruprecht had "never relinquished his rights to the crown of Bavaria" and that he was "still conventionally addressed by a small intimate circle as 'Your Majesty.'"

It is not inappropriate to point out that Ruprecht belongs to the Wittelsbach dynasty, which exercised feudal sway over Bavaria for seven centuries. The last scion of that dynasty, the 72-year-old Prince Ruprecht, is notorious for the leading part he played in World War I as a member of the Kaiser's High Command. Already at that time he was distinguished not only for his incompetence, which became a byword, but also for his inordinate self-conceit and love of power, which are characteristic features of all the German feudal overlords. Today Prince Rup-

recht's fantastic dream of restoring a monarchy in Bavaria has the whole-hearted support of the Vatican.

Prince Ruprecht is only one of the aspirants to the rulership of a future German militarist state restored under the aegis of the Catholic Church. The Vatican lends its support to the most diverse representatives of German reaction. It will suffice to recall that after Germany's downfall the Pope permitted that arrant Hitlerite, Weizsaecker, Ribbentrop's ex-deputy, to remain in the Vatican in a "private capacity." At the same time the Pope supports such personages as Bruning, who by his reactionary policy did no little to further Hitler's rise to power, and who while in exile did not find a single word to say in condemnation of Hitler's barbaric regime, but quite openly associated himself with the imperialist plans for the preservation of Germany's might. All this is clearly indicative of the Vatican's designs to establish a reactionary regime in Germany.

The Catholic reactionaries undoubtedly harbour similar designs in respect to other European countries. We all know of the support the Papal See rendered the reactionary Dolfus regime in Austria and the succeeding Schuschnigg government, which paved the way for the "Anschluss," in other words, for Hitler's occupation of Austria. It is noteworthy that immediately after Germany's defeat the Pope gave a long audience to Schuschnigg during which political questions were discus-

sed. Schuschnigg was also received by Monsignor Domenico Tardini and Giovanni Battista Montini, who, Reuter's Rome correspondent stated, "are empowered to conduct important negotiations."

Besides these intrigues for the restoration of the pre-war reactionary regime in Austria, mention should be made of the schemes being hatched in the Vatican for the resuscitation of the Hapsburg empire. An article in the April issue of the Italian Catholic *Realta Politica* throws light on these schemes. The author, the Catholic bishop Luigi Hudal, with the aid of arguments which he calls "purely economic," endeavours to prove that it is necessary to create a big state in Central Europe which would include nearly all the component parts of the former Hapsburg empire. The bishop holds that the "best variant" would be a union of Austria, Czechoslovakia, Hungary and Yugoslavia. He insists that this new conglomerate state must have a "firm monarchy," in other words, the Hapsburg dynasty. Reports have repeatedly appeared in the foreign press of negotiations which the Pope conducted with representatives of this dynasty for the restoration of the Hapsburg monarchy. In its editorial comment on Hudal's article, the *Realta Politica* stated that "this project for the postwar organization of Austria was conceived in Vatican circles." Evidently, these circles are little disturbed by the fact that their fantastic scheme runs counter to the

clearly expressed will of the peoples of Central Europe, that it is a challenge to the principles proclaimed by the United Nations, and that it is an attempt to throw Europe back a long way by re-establishing in its very heart a "prison of nations" under German-Hapsburg sway.

A prominent place in the Vatican's postwar plans is occupied by Poland. We have in mind, of course, not the democratic Polish Republic which the Polish people, liberated from German occupation by the Red Army, are now building. The Vatican and the reactionary Catholic groups in all countries regard the new Poland, where the people and their chosen representatives are in power, with undisguised hatred. They have been and still are rendering the Raczkiewicz-Arciszewski clique the most active support in their criminal attempts to prevent by the vilest terrorist methods the creation of a free and democratic Poland. The Vatican's plans in relation to Poland and the other medium and small countries of Europe are connected with plans to form a "bloc of Eastern and Central European countries" which is to serve as a new *cordon sanitaire* against the Soviet Union.

Thoroughly reactionary, too, are the plans of the Vatican in relation to Italy. The Papal See, as we know, consistently supported Mussolini's regime, concluded the Lateran Treaty with him in 1929, and gave its blessing to all his acts of terrorism

at home and aggression abroad. The eyes of the Vatican are now riveted on the efforts to restore the monarchist reaction in Italy, Professor Salvemini, assessing this policy in the *Nation*, wrote.

