

POLITICAL AFFAIRS

A magazine devoted

to the theory and practice of Marxism - Leninism

EDITORIAL BOARD

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

ALEXANDER BITTELMAN, MAX WEISS, HENRY WINSTON

VOLUME XXV, NO. 6

Contents

JUNE, 1946

From Potsdam to Paris—One Year of Foreign Policy	<i>Milton Howard</i>	483
May First Order of the Day	<i>Joseph Stalin</i>	490
Some Lessons of the Recent Strike Struggles	<i>Hal Simon</i>	493
Fundamental Remarks on the Question of Trieste	<i>Stephane Mitrovitch</i>	502
"Enlightened" American Imperialism in the Philippines	<i>James S. Allen</i>	526
The Activating Force of Marxist-Leninist Theory		
	THE BOLSHEVIK, <i>Editorial</i>	541
On Self-Determination for the Negro People	<i>William Z. Foster</i>	549
Planners of Atomic Imperialism	<i>Joseph Clark</i>	555
Arab-Jewish Unity for the Solution of Palestine's Problems	<i>Meir Vilner</i>	561
BOOK REVIEWS:		
Lesson For America	<i>Stanley Ryerson</i>	567
Soviet Policy in Distorted Focus	<i>John Stuart</i>	571

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

PRINTED IN THE U.S.A.

 209

AUTHORS AND TOPICS

MILTON HOWARD, honorably discharged from the U.S. Armed Forces after several years of active service, is Associate Editor of the *Daily Worker* and of *The Worker*. * * * The contribution by WILLIAM Z. FOSTER, National Chairman of the Communist Party, represents the text of his remarks at a meeting of the National Board and is printed in this issue as a contribution to the discussion on the question of self-determination for the Negro people. * * * HAL SIMON, member of the Communist Party's National Committee and New York State Board, is the Trade Union Director of the Party in New York. * * * JAMES S. ALLEN, formerly Foreign Editor of the *Daily Worker*, is the author of several books and pamphlets. His latest book, *World Monopoly and Peace*, will be brought out by International Publishers next month. New Century Publishers is issuing his latest pamphlet, *Who Owns America?* during June. * * * MEIR VILNER is a leader of the Communist Party of Palestine. He is represented in this issue with his statement before the Anglo-American Inquiry Commission on Palestine. * * * JOSEPH CLARK, a veteran of the United Nations War, is Veterans' Affairs Editor of the *Daily Worker*. * * * STANLEY RYERSON, Educational Director of the Labor-Progressive Party of Canada, is the Managing Editor of *National Affairs Monthly*, organ of the L.P.P., and author of *French Canada* (International Publishers). * * * JOHN STUART is the Foreign Editor of *New Masses* and co-author with Bruce Minton of *Fat Years and the Lean* (International Publishers).

The July issue of *Political Affairs* will include articles by Doxey A. Wilkerson and Henry Winston in further discussion of the question of the right to self-determination by the Negro people in the Black Belt.

FRO
PAR
OF

AFTER
events
Axis s
reason
Such w
the arr
British
ward
1945-
Yet,
carius
Big Fo
with st
press
world
opinion
istically
tion as
It w
history
determ
crisis ar
this ren
Potsdar
ifies for
THE S
THE

The

FROM POTSDAM TO PARIS—ONE YEAR OF FOREIGN POLICY

By MILTON HOWARD

AFTER EXPERIENCING the gigantic events of the world war against the Axis states, the peoples had every reason to expect a period of peace. Such was their hope one year ago as the armies of the American-Soviet-British coalition lunged forward toward Berlin and victory in May, 1945.

Yet, one year after, peace is precarious. The Paris meeting of the Big Four foreign ministers is tense with strains. So relentlessly has the press dinned the talk of another world war looming that public opinion has begun to accept it fatalistically, without any precise realization as to what it will entail.

It will be useful to examine the history of the anti-Axis coalition, to determine the reasons for its present crisis and possible collapse, and what this remarkable turn of events, from Potsdam 1945 to Paris 1946, signifies for the American working class.

THE STRUGGLE FOR THE COALITION

The coalition against the Axis

posed the problem of working agreements between bourgeois-democratic states and the great Socialist State. It was the calculation of the Axis leadership that there were insuperable obstacles to the organization of a coalition between these two sectors of the world. That calculation proved to be false.

Objective necessities—in which the Soviet Union played such a determining part—over-riding the prejudices, fears and hatreds of the ruling classes in Britain and the United States, created the conditions that made such a coalition inevitable.

The coalition had its uneven history. Collective security for stopping Nazi aggression was proposed by the Socialist state following Hitler's advent to power. Marxist-Leninist science first and alone most clearly revealed the essential character of German fascism as a drive, not merely for a re-division of the existing markets and colonies, but for a domination of the entire world, including its great national states. Marxist-Leninist science enabled the working class Communist parties in the capitalist countries to appreciate the same truth, and to act as the vanguard in revealing the danger to the national existence of their countries. But, Marxist-Leninist science is not admired or applied by the propertied classes which rule the capitalist states. The slogan for collective security against German-Japanese expansion fell on deaf ears from 1933 to 1941, eight years in which the fas-

cist enemy was permitted to conquer Europe, a good part of Asia, and reach the very brink of success. As the alternative to a coalition with the Socialist State, the ruling circles of Britain and France gambled on the possibility of a world capitalist coalition or understanding within which German imperialism would be bought off by pledges of limitless booty to the East. American ruling class opinion wavered between the counsels of Hoover and Vandenberg, urging the advisability of non-interference with German expansion, and the far-sighted views of President Roosevelt. The latter's "quarantine the aggressor" policy met with serious resistance in the ranks of his own class and was insufficiently pressed by the President. The Hoover line was aided by the Dies and Social-Democratic type of propagandists, who presented the "quarantine the aggressor" policy as a "trojan horse" operating in the sole interest of the Soviet state.

Confronted with this blindness of foreign policy as applied in the super-crafty shallowness of Chamberlains and Daladiers, the Socialist State sought to protect itself, to gain time, by signing the German-Soviet non-aggression pact.

The essential character of German fascist expansionism was characterized definitively by Marxism-Leninism as *unlimited in its aims and menacing in every direction. This essential character did not change and could not change.* German fascism,

in alliance with Japanese militarism, remained a force for the conquest and subjugation of *all* states.

No intrigues of the Munich circles in the governments of the capitalist states could alter that fundamental fact. With the sabotage and eventual wrecking of the Soviet-urged Peace Front by the Munich policy of the Western powers, World War II was an inevitable consequence.

THE ANTI-AXIS COALITION DEVELOPS

We arrive then at June 22, 1941, the day of the Nazi attack upon the Soviet Union, and the final realization even by the pitilessly reactionary Churchill that the advent of the anti-Axis coalition in some form, at least, was inevitable.

The coalition began its difficult evolution. It evolved through the pledges made to Molotov by Washington and London (July, 1942) on the "full understanding reached with regard to the Second Front" through the Teheran agreement (December, 1943) "on the scope and timing of the Second Front," as well as on the long-range outlook for postwar collaboration; through the Crimea decisions (February, 1945) for the destruction of Nazism and the solution of such issues as Polish boundaries. It reached its climactic and triumphant peak in the Berlin (or Potsdam) agreements in August 1945, in which the most concrete steps for the complete elimination of

Nazis
were
Th
with
stituted
Axis c
As e
also th
of the
created
ain an
impact
To g
ruling
Londo
pledge
away f
is nec
pledge
signatu
At C
To a
break
Genera
Germa
inate o
that co
bring a
fishmen
for all
wipe o
remove
fluence
Franco
and t
former
and
treaties
At th
the Un
establis

Nazism and fascism from Europe were solemnly agreed upon.

The Potsdam agreements, together with the Crimea agreements, constituted the high-point of the anti-Axis coalition.

As events were to prove, they were also the eve of the approaching crisis of the coalition, a crisis deliberately created by the ruling classes of Britain and the United States under the impact of a sharp reversal of policy.

To gauge the degree to which the ruling circles of Washington and London have reneged on their pledges, and shifted their policies away from postwar collaboration, it is necessary only to repeat the pledges to which they affixed their signatures one year or so ago.

At Crimea:

To disband all German forces, and break up for all time the German General Staff; remove or destroy all German military equipment; eliminate or control all German industry that could be used for war purposes; bring all war criminals to swift punishment; exact reparations in kind for all damage done by the Nazis; wipe out the Nazi party, Nazi laws, remove all Nazi and militarist influence from German life; exclude Franco from the United Nations; and prepare for trusteeships of former Axis-controlled territories and possessions, pending peace treaties.

At the San Francisco Conference, the United Nations organization was established, with power resting in

the Security Council, with Britain, the Soviet Union, the U.S., France, and China having permanent seats and veto power.

Such was the peace basis established as a result of the anti-Axis coalition which crushed German and Japanese expansionism.

REACTION RESURGENT

Yet, even at San Francisco there began to appear the more or less rapid emergence of the imperialist-reactionary calculations which had been over-ridden during the war by the common necessity to wage a national war in coalition with the Socialist State. American policy, now dominated increasingly by the sinister Vandenberg, spokesman for the old Hoover forces in the government, proposed the admission of reactionary Argentina and the denial of admission to progressive-democratic Poland. This had been preceded by the Chapultepec Conference with the Latin-American countries in which American imperialist dominance asserted itself more vigorously and openly.

There followed the series of crises—the breakdown of the Foreign Ministers Conference in London, in September, 1945; the temporary easing of matters at the Moscow Conference in December, 1945; and the January, 1946, meeting of the U.N. in London, where Iran was dished up as the first of the provocative *démarches* intended to “wrest moral leadership from the Soviet Union.”

The drift of events became apparent when, in reply to Soviet charges of British violence in Greece and Indonesia, Bevin could only find the reply that Communist parties constituted a "menace" to peace.

The trend became even more pronounced with the outburst of the crude spy scare in Canada, manipulated clearly from London with Washington connivance and approval. This was followed by the trumpet blast which was intended to announce the new phase of political relationships, the Fulton speech of Winston Churchill, delivered under the sponsorship of President Truman, calling for an Anglo-American war bloc to establish world domination, and the revival of the politics of the *cordon sanitaire*.

Thus, in the space of a year the atmosphere had deteriorated to such a degree that in his 1946 May Day address Generalissimo Stalin could single out as the general development in world politics "*the intrigues of international reaction which is hatching plans for a new war.*"

At Paris, as at the United Nations, the intention has been clearly to substitute for the conception of the Big Three the new conception of an American-British bloc pursuing aggressive aims against the third of the major anti-Axis allies. At Paris, American policy has been systematically directed toward the strategic aim of revising the Crimea and Potsdam agreements downward, so to speak, from the level of consistent

anti-Nazi, anti-fascist levels toward a policy of aiding the classes and groups formerly in the fascist Axis camp. The Tri-Power Crimea Conference of February, 1945, enunciated the principle of the right of the liberated peoples of Europe "to choose the form of government under which they will live." Yet the new peoples' democracies are now the victims of financial pressure and slander intended to coerce them to grant greater powers to the former pro-Axis groupings. Conversely, the Crimea decision to de-nazify Germany becomes more and more a dead letter as British policy openly supports the old Nazi industrialists in the Ruhr and maintains a tremendous Nazi army. In the American zone, similar conditions prevail while in Italy the notorious Polish fascist General Anders maintains his army intact under American-British sponsorship.