As long as Mussolini was in power, the Vatican tried to rescue him from ruin. Since his collapse, the Vatican has been trying to rescue the Royal House, the conservative social classes and the Concordat of February, 1929. This is the Vatican plan for Italy.*

The Vatican's sympathies for fascism are clearly revealed in the support it is consistently giving to this day to the Franco regime. Noteworthy in this respect is the appeal of Gonella, official Vatican publicist, in *Il Popolo* "not to throw away the advantages which the preservation of the Franco regime in Spain represents for conservative Europe." Gonella lauded the "great historical services" rendered by the Franco regime and tried, in the face of obvious facts, to deny its fascist character. Last January documents were published in the *Quaderni Italiani*, an Italian magazine issued in America, which disclosed the part taken by the Vatican in the fascist intervention in Spain. From these documents it is evident that the Vatican lent its active support to Hitler's and Mussolini's intervention and facilitated their brutal acts of violence against the Spanish people. The Italian

* Gaetano Salvemini, "No Vatican Plan for Italy," *The Nation*, February 3, 1945.

newspaper *Giustizia e Libertà*, writing recently of the Vatican's policy in Spain, said that "the Church in Spain maintains a united front with fascism... and has converted the Franco regime into a bastion of clerical reaction." The Pope continues actively to support the Franco regime to this day. Only the other day reports appeared in the foreign press that the Vatican has granted asylum to fifty members of the "Blue Division." An official Vatican report stated that quite recently the Pope sent his blessing to Franco on the occasion of the latter's attendance at the Valladolid celebrations. The very close connection that exist between the Vatican and Salazar's clerical-fascist regime in Portugal is sufficiently well known.

The Vatican's pro-fascist sympathies were likewise reflected in the assistance it invariably rendered to Pétain and his clique. Pétain's representative, like Ribbentrop's, has been allowed to stay on at the Vatican in a "private capacity."

As for the Vatican's hostility towards the Soviet Union, that is too notorious to need concrete proof and illustration. It can be said without the slightest exaggeration that there has not been a single anti-Soviet campaign, or act of provocation against the Soviet Union, in which the Vatican or the reactionary Catholic circles which it inspires have not had a hand. The intrigues and designs of these circles against the country which has saved the civilization of

Europe from fascist barbarism rouse the just indignation of democrats all over the world. The reactionary Catholic press invariably supports every manoeuvre and attempt to disrupt collaboration among the democratic Great Powers and to isolate the Soviet Union. This is one of the most important objects of the Vatican's postwar policy.

The Vatican's postwar plans for Europe are therefore not open to any doubt. They are permeated with a spirit of black reaction and are fundamentally inimical to the vital interests of the European peoples, to their liberty and to peace among nations. A recently published statement of 1,600 American clergymen said that the Vatican had concluded treaties of friendship with the fascist countries, that the Pope had supported Mussolini in Italy, Dolfuss and Schuschnigg in Austria, Hitler in Germany, Franco in Spain and Pétain in France, and was now ranged on the side of the enemies of democracy.

No less reactionary and anti-democratic are the activities of the Vatican outside of Europe. We need only recall the subversive work of the Catholic reactionaries in Latin America. At the end of May, Carlos Duarte, the well-known Catholic bishop of Maura, in a statement which was printed in *A Noite*, trenchantly criticized the "fascist tendencies of the Roman Catholic clergy" in Latin America. Duarte accused the Papal Nuncio Aloisio,

i.e., an official representative of the Pope, of having been implicated in espionage in favour of Germany, of having taken part in fascist espionage in Latin America, and of having sent military information to Germany *via* Italy.

Information recently published in the press throws light on the Vatican's economic interest in the fascist regimes. The American magazine *Protestant* printed an article by its correspondent Gordon—who lived for a long time in Uruguay—in which he averred that over 40 per cent of the capital of the Banco Frances-Italiano del America del Sur, one of the chief fascist centres in Argentina, was owned by the Vatican. The Vatican has vast sums invested in financial and industrial establishments in many countries, chiefly in Spain, Switzerland and France. It owns about one-third of

the stock of Worms' Bank in France, the directors of which actively co-operated with the Nazi occupying authorities. The Vatican controls the Compania Italo-Argentina de Electricidad, which has branches in Argentina, Paraguay, Peru and Switzerland.

All these facts are sufficiently indicative of the reactionary, pro-fascist nature of the activities of the Vatican and the Catholic reactionaries in Europe and America. The Vatican's policy runs directly counter to the principles of the United Nations and the plans for enduring peace. Today the Vatican is acting as the agent of extreme reaction which exploits every opportunity to pursue its subversive activities in favour of fascism. It is the duty of all those who are interested in the building of enduring peace to combat this reactionary policy of the Vatican.

A N
COA
FOR
by DO
THE D
Potsda
Franco
nunity
shaken
regime
Spanis
pressor
The
these
Madri
Catalo
have
anti-F
proof
at the
which
Falang
At
agitati
are fr
ions
coup
discon
Franc
broad
Repu
Spa
* Fr
ember

A NATIONAL COALITION FOR SPAIN*

by DOLORES IBARRURI (*Pasionaria*)

THE DECISION taken by the historic Potsdam Conference to exclude Franco Spain from the world community of nations has profoundly shaken the stability of the Franco regime and greatly assisted the Spanish people's fight against its oppressors.

The new wave of terror let loose in these last few weeks—especially in Madrid, the Basque Country and Catalonia, where hundreds of people have been arrested on suspicion of anti-Franco sentiments—is clear proof of the fear of the ruling clique at the prospect of a popular rising which would sweep away the Falangist filth.

At the same time there is great agitation in Monarchist circles which are frantically making final preparations for an attempted Monarchist "coup" so as to prevent the growing discontent among all who are against Franco from expressing itself in a broad, popular struggle for the Republic.

Spaniards, whether in Spain or

abroad, feel that the hour is drawing near for the long-awaited solution and are preparing to take an active part in the march of events.

THE SPANISH PARLIAMENT

In Mexico, with an inspiring unity of purpose, the Spanish Republicans have held a meeting of the Spanish Parliament in order to elect a President and set in motion the constitutional machinery of the Republic.

What do the Spanish Republicans want and where are they going? What will be the main characteristics of the government which the Spanish Republicans form and what forces will participate in it?

Sr. Martinez Barrio, who is now President of the Republic, has given a sound answer:

"The Government formed will be a Government of national concentration which will include all loyal groups represented in the Republican Parliament, together with all those national forces which have a firm basis in Spain, although they lack parliamentary representation because of their voluntary decision not to contest elections. It should also include representatives who, while they are not members of political or trade union organizations, do symbolise the best of Spain's intellectual and moral achievements. It should be a Government with authority, counting on everyone's support."

THE GIRAL GOVERNMENT

Nevertheless, things have turned out rather differently. The Govern-

* From *Unidad y Lucha*, Toulouse, France, September 4, 1945.

ment which was formed after Dr. Negrin had handed in his resignation is not in any sense a National Coalition Government. On the contrary it has a narrower basis than the previous Republican Government.

We Communists have nothing whatever against working with Sencr Giral, who is a democrat well known for the important part he played as Republican Premier in the first months of our war of liberation, when he assisted the development of resistance and the arming of the people in order to withstand Fascist aggression. But it is a fact—and a fact with which we cannot agree—that in Sr. Giral's present Government those fundamental forces on which the Republican regime must rely are missing.

The Communist Party is missing. The Socialist Party is missing, even though there are outstanding Socialists in the Government. Of the Catalan Parties, neither the Esquerra nor the United Socialist Party of Catalonia are represented, and the representatives of the two great trade union organizations of the workers are also absent from the Government.

In short the Government does not include representatives of the parties and organizations which were the very soul of Republican resistance to the criminal Hitlerite-Falangist conspiracy.

The narrow basis on which the present Government is formed cannot awaken enthusiasm among the broad mass of democratic people in

other countries, whose help will be needed to bring the reconquest and consolidation of the democratic Republic to a successful conclusion.

There is also the risk of a new division of Republican forces into those who are in the Government and those who are not. This division must be prevented because it would be a real catastrophe for the development of the fight against Franco.

Support for the Government of Dr. Negrin was not merely support for a political figure with certain particular characteristics. It was support for a policy; the policy of resistance and firmness against Fascism and of Republican continuity and strict legality.

In the new Government everything has been set aside which had any relationship, whether close or distant, with the preceding one, which was the last legal Government of the Republic.