And all this reversal of the anti-Nazi decisions in favor of the plan for the Anglo-Saxon powers to dominate the world is presented by official Washington as a hastily and reluctantly improvised defense against alleged Soviet expansionism.

A policy of friendship with the Soviet state on the part of any smaller state is viewed as infallible proof of "Soviet domination." Only willingness to restore to power the venomous feudal fascist gangs in the Balkans and in Poland is considered proof of "independence." That is, only servility to the imperialist or-

ders
adm
des
An
Trea
berg
Janu
again
the C
Byrn
ica's
settle
Th
cept
is re
fy G
"pro
ture
of d
could
cism
think
such
alarm
a p
aims.
THE
ST
W
Was
on th
a fat
the n
form
tween
Social
failur
talis
Le
and

ders of Washington and London is admitted to be genuine "independence."

And the delusive Four-Power Treaty offered by Senator Vandenberg to the United States Senate in January, 1945, as a *political weapon against Roosevelt's agreements at the Crimea* now appears in Secretary Byrnes' hand in Paris, 1946, as America's sole contribution to a postwar settlement.

That the Soviet Union would accept from the United States, which is renegeing on its pledge to de-nazify Germany, the "protection" of its "promise of aid" in the event of future German aggression, was a piece of dupery that only a Vandenberg could invent. It is a sign of the cynicism of current American political thinking that Soviet coolness toward such crudities is viewed with mock alarm and simulated melancholy as a proof of Soviet "expansionist aims."

THE OUTLOOK AND THE STRUGGLE AHEAD

Where do we stand, then, today? Was the American-British welching on the Crimea and Berlin decisions a fatalistic inevitability, inherent in the nature of their class rule? Is any form of postwar collaboration between the imperialist powers and the Socialist State doomed in advance to failure by "objective forces" of capitalism?

Lenin taught the working class and the Communist vanguard that

"politically, imperialism is, in general, a striving towards violence and reaction . . . the political features of imperialism are reaction all along the line." But it is not a foregone conclusion that this striving toward extreme reaction shall prevail at any given moment. The anti-Axis war was waged by imperialist states in alliance with the Socialist State despite their inherent striving toward the policy of reaction all along the line. Soviet diplomacy directed toward the defense of the Socialist State, and therefore toward the defense of peace and the advance of democracy, as well as the "objective forces," frustrated the classic plan for a united capitalist assault. The peoples' forces, in the anti-Axis war, waged the struggle heroically as a fight to destroy fascism. They emerged in their victory intent on completely destroying the fascist remnants and on preventing the restoration of a Munich policy. This is the meaning of the newly-risen peoples' democracies in Europe. This is the meaning of the unquenchable desire of the popular masses the world over for alliance and friendship with the Soviet Union.

Monopoly capitalism is no more fated to have complete success in its current foreign policy than it is fated to have complete success in its constant efforts to drive the conditions of the working class down to the lowest physical level consistent with survival.

It was a mistake to view the anti-

Axis war as a "pure phenomenon," as wholly a peoples' war without any imperialist components. British imperialist considerations particularly were operative at every step in the military strategy. We know that the Second Front was deliberately sabotaged by the imperialist, especially the British imperialist, forces for two years as a political decision to throw the main brunt of the war's losses on the Socialist State, with the plan of uprooting as little as possible of the obsolete social conditions prevailing in Europe. But the fact remains that the victory over the Axis was a triumph for the working class and all democratic forces, a triumph for world progress that brings uneasiness to the camp of the monopolists.

The Yalta-Potsdam accord which took as its basis postwar Anglo-Soviet-American collaboration, was realizable only if it was, and is, understood that the diplomatic documents did not obviate the necessity for mass struggle to effectuate them, but increased that necessity.

The need for that struggle became manifest while the war was still being waged. The San Francisco Conference made clear for all to see the aggressive imperialist intentions of the Anglo-American bloc. Today, those intentions dominate policy in Washington, and in London under the "Labor" government.

As the alternative to a postwar "equilibrium," imperialism, wielding the atomic weapon, now calculates that it has an opportunity to force a

decision, or at least, to prepare the way for a decision in the not too distant future. Once again, it is making the same calculations of an "unprepared" Soviet Union which led Hitler to disaster. It is speculating on the solidity of the American-British bloc, hoping to subordinate the inner contradictions of this unstable alliance to the greater goal of destroying the Socialist State and forcing all mankind into the yoke of Anglo-Saxon imperialist domination.

Marxism-Leninism teaches that wars are generated by the contradictions inherent in capitalist society. They are generated by the uneven development of various imperialist states, each trying to establish a division of markets and colonial loot consistent with its power. They are generated by the chronic tendency of the capitalist world to dream of a "solution" of its insoluble contradictions at the expense of the Socialist State and the new democratic states.

But Marxism-Leninism is a philosophy of the action of the masses as conscious instruments of history, making history through resistance to the designs of the propertied classes. Alternately, our philosophy is falsified as "adventurist insurrection" and "conspiracy," or "passive fatalism." It is neither. Imperialism inevitably breeds war. But imperialism is not the unbridled master of history or events. It collides with the strength of the Socialist State, the will of the liberated peoples for national independence and a democratic life, the

aspirations of the colonial millions for freedom, and the counter-policies of its "own" working class.

The people must be armed with knowledge of the destructive, reactionary character of the foreign and domestic political policy of monopoly capitalism and its spokesmen in and outside the government, in particular the Hoover-Vandenberg combination. This knowledge sinking deeply into the consciousness of the people can become the force to balk the current ruinous course of the nation's ruling class. Resistance by the masses

to Wall Street war-scheming can change events. Given leadership and perspective, the people can successfully compel the restoration of the peaceful postwar collaboration between the United States, the Soviet Union, and Britain, envisioned in the Yalta and Potsdam agreements. The foreign policy of this country must not be allowed to remain the policy of the monopolies. The people, and especially the labor movement, must rise to their historic responsibility. That is our message to the working class today.

STALIN'S MAY FIRST ORDER OF THE DAY

THE ORDER OF THE MINISTER FOR THE ARMED FORCES
OF THE U.S.S.R., No. 7, ISSUED ON MAY 1, 1946, MOSCOW.

COMRADES, RED ARMY AND RED NAVY men, sergeants and petty officers!

Comrade officers, generals and admirals!

Working people of the Soviet Union!

Today, for the first time since the victorious termination of the Great Patriotic War, we celebrate May 1—the international holiday of working people—in conditions of peaceful life, won in a hard struggle against the enemies at the cost of heavy sacrifices and privations.

One year ago the Red Army hoisted the banner of victory over Berlin and completed the defeat of fascist Germany. Within four months after the victorious termination of the war against Germany, imperialist Japan downed her arms. The Second World War, prepared by the forces of international reaction and unleashed by the chief fascist states, ended in a full victory of the freedom-loving peoples. The smash-up and liquidation of the main hotbeds of fascism and world aggression resulted in deep changes in the political life of the peoples of the world, in a wide growth of the democratic movement among the peoples.

Taught by the experience of war, the popular masses realized that the destinies of states cannot be entrusted to reactionary leaders, who pursue the narrow caste and selfish anti-popular aims. It is for this reason that peoples which no longer wish to live in the old way, take destinies of their own states into their own hands, establish democratic order and carry on an active struggle against the forces of reaction, against instigators of a new war. The peoples of the world do not wish a repetition of the calamities of war. They fight persistently for the strengthening of peace and security.

In the vanguard of the struggle for peace and security marches the Soviet Union, which played an outstanding part in smashing fascism and fulfilled its great mission of liberation. The peoples liberated by the Soviet Union from the fascist yoke received an opportunity of building their state life on democratic principles, of realizing their historical aspirations. On this road they find fraternal assistance on the part of the Soviet Union.

The entire world has had an opportunity to convince itself, not only of the power of the Soviet State, but also of the character of its policy based

on the recognition of equality of all peoples, respect for their freedom and independence.

There is no reason to doubt that in the future the Soviet Union will be true to its policy—the policy of peace and security, the policy of the equality and friendship of the peoples.

Upon the termination of the war, the Soviet Union started peaceful Socialist construction. The Soviet people enthusiastically set about peaceful constructive labor, which had been interrupted by the war.

The law on the Five-Year Plan of restoration and development of the national economy of the U.S.S.R. in the period from 1946 to 1950, adopted by the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R., opens new prospects of further growth of the productive forces of our own country, the growth of her economic might, the rise of her material welfare and culture.

The workers, peasants and intellectuals of our country received the Five-Year Plan as a militant program which corresponds to their vital interests. We may hope that the Soviet people, led by the Communist Party, will not spare their strength and labor in order not only to fulfill but also to over-fulfill the new Five-Year Plan.

Developing peaceful socialist construction, we should not forget for a single minute the intrigues of international reaction, which is hatching plans for a new war. It is necessary to remember the teaching of the great Lenin to the effect that in passing to peaceful labor, it is necessary to be constantly vigilant, to protect as the apple of one's eye the armed forces and defensive power of our country.

The armed forces of the Soviet Union—our land troops, air forces and Navy—discharged their duty to the Motherland in the Great Patriotic War. Now our armed forces are faced with a task of no less importance: vigilantly to guard the hard-won peace and the constructive labor of the Soviet people, to be the reliable bulwark of the interests of the Soviet Union.

The successful accomplishments of this honorable task is possible only on the condition of further growth of military culture and military skill of the officers and men of our Army, our Navy and our aviation. The armed forces of the Soviet Union must daily improve their military art on the basis of experience of war, on the basis of the progress of military science and technique. Beyond any doubt, our Army, our Navy, and our aviation will accomplish with honor all those tasks facing them.

**Comrades, Red Army and Red Navy men, sergeants and petty officers!
Comrade officers, generals and admirals!**

Comrade men and women workers, men and women peasants, people of intellectual labor, veterans demobilized from the Red Army!

POLITICAL AFFAIRS

On behalf of the Government and the Communist Party I greet and congratulate you on the day of the First of May!

To mark the international holiday of working people, I order:

Today, May 1, a salute of 20 salvos to be fired in Moscow, the capital of our Motherland, and in the capitals of the Union Republics and also in Lwow, Koenigsberg, Khabarovsk, Vladivostok and Port Arthur, and in the hero cities: Leningrad, Stalingrad, Sevastopol and Odessa.

Long live our valiant armed forces!

Long live our glorious Communist Party! Long live the great Soviet people! Long live our mighty Soviet Motherland!

Minister for the Armed Forces of the U.S.S.R.
Generalissimo of the Soviet Union,

STALIN.

S
O
S

W
rea
unc
sar
out
the
gle
the
It
bri
of
pro
I
ne
con
and
imp
cre
be
cal
sio
sib
wo
gra
the
cap
I
stri
era

SOME LESSONS OF THE RECENT STRIKE STRUGGLES

By HAL SIMON

WITH A NUMBER of major strikes already concluded, and others either under way or impending, it is necessary for the trade unions to begin outlining a program of action for these present and impending struggles which takes into account both their economic and political aspects. It is our intention, in this article, briefly to outline and discuss some of the important aspects of such a program.

However, before doing so, it is necessary, first, that certain questions connected with the wage struggles and demagogically advanced by the imperialists and their agents to create confusion among the workers, be answered in a clear and categorical fashion. For, unless this confusion is eliminated, it will be impossible effectively to mobilize the workers for carrying out the program of action which is dictated by the present offensive of monopoly capital.