Does this mean a change in the policy of no compromise with Franco and what he represents, or is there simply a misunderstanding between the various Republican groups?

A NATIONAL COALITION GOVERNMENT

It would be absurd to ask for unanimity on every occasion. But it certainly is possible to get agreement on the fundamental problems if, in the defense of Republican interests, we have no intervention or interference foreign to our country's vital interests.

Would it not be possible for the forces which are in the Government and those of us who find ourselves outside to sit down round the same table and reach a final agreement on the formation of a Government to lead the fight against the Franco regime and replace the Franco Government until such time as the people can freely express its will?

Senor Giral himself, taking into account the weakness of his Government, has declared that in its present form it is not final, but provisional, and has thus opened the way towards the possibility of deciding the problem afresh.

The present Government will have to submit itself for Parliament's approval or rejection on October 1. And even if it should secure a majority, Senor Giral cannot be satisfied, since at the best that precarious majority would in no way change the relationship of forces on which his Government is based.

Only by close collaboration of all the anti-Fascist groupings represented in a National Coalition Government is it possible to provide leadership for the struggle which will lead to Franco's overthrow. Only such a Government can speak in the name of the anti-Franco forces of Spain.

This Government must have a programme. It is not enough to utter generalizations about the Constitution of 1931, which, in principle, is

respected by everyone. Nor is sufficient to talk interminably about avoiding bloodshed, as if Franco was not shedding our people's blood in torrents and as if the Republicans themselves had started the rebellion of July 18. Something more concrete is required.

Let us exert all efforts to find the best methods for coming to an understanding. By so doing we shall take away all pretexts and excuses from those friends who are rushing off at a tangent towards disunity among Spaniards in a way that bodes no good for any of us.

We Communists are only unable to work with Fascists, who are guilty of our country's ruin and poverty, with those who are responsible for the grief and suffering of our people.

On the basis of unity of all the anti-Fascist forces we are ready to collaborate with anyone who honestly desires to take part in the restoration of the democratic liberties, which were founded on the 1931 Constitution and destroyed by the Falangists.

It is urgently necessary to form a genuine Government of National Coalition, not only in order to give the Republic a leadership, but also because the formation of such a Government can give rise to a great wave of fighting enthusiasm and unity among the mass of the people inside Spain.

THE MISSION OF THE CHINESE COMMUNISTS*

By MAO TSE-TUNG

COMRADES! Our mission is great and our policy is definite and clear. What attitude should we adopt in carrying out this policy and mission?

Obviously and indubitably, the international and domestic situation has revealed a bright future for the Chinese people and us.

It has created unprecedentedly favorable conditions. But at the same time, grave difficulties still exist. Those who can see only the bright side will not be able to fight well for the realization of the Party's mission.

In the twenty-four years of the Party's history and in the eight years of the anti-Japanese war, we have created a great force out of the Chinese people. In this respect our accomplishments are obvious and indubitable. Yet certain defects still exist in our work. Those who see only the results and not the defects will not be able to fight well for the realization of the Party's mission.

Since its birth in 1921, the Chinese Communist Party has experienced,

* From the Report by Mao Tse-tung to the 7th National Congress of the Chinese Communist Party, Yenan, China, April 24, 1945.

in the twenty-four years of its history, three great struggles—the Northern Expedition, the Agrarian Revolution, and the still-raging anti-Japanese war. From the very beginning, our Party has based itself on the theories of Marxism, because Marxism is the crystallization of the world proletariat's most impeccable revolutionary scientific thought. The universal truth of Marxism, once wedded to the materialization of revolution in China, has changed the course of the Chinese Revolution and has given birth to the neo-democratic stage of history. The Chinese Communist Party, armed with the theories of Marxism, has infused into itself a new practice, closely collaborating with the masses, and self-criticism.