Immediately after the end of the strikes in General Motors and General Electric, the capitalist press with

one voice began to shout: "Was it worth it? Who gained from these strikes?" The *New York Times* of March 14, in an editorial, stated that the strike was a "pyrrhic victory"—the workers gained nothing, the employers gained nothing, and the "general public" gained nothing. The editorial concluded: "Why did it have to take place at all?"

WERE THE STRIKES WORTH WHILE?

Similarly, in the *Atlantic Monthly* for May, Professor Sumner H. Slichter asks: "Were the strikes worth while from the union standpoint?" To which he gives the answer: "They were hardly justified by the wage increases won."

In the steel plants of Lackawanna, Syracuse, and other places, the foremen and supervisors are scurrying about, also asking the workers: "Was it worth it? What did you gain from the strike?"

Let us examine these questions, and the "answers."

The trade union leadership must give a firm answer to the question: "Was it worth it?" And the answer must be an emphatic *yes!*

To begin with, the wage increases gained by the steel, auto, electrical, and other workers are the largest in total amount granted at any one time in the history of the trade-union movement. They represent a significant contribution toward meeting the basic demand of the workers in all of the strikes—the restoration of the heavy cut in take-home pay.

However, the question of "worth while" cannot be determined by examining only the wage-increase aspect of the workers' gains, important as this is. Other aspects of the question must be noted, as follows:

1. Although more than two million workers have been on strike in various industries, not a single strike has been lost. The special significance of this important fact is sometimes lost sight of. It is almost assumed that today, as a matter of course, strikes must be victorious. But such an assumption is possible only if one forgets the bloody struggles of the workers after the First World War, the smashing of the 1919 steel strike and the packing-house strike. At that time the trade union movement was almost liquidated and was not really revived again until 1934.

2. The victories gained so far are an inspiration to the millions of workers who have not yet won, or even begun to fight for, their own wage demands. They have given increased strength and confidence to the seamen, railroad workers, coal miners, and white collar workers, all of whom are now in the midst of contract negotiations.

3. The economic struggles have resulted in a growing alertness on the part of the labor movement to the need for independent activity on political questions. In Schenectady, for example, the entire leadership of the U.E.R.W.A., immediately upon the end of the strike at G.E., began to

turn its strike apparatus toward the establishment of P.A.C. clubs in the various wards. The workers there are determined to have something to say about the elections for a new City Administration, for they remember that the Mayor and the old City Council opposed their strike. In Westchester, the workers who were on strike in Tarrytown did not forget that they too faced hostile administrations during their strike; and their electoral activity resulted in the defeat of Republican administrations, in a number of villages, that had been entrenched in power for more than 45 years.

Certainly, in the course of these strikes, the workers have gained much in political maturity. Millions of them have shed many illusions about the Truman Administration, and are beginning to understand the independent role that labor must play on the political field. This is evidenced by the concern with which a number of recent trade union conventions have discussed the prospect of a Labor Party.

4. Perhaps, above all else, these strikes were "worth it," *i.e.*, necessary, because they defeated the offensive of Big Business against the trade unions, and especially against the C.I.O. They defeated, in the words of Philip Murray, "the conspiracy of big business." This conspiracy was an attempt on the part of the monopolies, immediately upon the end of the war, to weaken, indeed to destroy, the effectiveness of

the
cont
part
path
Tha
ficti
secre
of th
Hote
meet
atten
"han
plan
solid
of th
contr
sible
then
a Se
Moto
requ
creas
befor
befor
sent
corpe
had t
wage
been
anyh
As
deter
have
postw
tions.
ever,
even
forms
main
peopl
from

the trade union movement, and to continue their huge profiteering, as part of their plans for clearing the path for new imperialist adventures. That this conspiracy is fact and not fiction is proved by the notorious secret meeting held at the beginning of this year at the Waldorf Astoria Hotel in New York City. At that meeting, the "captains of industry" attempted to work out a plan for "handling" the "union problem," a plan which was thwarted by labor's solidarity and militancy. One aim of that conspiracy was to smash price control and to secure the largest possible price increases. Chester Bowles, then O.P.A. Chairman, reported to a Senate committee that the Ford Motor Company, for example, had requested a 55 per cent price increase in the Spring of 1945, *i.e.*, even before the end of the war, and even before the auto workers had presented their wage demands to the corporations. It is thus clear that had the workers not fought for their wage demands, they would have been confronted with price increases anyhow.

As a result of their unity and their determined struggle, the workers have won the first round against the postwar offensive of the corporations. It must be emphasized, however, that this offensive continues, even though it may be assuming new forms. Nevertheless, the fact remains that the trade unions and the people as a whole have gained much from these strikes against the strong-

holds of finance capital and imperialist intrigue in the United States.

HOW THE FULL WAGE DEMAND COULD HAVE BEEN WON

In the huge plant in Schenectady, the workers were asking: "Could we have gotten more if we had stuck it out longer? Why didn't the trade unions get the \$2 a day they originally asked for?"

To these questions, too, the trade union leaders must give direct answers. To begin with, the duration of a strike does not in itself determine full victory. The G.E. workers were on strike for 57 days and secured an 18½¢ increase; the G.M. workers were on strike for 113 days and also secured an 18½¢ increase. Clearly, "sticking it out longer" is not the complete answer.

But could the workers have made greater gains? The answer to this must be in the affirmative. In answering this question, however, certain lessons must at the same time be drawn for the future.

A major reason why the full \$2 a day was not won is that insufficient unity was developed within the C.I.O. This was due to the activities of such individuals as the Social-Democrat Reuther of the U.A.W., who fought against a united strike strategy, who "jumped the gun," and who refused to cooperate with other striking sections of the trade union movement.

Although some steps were taken

at the start by Philip Murray to coordinate the various strike struggles, Reuther's factional-inspired activities did not permit this coordination to be developed to any high degree, and it resulted in the necessity for separate settlements by the electrical and steel workers' unions. Even within the steel industry itself, the original policy of one settlement was not carried through, with the result that many steel workers in fabricating plants had to continue on strike long after the basic steel plants settled. Certainly, if the C.I.O. had waged a really coordinated, unified, struggle, the workers would have gained much more.

A second major reason why the workers did not win their full demands was the strike-breaking role of the Executive Council of the A. F. of L. This officialdom gleefully assumed the role of spokesman for Big Business within the labor movement and condemned the demands of the C.I.O. workers as "excessive." The Executive Council smugly claimed that the A. F. of L. workers had gained wage increases without resorting to strikes. Yet, at the very time it was making that claim, there took place the general strike by the A. F. of L. in Stamford; the A. F. of L. general strike in Lancaster; and the A. F. of L. one-day holiday in Houston. Nor should it be forgotten that the coal miners are in the A. F. of L., and at this moment are out on strike. All of these strike actions have been for wage demands.

In almost every area in which the C.I.O. was on strike, cooperation developed between the rank and file and the lower bodies of the A. F. of L. and the striking C.I.O. unions. In Albany and Schenectady, the Central Trades and Labor Council of the A. F. of L. went on record in support of the electrical, steel and auto workers' strikes. In Buffalo, the head of the C.T.L.C. of the A. F. of L. likewise came out in support of the C.I.O. strikes. In many localities, experience during the strikes showed a desire on the part of the rank and file of the A. F. of L. to gain wage increases comparable to those won by the C.I.O. workers, and, yes, to work together with the C.I.O. to achieve these demands. However, the Executive Council did its work well for monopoly, preventing real unity between the A. F. of L. and the C.I.O. in the course of the strikes.

It is clear, then, that the workers could have secured greater wage increases. If the trade unions are to win victories in the future, the lesson of unity must be learned rapidly. The rank and file of the A. F. of L., inspired by their brother workers in the C.I.O., should demand united action between the A. F. of L. and C.I.O. in the struggles ahead. Within the C.I.O. itself, the workers must reject and defeat the disruptive activities of Social-Democrats and unify the ranks of the C.I.O. around a positive, militant program.

When General Motors settled with

the
sett
same
gan
over
The
that
malc
origi
some
the
senc
or in

NO

TH
over
due
tratic
trol
on t
TH
whic
thing
cures
corp
ing
will
State
" . . .
are
15¢
rang
per
win
will
getic
resor
Bu
guar

the U.A.W. and General Electric settled with the U.E.R.W.A. on the same day, a number of workers began to feel that the strike wave was over and that all would now be well. The capitalist press crowed loudly that now we can get back to normalcy, now we can proceed with our original reconversion plans. Even some trade union leaders felt that the newly-won wage increases lessened the possibility of a serious crisis or immediate depression.

NO ILLUSIONS!

The strike wave is by no means over. The pressure of price increases due to the failure of the Administration to enforce rigid price control will place new wage demands on the order of the day.

The so-called 18½¢ wage pattern which the workers won is not something that will from now on be secured without a fight. If the big corporations can get away with giving only a 10¢ wage increase, they will do so. Actually, as the *United States News* of May 10 pointed out: "... many industries and companies are granting raises of 7¢, 10¢ and 15¢ an hour. The most frequent range, nationally, is from 12¢ to 15¢ per hour." If the workers want to win their full wage demands, they will have to continue to act energetically and decisively with all the resources of their organized strength.

But these wage increases are no guarantee that we shall enter a pe-

riod of "normalcy." In New York City, for instance, almost half a million workers (the majority veterans) are unemployed, with the figure growing monthly. Also, while the wage increases are of definite benefit to the four million workers who have won them, the general impoverishment of the workers proceeds apace. Millions of workers have not yet received wage rises to meet the rising cost of living. Price increases have hit 130 million people, whereas wage rises have been granted to only four million. Some manufacturers are already admitting that the so-called pent-up demand for consumers' goods will be satisfied in a relatively short period of time. The prospect, therefore, is not one of "normalcy" but of growing unemployment and developing economic crisis.

Trade union leaders, and especially Communists, must begin giving clarifying answers to the questions in the minds of the workers and not lull them into any false sense of security. Encouragement must not be given to the idea that wage increases, necessary and important as they are, will prevent the oncoming of an economic crisis. Answering their questions in a correct fashion will help fully to mobilize the workers for the struggles ahead.

A correct fashion means to help develop a full understanding of the relationship of these immediate economic questions to the grand strategy of the imperialists. Failure to

show the connection between the drive against the trade unions and the imperialists' drive for world domination has been the main weakness of the trade union movement in the present great wage and strike struggles.

The imperialist policies which are destroying the basis of world peace are having serious effects within the trade union movement. Big Business is using every weapon at its command to destroy the anti-war and anti-fascist sentiments of the American workers, and to chain labor to the U.S. imperialist war drive. Big Business is pinning its hopes on the ability of the Executive Council of the A. F. of L. to sell monopoly's program to the workers. It is pinning its hopes on the disruptive activities of the Social-Democrats, who, with demagogic phrases, carry out the dictates of their imperialist masters. It is encouraging the Catholic hierarchy, and particularly its labor division, the Association of Catholic Trade Unionists, to develop its divisive activities within the trade union movement. The attempts of monopoly to win the workers for its war program can only be combatted by a fight for trade union unity and a most vigorous fight against these war preparations.