The universal truth of Marxism, reflected in the struggles of the proletariat all over the world, becomes a useful weapon to the Chinese people only when it is wedded to the actual process of the revolutionary struggle of the Chinese proletariat and people. The Communist Party has achieved this union. The development and progress of our Party originated in the determined fight against dogmatism and empiricism that repudiates the universal truth of Marxism. Dogmatism holds itself aloof from actual practice, while empiricism mistakes local experiment for the universal truth; both these opportunist ideas are not in conformity with Marxism. In its twenty-four years of struggle, our Party has been overcoming such erroneous thinking, greatly consolidating itself in this

respect. We have now about 1,210,000 Party members, most of whom joined the Party in the anti-Japanese war. Some of these members, as well as some who joined the Party before the anti-Japanese war, still entertain various erroneous ideas. Years of rectification work have greatly eliminated these erroneous ideas. But this work should be continued, and the thought-education inside the Party should be intensified. All key Party workers throughout the land should be made to understand that the close union of theory and practice is a salient feature by which the Communist Party is distinguished from all other political parties. Therefore the mastery of thought-education is the principal factor in consolidating the Party for its great political struggle. Without this mastery, the Party's political tasks will not be accomplished.

Another salient feature by which the Communist Party can be distinguished from all other parties is the very close relationship between it and the great majority of the people. We begin by devoting ourselves to serving the Chinese people and not deserting them for a single moment, serving the interests of the people and not the interests of any particular group or individual; and our responsibility to the people is one with our responsibility to our leadership. Communists must always be ready to uphold truth, because all truth is compatible with the people's interests. Communists must always be

ready to rectify what is wrong, because what is wrong means what is incompatible with the people's interests. The experience of our twenty-four years has told us that all correct practice, tasks and policy are so because they conform to the demands of the people in a particular time and place, and because they serve to unite the people. All erroneous tasks, policy and practice are so because they do not conform to the people's demands and because they are unconnected with the people. Dogmatism, empiricism, directivism, tailism, factionalism, bureaucratism, militarism and arrogance are undesirable because they alienate the people. Such things should be rectified. This Congress should warn every comrade in every link of the Party work not to allow himself to be estranged from the people. Every comrade should learn to love the people, to listen to them carefully, to mix with them instead of overriding them, to develop and raise the consciousness of the masses with due consideration to their intelligence, and to help them, if they are willing, to organize themselves gradually for all necessary struggles. Directivism is wrong because its impetuosity tends to ignore the people's understanding and their will. Our comrades must not assume that the people understand what they themselves have understood. We must go to the masses if we want to know whether they understand what we have done and whether they are willing to do as they are bidden. In

this way, we can avoid directivism. Conservatism is also wrong, because its slow pace will cause it to lag behind the understanding of the masses, and so will not be able to lead the people forward. Our comrades must not assume that the people cannot understand what they themselves have not yet understood. Often the people overtake us. They want to go forward but our comrades, instead of leading them on, keep airing the views of some of the laggards and mistaking these views to be the views of the people. In short, every comrade should be made to understand that everything a Communist says or does is judged by its compatibility with the major interests of the majority of the people or its acceptability by the majority of the people. Every comrade should be made to understand that as long as we rely upon the people, have confidence in their inexhaustible creative power, trust them and join forces with them, no difficulty will be too great to be overcome and no enemy will be able to crush us, but on the contrary we shall be able to crush our enemies.

Yet another salient feature by which we can be distinguished from members of other parties is our serious self-criticism. We have often said that a house should often be cleaned, or dust will gather in it, and that our face should often be washed, or it will get dirty. The ideas of our comrades and the work of our Party can often get dusty, and should also be cleaned. "A running stream does not

get putrid; a door-pivot does not get worm-eaten" illustrates the resistance of continual motion to contaminating influence or erosive action. To us, the most effective means of resisting the contaminating influence of political microbes is the constant review of our work, always with a view to widening the democratic practice, the ability to take criticism and self-criticism without flinching, and its putting into practice of the ancient adage, "Rectify your errors if you made any; strive to excel yourself if you have made none." We have been able to reap the fruits of our rectification movement mainly because we launched in that movement a successful campaign of correct and serious criticism and self-criticism. Are we Communists, who serve the major interests of the majority of the people, who are confident that our cause is just and are always ready to sacrifice our own lives for it, unwilling to part company with any erroneous idea, viewpoint, opinion, or measure that does not conform to the people's demand? Are we willing to let our clean appearance and sound bodies be sullied by political dust, or defiled by political microbes? Could less revolutionary heroes have given up their lives for the interests of the people; can't we give up our personal interests or erroneous idiosyncrasies?

Comrades! As soon as this Congress is over, we will go to the battlefield, to defeat the Japanese aggressors and build up a new China, in accordance with the resolutions taken

by this Congress. To attain this end we must be united with all the Chinese people. Let me repeat: we must join hands with anyone who favors the defeating of the Japanese aggressors and the building up of a new China, irrespective of his class or political affiliation. To do this well, we must, under the organization and discipline of democratic centralism, keep the Party more powerfully united than ever. We must join hands with any comrade who is willing to abide by the Party's platform, statutes and resolutions. In the period of the Northern Expedition, our Party had only 50,000 members, most of whom were later killed or dispersed by the then enemy. In the Agrarian Revolution period, we had about 300,000 members, a large part of whom were also killed or dispersed later. Now we have over 1,200,000 members, and this time we cannot be killed or dispersed by the enemy. If we can make good use of our experience of these three periods, if, by taking a humble instead of an arrogant attitude, we stand together in greater solidarity and are more closely united with all the Chinese people, then it is certain that we shall not be dispersed by the enemy, but shall instead thoroughly exterminate the Japanese aggressors and their

faithful servants, and, after exterminating them, shall build up an independent, free, democratic, united, and prosperous China.

The experience and the three revolutions, especially the experience of the anti-Japanese war, has made the Chinese people, and us, believe that without the efforts of the Chinese Communist Party, without the support given to the Chinese people by the Chinese Communists, China's independence, freedom, democracy and unification, or her industrialization and agricultural modernization, is impossible.

Comrades! I strongly believe that the Chinese Communist Party, experienced in the three revolutions, can accomplish our gigantic political mission.

Thousands of people and Party heroes have bravely laid down their lives for the interests of the people. Let us, holding their banner high, advance along the path sodden with their blood!

An independent, free, democratic, united and prosperous China will soon be born. Let us welcome the happy day.

Down with the Japanese aggressors!

Long live the emancipation of the Chinese people!

BOOK REVIEWS

AN INDISPENSABLE LABOR MANUAL

Review by WILLIAM Z. FOSTER

LABOR FACT BOOK 7. Prepared by
Labor Research Association. International
Publishers, New York. 1945.
208 pp., \$1.60.

The Labor Research Association has made another important contribution to our economic, political and labor literature. Its new *Labor Fact Book 7* is the sort of book every reader of *Political Affairs* will want to add to his library. For there is nothing like it; nothing that so neatly summarizes the major developments and events, the basic facts and figures of the recent period.

The latest volume in this biennial series of valuable handbooks which started in 1931, takes up where the last one left off. It covers the period from early 1943 to the spring of the present year. Its 208 pages are crammed with data that everyone needs in order to understand properly the crucial years of war and the postwar world ahead of us.

L.R.A.'s new book, like its predecessors, not only deals with the conditions of labor and the developments in the labor movement, but covers a wide range of topics of timely interest to the

labor movement as it becomes an increasingly vital factor in our national life. A mere listing of the main chapter headings indicates the broad coverage of the volume.

First comes "The War Economy," packed with condensed information on production, consumer income and expenditures, the profits of the capitalist class, the reserves and surpluses set aside by the corporations, the dividends paid and high salaries maintained right through the war. Then we have a group of related subjects under the heading of "Postwar Goals and Problems." The section starts out with President Roosevelt's Economic Bill of Rights. It includes all aspects of the conversion dealt with to some extent but mainly evaded by the last Congress. It covers all the relevant material needed for an understanding of Federal tax policies and the class distribution of the tax burden. It presents pertinent background material on national product and national income in the light of the recent studies of the U. S. Department of Commerce. Then it gives us related information on the government's plans for postwar full employment and public works. Foreign trade, international cartels, and Bretton Woods agreements are among the topics discussed in the same chapter.

But L.R.A. is not content to deal only with the programs that have been worked out by business and government experts. It gives due credit to the various reconversion and post-

plans that have come out of serious trade union thinking on the subject. At the end of a chapter on "Labor and the Nation," it summarizes the most advanced of these programs, both the over-all plan of the C.I.O., for example, and the specific programs worked out by particular C.I.O. unions to meet the special conditions in their industry. There are scarcely any union plans of importance that are not given some mention in this section of the book.

Another feature of this chapter is the whole story of the C.I.O. Political Action Committee and its role in the election of last year, along with lists of the main progressives elected to Congress and the votes received by the leading candidates. As in the last *Fact Book*, space is devoted also to presenting labor's role in the war, a picture that has been completely distorted in the capitalist press. Here we find the exact strike record of the unions in this period. We see what organized labor, adhering to its no-strike policy, did on the production front and in the sale of war bonds, in war relief and in countless other ways to bring about victory over the Axis.