A PROGRAM OF STRUGGLE

Hence, it is within the framework of the fight for peace that the trade union movement must work out,

and fight for, its program of struggle. The major points in such a program are:

1. *Mobilization of the trade unions for the fight for peace.* Organized labor must speak out, in a united fashion, against the huge military appropriations, against universal military training, against the Anglo-American attempt to split the United Nations. It must speak out for friendship with the Soviet Union and for Big Three Unity on the basis of the fulfillment of the Moscow, Yalta and Potsdam agreements. The trade unions must work energetically to rally the support of all American labor for the World Federation of Trade Unions as a key means of achieving working-class unity in the struggle against the imperialist war drive.

2. *Enforcement of the contracts which the workers have just won.* The big corporations, such as Bethlehem Steel, are already attempting to violate or cut the heart out of the recent agreements. They are trying to "get even" by taking away privileges such as wash-up time. They are refusing to permit the workers, as is customary, to finish out a full week by doing maintenance work; now, as soon as the workers stop rolling steel, they are sent home.

The Rochester Products Company issued a circular to all its foremen and supervisors which said, in effect, that the wage increases won by the workers had to come from somewhere, *i.e.*, from speed-up and in-

crease
states

A
be ex
rise.
to get
crease
"chic
crease
where
greate

Th
men
work
teste
quest
contr

3. 6

ized.

the C

entire

call f

noun

ers a

lars f

C.I.O.

issue

Souh

of its

cil of

activi

the C

plans

How

upon

those

appe

again

South

Ther

increased exploitation. The circular states:

A better day's work may properly be expected when hourly wage rates rise. It is up to supervisors to endeavor to get increased value in return for increased hourly pay. Let's not be "chicken-hearted" about this. The increased pay has to come from somewhere. Much of it has to come from greater job efficiency.

The trade unions, the shop chairmen and stewards, and the militant workers generally, are going to be tested in this coming period on the question of the enforcement of the contracts.

3. *Organization of the unorganized.* Philip Murray, President of the C.I.O., has given the lead to the entire trade union movement in his call for an intensive drive to organize the South. The C.I.O. has announced that it will use 200 organizers and will spend one million dollars for this purpose. Every major C.I.O. convention since the call was issued has placed the question of the Southern organizing drive at the top of its program. The Executive Council of the A. F. of L., goaded into activity by the organizing plans of the C.I.O., has announced its own plans for organizing the South. However, its Red-baiting attacks upon the C.I.O., which coincide with those of the Rankins and Bilbos, its appeal to the employers to aid it as against the C.I.O., will not help the Southern workers, Negro and white. There is room for both the C.I.O.

and the A. F. of L. within their respective jurisdictions, in the Southern organizing drive. Neither organization, however, will be able to achieve a full measure of success if the A. F. of L. persists in its present tactics. Local unions in New York, as well as other places throughout the country, should consider at once the adoption of a program of support for the campaign to organize the South, as well as for the organization of the unorganized in their own localities.

4. *Preparation for the 1946 elections.* The trade union movement, with notable exceptions, has not sufficiently begun to draw the full lessons of the strikes in terms of preparations for the 1946 elections. Success on the strike front will be at least only temporary if the political front is conceded to the reactionaries and big corporations. It is in Congress that attempts are being made to tie the hands of labor through anti-labor legislation. It is in the White House and in Congress that the main steps are being taken to prepare our country for another world war. The militancy, initiative, and unity which won the wage struggles must be channeled into the fight for victory in the 1946 election, must reflect itself in greater independent political initiative on the part of the trade unions. The 1946 elections can and must be a forum for putting forward the entire program of the trade union movement. Thus, the 1946 elections, if properly approached by the trade

union movement, can contribute greatly toward the development of a new third party based on the broadest labor-progressive coalition.

5. *The fight for price control.* The trade union movement must organize and lead a mass campaign for rigid price control. This is necessary, if the wage increases are to have any meaning, and if the general support of the people gained by the trade union movement during the strikes is to be maintained. The monopolists, through their press, are claiming that the workers are not interested in what prices the so-called consumers have to pay, but are interested only in wage increases, as though the trade unionists were not part of the consuming public. Such arguments can be answered most effectively by a real mass campaign for price control, and against the wrecking of O.P.A. by Congress.

6. *The fight against discrimination; for Negro and white unity; for unity between the veterans and the trade union movement.*

The big corporations have not been successful in splitting the wartime unity between Negro and white workers. This was demonstrated dramatically on the picket line.

But to maintain and strengthen this unity, the trade unions must demonstrate in practice their concern for, and sensitivity to, the day-to-day problems of the Negro people. The majority of the organized Negro workers are in unions under progressive trade-union leadership.

These unions must take the lead in the fight for the hiring of Negro workers where they have been barred from employment; for adjustment in seniority where necessary; for participation by Negro workers in apprenticeship, upgrading, and training programs; and for the bringing of additional Negro workers into the leadership of the trade unions. The unions must, in addition, take the lead in helping to solve the burning problems of the Negro people in the communities, such as housing, excessive prices, etc. Negro and white unity was an important factor contributing to the victory of the workers in the recent strike struggles. The trade union movement must continue to strengthen this unity by an aggressive fight for the solution of the day-to-day problems of the Negro people.

The big corporations also thought that when the soldiers came home they would be able to use them as strike-breakers. It is significant that the veterans, not only participated fully in these strike struggles, but in many cases were in the leadership of the main strike committees. What the big corporations did not realize was that the basic needs and demand of the veterans and those of the workers are one and the same.

However, here too the trade-union movement cannot assume that this failure of the trusts is a settled question. Attempts are still being made to pit the veterans against the workers, particular use being made of the

issue of
union:
by an
the v
bonus
ing th
unemp
strikin

BUILD

The
sentia
trade
tion o
and r
nist F

In
strike
where
Comm
strong
active
these
plants
when
given
are n
tracts
muni
for th
and
the C
than
Comm

issue of "super-seniority." The trade unions must fight to maintain unity by answering the special needs of the veterans on such issues as the bonus, housing, etc., and by continuing the types of struggles that won unemployment compensation for striking veterans.

BUILD THE PARTY!

These are some important essentials for a victory program for the trade unions. But for the full realization of this program, the conscious and rapid building of the Communist Party is necessary.

In the course of the recent great strikes, it became apparent that wherever there was a functioning Communist Party the strikes were strongest and the workers most active. Following the settlement of these strikes, the workers in the plants are beginning to learn that when there are Communists in a given department, the supervisors are not able to water down the contracts recently won. However, Communists are not only good fighters for the enforcement of the contracts and not only staunch supporters of the C.I.O.'s program. They are more than that. Precisely because they are Communists, they are the most

potent force for helping the workers to understand the relationship between their day-to-day experiences in the shops and the general problems facing the working class as a whole. Through their understanding and application of Marxism-Leninism, Communists contribute in a way that no others can toward developing the political maturity of the workers and preparing them to meet the critical issues which obsolete capitalism is forcing upon them, issues which can only be met by a working class with a Socialist prospective.

The degree to which the current Party Building Campaign is successful will be a measure of the degree to which, in general, the workers will be victorious in the struggle against the drive of monopoly capital on the domestic and foreign fronts.

By utilizing the lessons of the recent and impending strike struggles, by answering the workers' questions as to what lies ahead, by bringing to them, through our Party, the generalized experiences of the working class and by building a strong, mass Communist Party, we will make an important contribution in this most critical period toward advancing the cause of the working class, and of the people as a whole.

FUNDAMENTAL REMARKS ON THE QUESTION OF TRIESTE*

By STEPHANE MITROVITCH

SINCE THE QUESTION of Trieste has been raised as the most important question in the normalization of relations between Yugoslavia (which during the war against fascism made a great contribution to the struggle of progressive humanity, and won a place of honor among the free nations) and Italy (which was the main European ally of Hitlerite Germany, whose fascist troops in large part were lined up against the forces of liberation of our peoples), the representatives of the democratic movement, and in particular of the Italian labor movement, have quite often in the press and official speeches formulated their point of view on Italian-Yugoslav relations, a point of view which does not differ essentially from the position of Italian officialdom. Starting from this viewpoint, which is contrary and opposed

to that of our Republic, they have indirectly begun a polemic against our governmental policy on the question of Italian-Yugoslav relations in general, and on the question of Trieste in particular. Thus, they have hindered the development of solidarity and unity between the democratic movements in Italy and Yugoslavia, a unity which, thanks to the diligent help of our national liberation movement and leaders to the anti-fascist struggle of the Italian people, was being strengthened and was increasingly developing during the last years of the war.

The adoption of this position by the representatives of the Italian democratic movement, as much from the viewpoint of principles as from that of practical and political importance, is not only profoundly in error but also creates new obstacles and strengthens the old hindrances to the solution of the problems of the Italo-Yugoslav frontier, of Italo-Yugoslav relations in general, and the building of solid bases for a just peace in this section of Europe.

It would be totally erroneous to pass over these polemics in silence and not to show, by open and deep discussion, the theoretical and practical error of these conceptions and positions of the representatives of the entire democratic and working-class movement in Italy. That would be a mistake, not only from the point of view of the defense of the national rights of our country, not only from the point of view of the struggle for a democratic solution of the prob-

* From *Cahiers de Communisme*, theoretical organ of the Communist Party of France, March, 1946.

lem of Italo-Yugoslav relations, but equally from the point of view of the struggle for democracy in Italy itself and of the building of a just peace in Europe. For on the creation of concrete conditions perfectly defined for the solution of concrete and perfectly defined questions which are constantly on the order of the day for the progressive social forces in the different countries and in the different parts of the world, depends also the destiny of democracy and the establishment of a just peace and, thus, relationships between countries taken separately.

As far as Yugoslavia is concerned, it has fully realized these conditions. The Yugoslav people and their proved leaders, in the course of the war for liberation, and according to the principles of this struggle, have, since the first days of the popular uprising, created and realized the preliminary conditions for the establishment of friendly and frank relationships with neighboring countries and all other countries, and thus also with Italy.

These preliminary conditions are:

1. The consciousness among the popular masses of our country of the necessity in war of a unified struggle of all the liberty-loving nations for the liquidation of the fascist aggressors, and today, in peacetime, of the necessity of this same struggle for the wiping out of all the vestiges of fascism and its accomplices; that is to say, for the strengthening and construction of a just peace. This con-

sciousness our people have demonstrated in action by the creation of a union, by a struggle with all free peoples, particularly with neighboring peoples. Toward the Italian people, they have also demonstrated this by organizing Italian military units within our country during the war, and now in peacetime by taking a position from the point of view of a unified struggle with the Italian democratic movement for the liquidation of the last vestiges of Italian fascism and of the war criminals;

2. Our new State has been cleansed of all imperialistic and chauvinistic sentiments toward other peoples, which is one of the main conditions for a vast and progressive international collaboration. The Italians of the Julian Venetia have had the opportunity of directly testing this at the time of their encounter with our army;

3. The firm position of our people and the leaders of our State in favor of putting into practice the rights of peoples to self-determination up to the point of secession. Yugoslavia entered the war and supported it to the end, at the cost of many victims, without any imperialist aims on any foreign soil, but logically maintaining at the same time the principle of unification of all its national territories. Marshal Tito already stated this principle during the war. "We want nothing that belongs to others but we shall give away nothing that belongs to us," which remains the basis of relations between the "Federated

Peoples Republic of Yugoslavia" and the neighboring nations;

4. The consciousness on the part of our people and the leaders of our State of the necessity of a united struggle of liberty-loving peoples for the building of a just peace, removing as far as possible all source of future conflicts and every basis for new wars.