Not only is the story of achievement recounted, but the just praise that was accorded labor for its magnificent war record is also recorded quotation by quotation for history to evaluate.

Returning G.I.s also may examine here the true war record of labor after having been so long misled into believing that the unions were loafing or striking on the home front while they were at the battle front. In this connection the revealing section on "Labor Helps the Veterans" is also of unique value for those who would help cement the bonds of unity between la-

bor and the returning servicemen and servicewomen. The *Fact Book* shows that labor has been away out in front in all the various services performed for veterans. No serviceman could have any doubts as to who his real friends are after reading this section of the book.

In the chapter on "Labor Relations and Boards," L.R.A. pulls no punches in sizing up the stalling methods of the National War Labor Board. The book gives the significant rulings and decisions of the Board and shows specifically how these decisions either advanced or retarded the cause of labor and of true economic stabilization in wartime. At the same time, the volume sums up the law-defiers like Montgomery Ward and shows who the saboteurs of national unity and economic stabilization really were.

The chapter on "Labor and Social Conditions" has, like all the other chapters, completely new material supplementing that which appeared in the six previous *Fact Books* and all effectively arranged so that it can be used at a moment's notice by those who want the latest facts on the class distribution of incomes, cost of living, family budgets, wages and wage rates, hours of work, employment and unemployment, industrial accidents, health hazards. One of the most complete sections deals with public health and leads up to the new programs for social security and health insurance. Special sections in this chapter deal also with veterans' benefits, housing, white-collar workers, women workers, Negro workers, poll-tax laws, soldier vote regulations and the F.E.P.C.

Realizing the close relationship and interdependence of the farm and city

worker, the L.R.A. has as usual given ample space in the book to an extensive discussion of the farmers and their programs, their postwar prospects, and the organizations the farmers have established to carry out their goals.

Especially useful tables in the book are those covering the membership of each C.I.O. and A. F. of L. union, as well as a table showing the number of Negroes in various individual unions.

These are only a few of the highlights of this indispensable volume which closes with salient facts on the Latin-American and Canadian labor movements and a report on the new World Trade Union Federation.

We can think of no one recent book that will be of more value to the average trade unionist or active worker in any field of organization. The Labor Research Association is to be congratulated on putting so much information into such a small space. The facts are made to speak for themselves. They should indeed speak directly to readers running into the thousands. No better book of its kind is available in the English language. It should be a best-seller in progressive book stores and trade union literature departments.

INDIAN LETTERS OF A COMMUNIST SOLDIER

Review by R. PALME DUTT

BRITISH SOLDIER IN INDIA: The Letters of Clive Branson. International Publishers, New York. 128 pp., 40 cents.

THE DEATH OF Clive Branson on the

Arakan front in February, 1944, was the loss of one of the most promising and outstanding figures of the rising generation in Britain: an artist and poet; a Communist; a thinker; a tireless organizer and political leader; and a fighter. It is a loss that could ill be spared, and that will be felt the more deeply as these letters of his from India are read.

But this book is more than a memorial of Clive Branson. It stands in its own right as one of the most valuable books on India that could be put in the hands of any reader today. The problem often arises what introductory book on India could be recommended to the general reader, who does not yet want to study a political treatise, but wants rather a living picture of human beings. There are some novels like Forster's classic *Passage to India*, though old, or Mulk Raj Anand's stories which can help. But there can be no question what to recommend first now. Give your friend, no matter whom, no matter what his previous outlook, Branson's *British Soldier in India* to read. It will open his eyes. Vivid, easily read, unforgettable, it will arouse passionate interest and concern in the most indifferent, and teach more than many bulletier volumes.

In very simple compass these letters mingled with poems and sketches, give a picture of the Indian people and the conditions; of the army in India and the narrow world of the Sahibs; of the Congress and the tangled conflict of 1942-44; of the Communist Party of India and the workers' movement; and finally of the famine.

It is also a picture of the writer of one who was alive in every fibre of his being; who could think and feel

and act. It may help many to understand better, who may have been misled by the commonplace caricatures of Marxist "dogmatists," how a Communist responds to life. It is a magnificent expression of a Communist soldier in the present war.

It would be tempting to quote many passages at length. Here are one or two:

On housing:

"Never will any of us who have come to India for this war forget the unbelievable, indescribable poverty in which we have found people living *wherever* we went, and in millions. We are all agreed that if the people back home knew of these conditions there would be a hell of a row—because this state of affairs is maintained in the name of the British. And yet, too, we are all agreed that there is no parallel, no common visual or verbal symbols that could convey the slightest understanding of this state of affairs to the people at home. How can I tell the people of Nine Elms that their condemned houses are palaces compared with Indian slums? They just wouldn't believe me—would think me a liar. At home one is shocked if families live in one room. But how often do people from India explain that millions of human beings here *have no room at all*, that whole families live in *houses* made of plaited grass, rags, bits of tin, a bit of carpet—in all not more than 8 ft. by 4 ft. and perhaps 4 ft. high. And one can see this not only in *every* village, but on the outskirts of every town before one ever reaches the brick-built slums in the centre of the town."

On the famine:

"The last part of my journey was like nightmare. The endless view of

plains, crops and small stations, turned almost suddenly into one long trail of starving people. Men, women, children, babies, looked up into the passing carriage in their last hope for food. These people were not just hungry—this was *famine*. When we stopped, children swarmed round the carriage windows, repeating hopelessly 'Bukshish sahib'—with the monotony of a damaged gramophone. Others sat on the ground, just waiting. I saw women—almost fleshless skeletons, their clothes grey with dust from wandering, with expressionless faces, not walking, but foot steadying foot, as though not knowing where they went. As we pulled towards Calcutta, for *miles*, little children naked, with inflated bellies stuck on stick-like legs, held up empty tins toward us. They were children still—they laughed and waved as we went by. Behind them one could see the brilliant fiendish green of the new crop."

On Cripps and India:

"The only piece of news of interest arises from a speech I have just read by Cripps, in England. He is reported to have told some Indians (industrial Bevin boys): 'It is part of your job while you are here to study organization of labour so that you may, on your return to your own country, help your fellow workers to organize stable Trade Unions, not as political parties, but as protection for workers against exploitation and sweating and as a means of encouraging the sound development of Indian industries.' Would someone kindly inform Cripps that on May 1 at Nagpur the twentieth session of the All-India T.U.C. met—300 delegates representing over 350,000 workers—and demanded, among other things, 'as a protection for workers against ex-

ploitation,' the transference of power to a national government. Also on May 1, the same day as Cripps spoke, railwaymen, tramwaymen, textile workers, etc., were organizing meetings in Bombay, Calcutta, Karachi, demanding, mainly, the opening of the Second Front. And, above all, one should not forget the great Kisan (peasant) organizations. It is always surprising to such 'brilliant' legal minds as Cripps' that the ignorant workers and peasants, *in their own way*, arrive at an understanding of politics far in advance of their betters. And also tell Cripps it would make the organization of the workers much easier if Meerut Trials and the imprisonment of men such as Dange and Mirajkar did not take place. 'Safe' labor leaders are not fashionable among ignorant Indian and Chinese workers."

Or the confession of faith written to his wife a few weeks before his death:

"Always remember that one is given by fate only one lifetime in which to work and live for humanity. There is no greater crime, in my opinion, than to renounce the world, no matter for

what excuse. If anything should happen to either of us, never say, 'It is finished.' For we have both lived for one purpose, the emancipation of the working people. If by chance one of us has to leave this work before it is done, then let the other go on and do it through—not in the spirit of half self-sacrifice—as a monk or a nun—but even more in the fulness of human experience. What we miss we can only find in knowing humanity more deeply and not in the ever-narrowing circumference of private memories. Life for me has only been worthwhile in so far as I have been able to show, even a few people, the way to *forward* living. And, above all, whatever happens, let us never forget we are human beings and belong to the brotherhood of man. Tyrants and hermits are tarred with the same brush. Whatever happens we must go on *living*—there are so many years of grand work ahead."

British Soldier in India will remain not only as a living picture of conditions in India under British rule, but as a permanent treasure of British Communist literature.

could have
say, "It is
lived in
on of the
ce one of
efore it is
on and
it of his
nun—be
human es
e can on
ore deep
ng circum
Life is
le in so fa
even a fe
iving. And
ens, let
beings as
of man. I
ed with
appent pr
are so mu
"
will rema
of conditi
le, but a
ish Comm