Maintaining this point of view, our country for its part has created the necessary conditions for friendly relationships with all countries. These conditions are nothing but the result and natural, logical continuance of the policy followed during the war of liberation against fascism, a part of the program of this war. At the same time, these conditions are, under present circumstances, the basic elements of all foreign policy which has a peaceful and progressive nature.

However, matters stand quite differently in Italy. Italy has not yet realized these conditions. Instead of wiping out the vestiges of fascism and the war criminals, the most ardent Mussolini fascists have taken over in Italy the important positions in the social, economic and political life, while the war criminals have found a convenient asylum there. Instead of liquidating the chauvinist and imperialist policy toward other peoples, a campaign of violent chauvinism has been developing in Italy for some time against the liberal and heroic Republic of Yugoslavia. Instead of making their own the principles of the right of peoples to settle

their own affairs up to the point of separation, a right which was an integral part of the aims of this war, Italian officialdom fights desperately today to continue to oppress the Slavic regions. Instead of a real struggle for a just peace, a struggle not in words but in action, present-day Italy in its desire for the appropriation of foreign regions, especially Slavic regions, tends to create the seeds for new conflicts.

One might say sometimes, correctly, that there are "objective conditions," "specific conditions" of the development of Italy, the entanglement of "external factors," the existence of "relationship of forces," and other similar things so often mentioned, which are the reasons for it. Doubtless there is a good deal of truth in all this. But in the present case, however, it is not a question of these external and objective factors but of a certain "factor," of a certain moment of the political line of present-day Italy, of the line of the Italian democratic movement, of the line of the representatives most consistent in their actions, the leaders of the labor movement. Here, in this article, it is thus not a question of objective conditions of contemporary Italy, which are, because of various causes, difficult and quite complicated; but rather that the democratic movement, and particularly the labor movement, does not conduct a struggle which is tenacious, consistent and principled for the realization of the necessary conditions for the solution

of problems posed by Italo-Yugoslav relations. The absence of such a struggle makes the solution more difficult, weakens the forces of Italian democracy, and strengthens the positions of Italian reaction and even of non-Italian reaction.

II.

Certain leaders of the Italian labor movement, while disapproving the imperialist and chauvinist methods of Italian reaction's campaign against our country, and while stressing the need for friendly relations between Yugoslavia and Italy, have frequently declared:

We recognize no less than others do the Italian nature of Trieste and we will defend it. What separates us is the manner of defending it. (Declaration by Gallo published in *Unità*.)

And further:

We have always stressed the Italian character of Trieste. We have said that in our opinion it is the task of the government to defend the Italian nature of this city. We have proposed, in view of this defense, that an agreement be sought with the Yugoslav people and their government in order to reach a friendly solution of this question. As a result of the chauvinist campaign that Italian reaction has waged against the Yugoslavs, this just policy has been rendered impossible, with the result that the great majority of the Italian workers of Trieste have declared themselves for Yugoslavia. We think that the Trieste workers are taking the wrong road, but we can play the role of mediator only

if the campaign against Yugoslavia ceases and only if our policy modifies the relations between these two peoples. (From the speech by Palmiro Togliatti, at Turin, November 3, 1945.)

Still further:

... On the other hand, without going into detail, I can repeat to you that we Communists have from the start demanded a solution which takes into account the ethnic principle. (I was the first to show that Trieste has "an undeniably Italian character," which is in fact one of the first documents of this kind of our government.) But, at the same time, I demanded that one take into account the economic factor in order to avoid the creation of a permanent conflict between Italy and Yugoslavia.

... I add that we should give Trieste and other zones at present under dispute which will remain with us, the greatest autonomy; otherwise it would be very difficult to maintain there a free and democratic administration. (From the interview Palmiro Togliatti gave the correspondent from the journal *Giornale del Mattino*, September 9, 1945.)

Let us continue:

From what these papers say, it would seem to be we Communists "who renounce Trieste," we who are the ardent defenders of the Italian national cause. . . . I would like to expand on another aspect of this question which is, in my opinion, the most important. *We Communists affirm the Italian nature of Trieste.* (From an article by Palmiro Togliatti in *Unità*, May 16, 1945.) (My emphasis—S.M.)

We conclude with this:

Because we want to have a frontier and not an obstacle, the *Wilson Line*, which leaves a small number of Slovenes in Italy and a larger number of Italians in Yugoslavia, must be the sign of our future friendship. (Pietro Nenni in *La Voce Libera*, May 11, 1945.) (My emphasis—S.M.)

It is clear that these positions and declarations not only do not facilitate Italian-Yugoslav relations but, on the contrary, do not differentiate themselves in practice from the viewpoint of the Italian imperialists, and only aggravate and complicate them still further. Such a stand by the leaders of the Italian labor movement shows that there is no force in Italy which agrees to a just and consistent solution from a democratic point of view of Italian-Yugoslav relations and which would realize in practice on this question, unity with the peaceful and democratic activity of the Federated Peoples Republic of Yugoslavia. In Italy, all parties are thus unanimous on the necessity of defending the Italian nature of Trieste. Where they "differ," as they say, "is in the manner of defending it." This unanimity shows in itself that something is out of joint in the principles of the policy of the present leaders of the Italian working-class movement concerning the national question, particularly when one begins with the fact that this policy concerns the Federated Peoples Republic of Yugoslavia towards

which, obviously, the pro-fascist and reactionary circles throughout the world are not "favorably disposed."

In effect, in the previously cited declarations, certain fundamental theoretical errors are found which clearly show that the policy of the leaders of the Italian labor movement concerning the national question is on the wrong track, more and more losing sight of a clear and consistent solution from a democratic point of view of Italo-Yugoslav relations. This policy wavers between chauvinism, which is maintained in the petty-bourgeoisie by the demands of the Italian imperialists, and support of the national rights of Yugoslavia which are identical with the interests of democracy in this part of Europe, trying to find some "third," "appeasing" solution. That is its principal characteristic.

Firstly: Putting aside, for the moment, the question of the "Italian character" of Trieste and the "Defense of this character," which is the main object of the declarations cited, let us pause and consider the attitude of our Italian comrades toward the Julian Region as a whole.

What is really involved in this question? It is a question quite simply of recognizing the right of these Slovene and Croatian regions—which were oppressed by Italian imperialism and which, through their armed struggle with the aid of their Yugoslav brothers, freed themselves from the yoke of this imperialism—to be a part of their respective peo-

ples. Our Italian comrades either do not put the question, avoiding it in devious ways and tacitly making common cause with Italian reaction, or else speak of "Trieste and the disputed regions which will remain with us," (that is to say, which will remain with Italy—S.M.), copying their conduct from that of the Italian imperialists in their attitude toward "the other [which?] regions."

Speaking of similar questions, V. I. Lenin said:

The proletariat of the oppressing nations cannot confine itself to the general hackneyed phrases against annexations and for the equal rights of nations in general, that may be repeated by any pacifist bourgeois. The proletariat cannot but fight against the forcible retention of the oppressed nations within the boundaries of a given state, and this is exactly what the struggle for the right of self-determination means. The proletariat must demand the right of political secession for the colonies and for the nations that "its own" nation oppresses. Unless it does this, proletarian internationalism will remain a meaningless phrase; mutual confidence and class solidarity between the workers of the oppressing and oppressed nations will be impossible; the hypocrisy of the reformist and Kautskyan advocates of self-determination who maintain silence about the nations which are oppressed by "their" nation and forcibly retained within "their" state will remain un-

exposed. (V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. XIX, pp. 51-52.)

It is thus the duty of the Italian workers and of all Italian democrats frankly and clearly to place the question of self-determination and of political secession of the Julian Region and of the other Croat and Slovene regions which the Italian bourgeoisie has ravaged and oppressed during long years and which are fighting resolutely and continuously against "its" imperialist reaction. Instead of that, the Italian comrades, whom we cited above, speak of "Trieste and other disputed regions which will remain with us" (that is to say, with Italy) and reproach the workers of Trieste for taking a consistent and proletarian position and fighting for it.

It is the duty of the Italian workers and all consistent Italian democrats to pose "the question that is particularly 'unpleasant' for the imperialist bourgeoisie, namely the question of the *frontiers* of a state that is based on national oppression," that is to say, to pose the question of the Italo-Yugoslav frontier, fighting in order that the Yugoslav regions may unite with the mother country.

Instead, the leaders of the Italian working-class movement whom we quoted either ignored by silence the question of the Italo-Yugoslav frontier or else proposed the Wilson line as a frontier, which is imperialist both according to its practical results, a part of Yugoslav territory being "ceded" to Italy, and according to the

sentiments which dictated it; or else they speak openly, as we saw, of "Trieste and other disputed regions which will remain with us," thus in reality accepting, both in word and deed, the point of view of Italian imperialism on the question of the Italian-Yugoslav frontier.

Yugoslavia, before the Council of Foreign Ministers in London, quite completely defined its frontiers with Italy from the ethnic principle. Exclusively Yugoslav regions, as well as Trieste, entered into the frame of these frontiers. In the face of this, our Italian comrades, when they posed the question of other "regions at present under dispute which will remain with us," claim certain Yugoslav regions and actively oppose, not only the national rights of our country, but also the recognition of the rights of oppressed peoples, that is to say, of Slovenes and Croats, to self-determination up to the point of secession.

The numerous declarations by the leaders of the Italian working-class movement on "friendship with the Yugoslav people," on "the fraternal frontier," on "the national rights of Slovenes," on "a divorce with 25 years of imperialist policy," when examined in the light of these positions taken, become banal phrases empty of meaning, without value or importance; for such an attitude regarding the Julian Region objectively leads the Italian masses to the positions of Italian reaction toward our Peoples Republic.

Secondly: On the question of Trieste, the Italian working-class leaders have a position which is entirely clear and defined. As we have seen, they say that "Trieste has a character indisputably Italian," which is in effect established in one of the first published statements along these lines by our "Italian government," that they are "the first" (they, the leaders of the labor movement) to have affirmed "the Italian nature of Trieste," that it is "the task of the government to defend the Italian nature of this city," and finally that they themselves "will defend it." That is to say, that Trieste must belong to Italy. These arguments in favor of this position, according to the statements cited above, are founded solely on the "Italian character," of Trieste.

What then is this first document?

When one speaks of the determination of the nationality of cities, from a scientific point of view one does not exclusively pose the question of the national structure of these cities, but also the question of other conditions born in the course of history. So that the question may be clearer let us take an imaginary example: There are in the interior of Yugoslav territory two little towns where the majority of the inhabitants are German. No reasonable person could propose that they belong to Germany because their population is German. One can find similar examples in other countries. It is known that, after the October Revolution, Tiflis, the capital of Georgia, had only 25 per

cent Georgians and fewer than 35 per cent Armenians. No reasonable person ever put forth the thesis of the "Armenian character" of Tiflis. It is also a known fact that in Hungary there were towns where the majority of the population was German. The question of the composition of the population of a city from the point of view of nationality is therefore not the decisive condition nor the most important one for deciding its national allegiance.

Fundamental to the determination of the allegiance of the city is the national allegiance of its surroundings, for a city and its surroundings form a territorial and economic unit, for the environing countryside conditions the life and development of cities and, under conditions of more or less normal development, modifies and creates the national composition of cities according to its own national character, for the simple reason that the rural population, in various ways, filters, continually into the city. The case of Riga, which was formerly a German city, shows this clearly.

Speaking on this question, V. I. Lenin said:

But the national composition of the population is one of the most important economic factors; however, it is *not the only one or the most important*. Cities, for example, play a *very important* economic role in capitalism, but everywhere cities, be they in Poland, Lithuania, the Ukraine, Great Russia, etc., are distinguished by the most motley national composition of the

population. To separate the cities from the villages and the sections surrounding which gravitate toward them economically, because of a "national" factor is absurd and impossible. That is why Marxists cannot hold exclusively and completely to the point of view of the "national-territorial" principle. (*Collected Works*, Vol. XVII, p. 158.)

We think that Lenin's position explains clearly enough and in sufficient detail the theoretical side of the discussion on the subject of Trieste.

The Italian imperialists of yesterday and today knew and know that to "separate the cities from the villages and the sections surrounding which gravitate toward them economically . . . is absurd and impossible." That is why knowing this, they have tried in obtaining Trieste to also secure its surroundings, the Croat and Slovene Julian Region. That is to say, historical experience shows that Trieste in the hands of Italian imperialism has strengthened the dominating and conquering tendencies of this imperialism, and further, it has been the point of departure, since the beginning of the First World War until the victory over Italian fascism, for new conquests and oppressions of the Yugoslav regions.

Our Italian comrades also know that it is "absurd and impossible" to separate cities from their neighboring districts which gravitate toward them economically. That is why they pose, alongside the question of the "defense" of the "Italian character" of Trieste equally the question of the

other "regions at present under dispute which will remain with us," or, better stated, which will remain with Italy. That is why in defending the Italian character of Trieste, they insist upon the fact that the economic factor must also be taken into consideration.

There is yet another aspect to the "Italian character" of Trieste, that is to say the international nature of this character.

Marxist scientific estimation of the national composition of the population of given regions cannot be derived from the vulgar declarations about the national majority; it necessitates a study and appreciation of conditions, ways and means which have led to a national composition, to a given national majority.

It is only on the basis of a study of all these conditions that the labor movement can take a scientifically and politically correct position. In the history of regions and isolated cities there are cases where by a "natural" assimilation, the original national composition of the population has been modified. On the other hand, in the history of certain present regions, where have been cases where the modification of the national composition of the population has been effected by violence, terror, and upon the basis of privileges, by the oppressor's policy of nationalization. In this case, the labor movement does not recognize "assimilation" thus effected and does not take it into consideration when determin-

ing the national allegiance of the regions and cities in question. Particularly in the imperialist epoch, such an "assimilation" is a means and a method of the policy of oppression and violence of imperialists who habitually wear the mask of "civilizers." Lenin, in his polemic with the Bundist Liebman, rejected and condemned "assimilation" effected by means of violence, assimilation "by violence or which supports itself on privilege." (*Ibid.*, p. 146.)

In the countries where the power is in the hands of the people all assimilation by force is excluded. Our peoples' Republic, a truly democratic state, which realizes to the fullest equality between nationalities, has put into practice the right of free development for all national minorities. The Italians of the Julian Region have been able to convince themselves by their own experience of this. Under the very conditions of our people's democracy, they have gained the possibility for the complete development of their national, cultural and social life. Cultural rights under fascist authority were the privilege of the Italian upper-class, while in our peoples' democracy, the Italian workers have obtained this right. The complete multiple spread of national culture, national in form and democratic, popular and human in content in our peoples' republic, does not transform national units into narrow nationalist circles, but, on the contrary, presup-

poses broad collaboration, mutual aid and fraternal relations between all the nationalities and national minorities. This shows that all "danger" of assimilation in our republic is excluded on principle.

Despite this, our Italian comrades are worried about the "destiny" of the "Italian character" of Trieste. Instead of posing the question as to how this "character" was created, and instead of renouncing in principle and in fact Italian fascism's policy of oppression of Trieste and all of the Julian Region, they defend the "Italian character" of Trieste, forgetting the ways, means, and methods by which the Italian majority of Trieste was created and take it as a perfectly satisfactory condition for the determination of their political position concerning the retention of Trieste by Italy, whose national character it may be said in passing would have been quite different under conditions of normal development which would not have been hindered by violent measures.

Lenin in his polemic with Liebman, wrote:

No. There are not possible detours. Mr. Liebman has condemned "assimilationism" understanding under this term, not violence, not inequality, not the privilege. (*Ibid.*, p. 140.)

Thus we say to our Italian comrades: No. These are not possible detours. You have accepted "assimilation," understanding by the term

precisely violence, precisely inequality, precisely privileges.

Here, then, is what is involved in the theoretical aspect of the question of Trieste. But this question is not only theoretical; it is a concrete question of an historical, economic and political nature.

Historical, in the first place, because one must determine the historical process of the birth of the "Italian character" of Trieste.

Economic, because one must define the vital tie which links Trieste to a definite economic organism, Italian or Yugoslav.

Political, because one must consider this question in relation to the existing circumstances and relationships.

From the history of the establishment of the "Italian character" of Trieste we shall stress only three facts:

At a time when the Italian people waged the struggle for national unification, when the expansionist tendencies of the Italian bourgeoisie were not yet in the fore, the most advanced men of Italy, insisting upon the necessity for fraternity between the Italian and Yugoslav peoples, proposed the Sotcha River as the eastern frontier of Italy. Thus, in 1847, in his book *The Rights of Man*, Giuseppe Mazzini said that the source of the Sotcha was the frontier God had given Italy and up to which Italian was spoken and understood, while beyond this frontier Italians had no rights. The fact that Mazzini

himself changed his point of view in accord with the development of "expansionist" tendencies of the Italian bourgeoisie, does not change the importance of this historic fact.

The policy of the Austrian rulers in the Julian Region and particularly in Trieste was, taken as a whole, a policy favoring the Italians and encouraging the denationalization of the Slavic population (Croatian and Slovenian).

Stalin denounced the essence and the method of this policy in these terms:

There is an old specific system of ruling, under which a bourgeois government makes certain nationalities its favorites, grants them privileges and humbles the other nations, not wishing to bother with them. Thus, by placing one nationality in a favored position, it uses it to press on the others. Such, for instance, was the method of rule in Austria. (Joseph Stalin, *Marxism and the National and Colonial Question*, p. 161.)

The Austrian method of government in the Julian Region and particularly in Trieste, taken as a whole and not judged by a few exceptional maneuvers by Austrian rulers, followed the path of conciliation of the Italian nationality and through this oppression of the Croat and Slovene nationalities. The history of these regions shows this beyond the shadow of a doubt. We shall not insist on the fact that the Italian language was the only one allowed in the courts up to 1883, and that in practice

this state of affairs was not greatly modified until the end of Austrian domination of the Julian Region. Nor shall we insist on the question of the cultural privileges of the Italian minority, or on the question of the situation and the role of the Italians in the Austrian administrative apparatus, any more than on the question of the barriers systematically put in the way of the development of a Croat and Slovene intellectual class. These are historic facts known to all those whose thinking has not been sullied by chauvinism. We shall mention only that which is particularly characteristic of the history of the "Italian character of Trieste," for example, the famous Austrian census. In the Julian Region and in Trieste, there was carried out under Austrian domination, a census of the population, *not on the basis* of national origin, but upon that of the "language used." From the fact that by force of circumstances the Italian language was imposed in business and in large part in the administration, a large section of the population of Trieste had to know Italian. At the time of the census these people were put down as having Italian as their "language used." Better to illustrate this method of Italianization of the Croats and Slovenes of Trieste, we shall cite only one statistical fact: At Meintizgen important conclusions were reached concerning the place of origin of the inhabitants of Trieste since the census of 1900. Of 178,590 persons, 106,105 were born

in Carniole, in Dalmatia 3,098, and 17,718 abroad. Results were reached which show that the census regarding the language in use is not worthy of belief. Among people born in Carniole 6,153 were registered as usually speaking Italian, 1047 German and only 2,672 as Slovene; as for those of Dalmatian origin, 2,588 were described as Italian-speaking, 201 Serbo-Croat, and 85 German. (*Au sujet de Trieste*, p. 296).

The fascist government of Mussolini did not content itself with the Austrian methods for the creation of the "Italian character" of Trieste. By fascist methods of terror, assassination, torture, incendiary acts, deportation of populations, closing of Slovene and Croat schools, the destruction of cultural centers, etc., there began at an accelerated pace the creation of the "Italian character of Trieste." Mussolini's fascists also used "legal" means. From the beginning of their rule in the Julian Region, they brought a great number of Italians into Trieste. On the basis of the famous laws on the Italianization of names, places, and proper names, tens and tens of thousands of Croats and Slovenes became "Italians" overnight. It must be said in passing that it was specified in these laws that lists had to be made up of Italian and Latin names translated into a foreign language, or whose spelling had been changed by the addition of a foreign ending.

The fascist denationalization of the Julian Region also had its eco-

nomics aspects. One may mention the case of the agricultural cooperatives and credits which at the time of the Italian annexation numbered 310 and had 100,000 members. At the end of a certain time the cooperatives were liquidated, which was a heavy blow for the Slovene and Croat peasantry. Further, the banking policy of the fascists led to the plunging of the peasants into debt, and tended toward the dispossession of the Slovene and Croat peasantry. For this purpose on the initiative of the fascist organization of Trieste a special credit bureau was created "Ente per la rinascita delle tre Venezie," which bought Slovene and Croat property and resold it to the Italian colonizers. This plan, which had very painful consequences for the Slavic population, was called "Bonificazione Etnica" by the fascists.

Examined in the light of these historic facts, the thesis of our Italian comrades on the "Italian character" of Trieste, which does not recognize the arbitrary imperialist methods by which this character was created, is not even a half-truth. By not repudiating the Austrian and Mussolinian methods of denationalization of Trieste, the points of view of our Italian comrades recognize and accept the results of the Austrian census on the basis of "language used," as well as Mussolini's laws on changing names based on correction of deformed spelling and on the "rejection" of "foreign sounds" and the activity of the "Ente per la rina-

scita delle tre Venezie," and the organized immigration of thousands of Italians into Trieste with the end in view of Italianizing the city, etc. The point of view of our Italian comrades finally ends up in basing itself on the Austrian and Mussolinian policy of denationalization of the Julian Region and of Trieste in particular.

It is not necessary to speak very much of the fact that Trieste is a part of the economic organism which Yugoslavia constitutes, because our Italian comrades themselves affirm the fact that the "economic factor" must be taken into consideration. However, we want to say a few words about this factor. It is well known that Trieste under the Italian regime has suffered a relative decline and retrogression from the economic point of view. As a great seaport and market, Trieste has lost the importance it might have had in relation to our country and central Europe. The Trieste industry deprived of its hinterland, as much from the point of view of labor power as, in good part, from that of raw materials, is bound to retrogress. Only when linked to its hinterland, and solidly basing itself on it, can Trieste realize the conditions for its development.

As for the rest, it is not necessary to emphasize the economic wealth of Trieste with its hinterland, in both the narrow and large sense of the word, for Trieste does not escape from the general rule of the "natural division of labor"

(Stalin) which holds true everywhere, in all countries—the division of labor between certain regions and particularly between cities, economic centers and their environs. On the subject of this division of labor, Stalin wrote:

The division of labor thus established between the regions, cannot be eliminated by the stroke of a pen: it has been created historically by the whole course of economic development of the federation. (Joseph Stalin, *Cited Work*, p. 121.)

We have said that the Italian comrades, "taking into consideration" the "economic factor," recognize the fact that Trieste is linked and depends economically on its hinterland. But instead of recognizing the necessity for uniting Trieste to this hinterland, they speak "of other regions at present under dispute which will remain with us," thus joining with the thesis upheld, today as yesterday, by the imperialist Italian policy.

Insofar as Trieste and "the other regions under dispute" are concerned, taken as a concrete political question, we shall speak of this later on. For the moment, let us review only two things.

During the entire war of national liberation, the struggle of the peoples of the Julian Region was an integral part of the struggles of the Yugoslav peoples. It could not be otherwise because the population of the Julian Region, in its majority, belongs to the Croat and Slovene

peoples. By this struggle, to which it gave so much, the Julian Region has linked its destiny with that of Yugoslavia. The peoples of the Julian Region entered the struggle not only to free themselves of the fascist and German occupation but also to unite themselves with the Slovene and Croat peoples. It is a known fact that the democrats of Trieste and the workers in particular, without distinction of national origin, actively participated in this struggle. That is why when today our Italian comrades pose the question of Trieste and "other regions at present under dispute" as a question under "litigation" they are not only in error in principle but they also are mistaken as to the meaning of the armed struggle of the Yugoslav people—their goals, sacrifices and results. Such a struggle, led in order to rejoin Yugoslavia, remains a historic fact which no postwar combination can erase. That is the first point.

The second is as follows. The war against fascism was waged according to democratic slogans. Its world historic importance consists in this, among other things, that "all conditions indispensable to world peace have already been conquered" (Stalin). The defeated imperialists and the fascist circles throughout the world today, with the war ended, wage a tenacious struggle, under various forms and by various means, to conserve their former positions, to create new sources of conflicts. The Italian imperialists clearly ex-

hibit similar aspirations concerning Yugoslav territories. They would like to make the Trieste question the source of their future conflicts. When our Italian comrades thus pose the question of Trieste and "other regions under dispute" they impede the building of a just peace in the domain of Italo-Yugoslav relations.

That is what the "Italian character" of Trieste comes to, from the internal logic of "one of the first documents" of the Italian government which, alas, as they themselves say, the leaders of the Italian labor movement were the "first to set forth."

Thirdly, the leaders of the Italian labor movement, regarding the Julian Region, and Trieste in particular, again make another grave error in theory and political tactics. Either they consider the question of Trieste separately, without regard to the international situation or human progress under present conditions, or else they transform the present international situation, the present struggle of social forces of progress, into sheer phraseology which means nothing.

What is essential in this question is that they do not see that the joining of the Julian Region to the Peoples Republic of Yugoslavia—to Croatia and Slovenia—strengthens the position of democracy and world peace, strengthens the position of the social forces of progress; for Yugoslavia is a link in this chain of forces, the most solid fortress of democracy and peace in the Balkans and Cen-

tral Europe. On the other hand, the attitude—"defend" "Trieste and other regions today under dispute"—serves to strengthen the position of reaction in Italy and the entire world.

The labor movement in our country has had the opportunity in its own ranks to get rid of such points of view, which are dangerous in theory and practice for the working class. It has remained firm on its position of struggle for democracy, a struggle which is conducted on a world scale. Our movement has held to its position, thanks to the aid of Comrade Stalin:

His [Comrade Semich's] attempt to deal with the national question in Yugoslavia without reference to the international situation and the probable course of events in Europe must, undoubtedly, also be regarded as an error. (Joseph Stalin, *Cited Work*, p. 202.)

Certain ones however among our Italian comrades seem to want to "establish a link" with the international situation and "strengthen" their position on the question of Trieste, "support it" and "justify it" by the interests and the progress of liberty and democracy in all Italy and all Europe.

The question of the "interests and the progress of liberty and democracy," the question of the struggle for progress of humanity to which the national question is subordinated, is not an abstract phrase but a concrete political question. The

progress of humanity in each stage of its historic development unfolds in the midst of concrete historical conditions in each country and the entire world, starting from concrete positions obtained by progressive social forces in resolving the concrete questions existing on the level of struggle between the forces of reaction and progress. That is why the teachers of the working class have always maintained that this question must be approached from a concrete and historical point of view.

In considering the question of the Julian Region under present conditions, where do "the interests" and the progress of both liberty and democracy lie? The best reply to this question is the alignment of social and political forces regarding this question. The fundamental question of this alignment is, firstly, that all the truly democratic forces have come out in favor of the joining of the Julian Region, including Trieste, to Yugoslavia. We cite below some democratic newspapers.

The French newspaper *L'Humanité* of September 15, 1945, writes:

It must be recalled that Mussolini sent there Italians chosen with the aim of creating there a fortress of fascism and chauvinism. Trieste has no importance for Italy because Italian commercial trade is carried on through other Adriatic ports. The fact that Trieste was never developed under Italian domination is a proof of this. . . . Istria and Trieste are Slovene lands. Rightfully they must return to Yugo-

slavia. The project of dividing Istria in two so that Trieste and one section of the territory as far as the Pulj (Pola) is abandoned to Italy, corresponds neither to ethnic and economic conditions nor to simple justice.

The Polish paper *Glos Ludu* of September 10, 1945, writes:

One knows in general that the Italian working masses in Trieste fought side by side with their Slav neighbors against the common enemy and that this common struggle linked their fate with the fate of Yugoslavia.

The Czech paper *Svobodne Slovo* of September 2, 1945, writes:

To unite Trieste with Italy would mean to sacrifice the Yugoslav popular masses and still further to force Italy into a policy of expansion towards the Balkans, for she would undertake to assure a hinterland for the port of Trieste. That is why the slogan "Trieste to Yugoslavia" is profitable to justice and to the security of peace in Europe.

The Swiss paper *La Voix Ouvrière* writes:

Once and for all the question of Trieste must be settled. Toward this end prejudices and falsely sentimental positions must be abandoned and the question solved from a strictly realistic point of view in order to permit peaceful development of the Italian and Yugoslav peoples. It is perfectly certain that Italy can progress without Trieste.

Etc., etc. We think that is it not

necessary to quote the Soviet, Bulgarian, Albanian, and other progressive papers.

Secondly, the most reactionary elements of Europe and America, reactionary traitor elements of Yugoslavia as well, have taken the point of view that Trieste must belong to Italy. We have seen that the same position is taken by fascists and neo-fascists of all "nationalities," the Hearst press and the British fascist Mosley, the promoters of Western or Mediterranean blocs, Franco and his Portuguese colleagues, the reactionary clericals of Zurich, Rome and Zagreb, Yaltchin and his masters of Turkey, Palestine and Egypt; and naturally we find in this gang Pera Zivkovic and Jetic, Milan Gavrilovic, and other official or secret signatories of the memorandum by emigré "Yugoslavs" which they presented to the Foreign Ministers' Conference in London when it was discussing the Trieste question. Finally, Zivko Topalovic thought it necessary to line up again with the enemies of "his" country, this traitor, Social-Democrat adjutant of Mikhailovic, who, let it be said in passing, lives in Italy. Thirdly, the conceptions and positions of the representatives of the Italian labor movement, unhappily coincide with those of these reactionary circles.

This alignment of international forces is not a result of chance. The decisive facts are that the Julian Region is an integral part of the Croat and Slovene nations which

tral Europe. On the other hand, the attitude—"defend" "Trieste and other regions today under dispute"—serves to strengthen the position of reaction in Italy and the entire world.

The labor movement in our country has had the opportunity in its own ranks to get rid of such points of view, which are dangerous in theory and practice for the working class. It has remained firm on its position of struggle for democracy, a struggle which is conducted on a world scale. Our movement has held to its position, thanks to the aid of Comrade Stalin:

His [Comrade Semich's] attempt to deal with the national question in Yugoslavia without reference to the international situation and the probable course of events in Europe must, undoubtedly, also be regarded as an error. (Joseph Stalin, *Cited Work*, p. 202.)

Certain ones however among our Italian comrades seem to want to "establish a link" with the international situation and "strengthen" their position on the question of Trieste, "support it" and "justify it" by the interests and the progress of liberty and democracy in all Italy and all Europe.

The question of the "interests and the progress of liberty and democracy," the question of the struggle for progress of humanity to which the national question is subordinated, is not an abstract phrase but a concrete political question. The

progress of humanity in each stage of its historic development unfolds in the midst of concrete historical conditions in each country and the entire world, starting from concrete positions obtained by progressive social forces in resolving the concrete questions existing on the level of struggle between the forces of reaction and progress. That is why the teachers of the working class have always maintained that this question must be approached from a concrete and historical point of view.

In considering the question of the Julian Region under present conditions, where do "the interests" and the progress of both liberty and democracy lie? The best reply to this question is the alignment of social and political forces regarding this question. The fundamental question of this alignment is, firstly, that all the truly democratic forces have come out in favor of the joining of the Julian Region, including Trieste, to Yugoslavia. We cite below some democratic newspapers.

The French newspaper *L'Humanité* of September 15, 1945, writes:

It must be recalled that Mussolini sent there Italians chosen with the aim of creating there a fortress of fascism and chauvinism. Trieste has no importance for Italy because Italian commercial trade is carried on through other Adriatic ports. The fact that Trieste was never developed under Italian domination is a proof of this. . . . Istria and Trieste are Slovene lands. Rightfully they must return to Yugo-

slavia. The project of dividing Istria in two so that Trieste and one section of the territory as far as the Pulj (Pola) is abandoned to Italy, corresponds neither to ethnic and economic conditions nor to simple justice.

The Polish paper *Glos Ludu* of September 10, 1945, writes:

One knows in general that the Italian working masses in Trieste fought side by side with their Slav neighbors against the common enemy and that this common struggle linked their fate with the fate of Yugoslavia.

The Czech paper *Svobodne Slovo* of September 2, 1945, writes:

To unite Trieste with Italy would mean to sacrifice the Yugoslav popular masses and still further to force Italy into a policy of expansion towards the Balkans, for she would undertake to assure a hinterland for the port of Trieste. That is why the slogan "Trieste to Yugoslavia" is profitable to justice and to the security of peace in Europe.

The Swiss paper *La Voix Ouvrière* writes:

Once and for all the question of Trieste must be settled. Toward this end prejudices and falsely sentimental positions must be abandoned and the question solved from a strictly realistic point of view in order to permit peaceful development of the Italian and Yugoslav peoples. It is perfectly certain that Italy can progress without Trieste.

Etc., etc. We think that is it not

necessary to quote the Soviet, Bulgarian, Albanian, and other progressive papers.

Secondly, the most reactionary elements of Europe and America, reactionary traitor elements of Yugoslavia as well, have taken the point of view that Trieste must belong to Italy. We have seen that the same position is taken by fascists and neo-fascists of all "nationalities," the Hearst press and the British fascist Mosley, the promoters of Western or Mediterranean blocs, Franco and his Portuguese colleagues, the reactionary clericals of Zurich, Rome and Zagreb, Yaltchin and his masters of Turkey, Palestine and Egypt; and naturally we find in this gang Pera Zivkovic and Jeftic, Milan Gavrilovic, and other official or secret signatories of the memorandum by emigré "Yugoslavs" which they presented to the Foreign Ministers' Conference in London when it was discussing the Trieste question. Finally, Zivko Topalovic thought it necessary to line up again with the enemies of "his" country, this traitor, Social-Democrat adjutant of Mikhailovic, who, let it be said in passing, lives in Italy. Thirdly, the conceptions and positions of the representatives of the Italian labor movement, unhappily coincide with those of these reactionary circles.

This alignment of international force is not a result of chance. The decisive facts are that the Julian Region is an integral part of the Croat and Slovene nations which

was "given" to Italian imperialism on the basis of a treaty at the time of the first imperialist war; that the Peoples Republic of Yugoslavia has for the past five years been on the battlefield against fascism, that it has become an important fortress of democracy and peace, and that because of this, the interest of all the forces of liberty is to strengthen this fortress, and, finally, that the demands of Italy, principal ally of Hitler-Germany, toward the Julian Region and Trieste, are unjust and oppressive.

That is why the liberation, from the national point of view, and the reuniting of the Julian Region, is not only a demand flowing logically from the right of peoples to self-determination, and even to secession, but also a demand in the interests of European democracy. Clearly, neither the "special interests" of the Trieste workers nor the interest of progress and liberty and democracy in Italy and all of Europe can be found in the company of Hearst, Mosley, Zivkovic and others; the special "interest" and the general interest of the Trieste workers in these circumstances and at this time on this question lies with all progressive social forces. The present set of circumstances results in the fact that the special interests of the Julian Region and of Yugoslavia coincide precisely with the general interests of European and even extra-European democracy.

III.

There is however a "difference" between our Italian comrades and the open advocates of Italian imperialism on the question of Italo-Yugoslav relations. The "difference" does not lie in the posing of the problem but, as they themselves say, in the "manner of defending" (the Italian nature of Trieste). "That which separates us is the manner of defending it" said Gallo in his declaration, "for a better defense of the nature of Trieste."

This "manner of defending" has three characteristics:

1. *The autonomy of "Trieste and other regions under dispute."*

"I would add that we must give Trieste and other regions at present under dispute which will remain with us the greatest autonomy; otherwise it would be very difficult for us to maintain a free and democratic administration there."

Neither the official representatives of Italian policy "toward the east" nor the diverse fascist and pro-fascist provocateurs have yet maintained the point of view that Trieste must be "given" "the greatest autonomy." Their position is "consistent" and "logical." If the Julian Region and Trieste have an "Italian character," an "Italian origin," are "Italian territories," then "logically" it is not necessary to give Italian territories autonomy. "Venezia Giulia" remains "logically an Italian province."

However, our Italian comrades are embarrassed and should be embarrassed by the absurd contradiction into which they have fallen. The theses of the "unquestionably Italian character of Trieste" and the necessity of "giving" "the greatest autonomy" are mutually exclusive. According to what logical reasoning must Trieste and "other regions at present under dispute," if they are Italian territories, obtain the "greatest" national autonomy? To recognize the necessity of autonomy is to recognize the other non-Italian peculiarities of the whole territory that is called the Julian Region.

It is obvious that the author of the declaration about the necessity of giving the greatest autonomy felt the absurdity of his position; for he did not justify this "greatest autonomy" by the national characteristics of "Trieste and other regions at present under dispute," but by the necessity of "maintaining" "democratic administration." However, a democratic administration in states with a single nationality does not require, as any one knows, national autonomy, for there would be no one to whom to give it and no one to demand it. A democratic administration requires this autonomy in multinational states. Thus, either "Trieste and other regions at present under dispute" have an "unquestionably Italian character" and it is not necessary to give them autonomy or else "Trieste and other regions at present under dispute" have national

peculiarities different from Italian, and must be granted national autonomy.

Thus the thesis of the Italian imperialists falls into an absurd contradiction when it is taken up by certain of our Italian comrades. This contradiction is the result of attempts undertaken without directing principle to reconcile the imperialist reality of the position of official Italian policy toward the Julian Region with the forms of a consistent democratic approach.

What is the guiding thought of this grant of the "greatest autonomy" to "Trieste and other regions at present under dispute"? The guiding thought, above all, is to retain the Slavic "zones," these regions which border on the mother country (Slovene and Croat), under the authority of Italian imperialism, and then to raise among the population of the Julian Region the false hope of a possible freedom of nationalities under the authority of Italian imperialism.

Our Italian comrades invented nothing with this "autonomy." A similar conception of the "solution" of the national question was already presented well before their time by the Social-Democrats headed by Bauer. As is known, Stalin exposed the true face of this position in 1912.

Someone might say: But you also share the point of view of the necessity of giving Trieste the status of a federal unit within your republic. That is true. But this point of view,

because of its basic principles and logic, is in absolute opposition to the Italian point of view on "autonomy." Why? First of all, it is a question here of a city with a Yugoslav hinterland to which it has always been linked and with which it must remain unified if it is to live and develop; of a city which is objectively, according to every consistent scientific criterion an integral part of the Slavic regions, the Julian Region. That is why Yugoslavia does not deny the national peculiarity of this city but recognizes it and resolves this problem within the Yugoslav republic in accordance with the consistent application of the principles of equality among nationalities.

2. *The agreement between Yugoslavia and Italy.*

"We have proposed that in view of this defense (of the Italian character of Trieste) we would seek an agreement with the Yugoslav people and government to reach a friendly solution on this question," say our Italian comrades.

The question of friendly agreement is a theoretical and practical political question. The history of international relations and particularly contemporary experience, shows that friendly, fraternal, lasting relations can be established only between states that are free of all imperialist policy, that is to say, states in which power is truly in the hands of the people. A friendly agreement can be realized between states which, at

least during a certain period, have common aims, which work unitedly to reach them, and which in none of their activities threaten each other.

That is the general principle. What concrete basis do the leaders of the Italian labor movement propose to the Italian rulers?

According to their own words they propose an agreement with the aim of "defending" the "Italian character" of Trieste. Against whom is Trieste to be "defended"? Against the Peoples Federated Republic of Yugoslavia whose national rights are contested? When one adds to this the position regarding other "regions at present under dispute which will remain with us" (that is to say, Italy), one sees the whole basis of the agreement proposed by the leaders of the Italian labor movement.

Marshal Tito, in his famous article, "What is disturbing relations with Italy and what must be done to normalize them?" has presented the only just and possible basis for Italo-Yugoslav relations:

Yes. Yugoslavia wants to maintain good relations with Italy. But under what conditions? Under the conditions that the Italian government openly recognize that Yugoslavia has been a victim of Italy's imperialist attack, without using the arguments of Mussolini or anyone else, for that is an historic fact. Secondly, that the Italian government recognize the great number of victims and the enormous damage to which Yugoslavia has been subjected

during the Italian occupation. Thirdly, that Italy recognize the justice of Yugoslavia's territorial demands.

In the light of these concrete conditions so clearly defined, the declarations of our Italian comrades on the "friendly and fraternal relations," etc., reduce themselves to phrases without real content, and the basis which they propose and which includes "the defense of the Italian character of Trieste," plus "the other regions under dispute which will remain with us," has at present no common grounds with the position taken by our State and its leaders.

A sincere and friendly agreement between Italy and Yugoslavia would have far-reaching importance, which would go beyond the frame of Italian-Yugoslav relations. Our country was oriented toward such an accord during the war. We think that the aid which our country has given the anti-fascist movement in Italy is sufficient proof of that. Nevertheless, in Italy, despite these relations and this friendly accord, the circumstances have changed unfavorably, and for this Yugoslavia bears none of the responsibility. This responsibility falls in major part upon the present leaders of Italy who have not conducted their foreign policy with a view toward an equitable arrangement concerning the Italo-Yugoslav frontier, but have carried it on in the spirit of the well-known claims on Yugoslav territories of Italian imperialism. By their error-

ous position on Trieste and "other regions under dispute," by their hesitant, irresolute attitude during a whole series of repugnant campaigns conducted by Italian reaction against our country, the leaders of the Italian labor movement uphold the official policy of the Italian government now in power. Let us repeat it once more. One cannot resolve the problem of Italo-Yugoslav relations by declarations on "friendship," "respect," "admiration of Yugoslav democracy," on the repudiations of "fascist imperialism," on the "respect for the rights of nationalities," while on the other hand, one affirms the Italian character of Trieste, one states that one is ready to battle for it, one gives "the greatest autonomy" to Trieste and "other regions under dispute," and one accuses the workers and the democrats of Trieste of "taking the wrong road."

On this question the leaders of the Italian labor movement have fallen into an absurd contradiction.

3. *The Unity of the Working Class and the "Error" of the Trieste Workers.*

We understand this attitude of the Trieste workers but do not approve of it. . . . We are more than ever convinced that the solution of the problem of Trieste and the Italians of this region, the problem of the defense of their future, must be sought by a different route than that followed up till now, by a route which would see reunited in a single bloc all the democrats of

Trieste, whether Italians or Slovenes. (From the cited declaration by Gallo.)

We continue:

We think that the Trieste workers are taking the wrong road, but we could play the role of mediators only if the campaign against Yugoslavia is stopped. (From the speech by Palmiro Togliatti at Turin, November 3, 1945.)

To conclude:

We understand this reaction and this state of feeling among the Italian workers in Trieste. It is the result of the agitation by our nationalists and reactionaries. We understand this attitude, but we do not approve of it and we say so openly. We stand for the rights of each people to self-determination. But the Trieste Italians, like Italians in all parts of Italy, should not only be preoccupied with their own interest and development, but with the interest and development of democracy throughout Italy and in Europe. . . . The Trieste workers foresee the possibility of a return of fascism or reaction, and demand that Trieste enter the Yugoslav Federation where they would be sure of finding a political and economic regime more progressive and democratic than in Italy. (From the speech by Luigi Longa, October 22, 1945.)

If we remove the superfluous words from these statements, we find this idea:

a. We are partisans of the unity of the workers of Trieste, of unity between Italians and Slovenes, for their unity in one bloc;

b. The Trieste workers are taking the wrong road. We do not approve

their position on the entrance of Trieste into the Yugoslav Federation;

c. Each has the right of self-determination. The Trieste Italians must not take into consideration their special interests, but those of democracy throughout Italy and Europe.

d. The political and economic regime of Yugoslavia is more democratic and progressive than that of Italy;

e. The Trieste workers' position in favor of the entry of Trieste into the Yugoslav Federation is a reaction to the agitation of Italian nationalists and reactionaries.

Each one of these propositions contradicts the other: if someone favors the unity of the Trieste workers, the unity of Trieste democrats, a single bloc of Slovenes and Italians in Trieste, and this unity, this bloc is made upon the basis of the return of Trieste to Yugoslavia, then logically he recognizes also this basis of this unity. If, on the contrary, he declares himself against this basis, accusing the workers of Trieste of taking a "wrong road" because they declare themselves in favor of a return to Yugoslavia, he is then logically against the unity thus established, against the existing bloc of Trieste workers, the democrats of Trieste, the Slovenes and Italians of Trieste. It is one or the other. If you are, Italian comrades, partisans of the unity *established* between the Trieste workers, partisans of this single bloc, which *exists* between the democrats

of Trieste, then you must also recognize the basis of this unity: the union of Trieste and Yugoslavia. But if you are hostile to this union, as you say, then you are hostile to the unity thus created by the bloc of Trieste workers, hostile to all labor and true democratic unity. It is one or the other.

If each has the right of self-determination and if the majority of Italians and almost all the Slovenes have decided that Trieste must return to Yugoslavia, then it is necessary to recognize this decision, then the problem of Trieste is solved and then it is not necessary to have any "mediator." If you, Italian comrades, consider that you can play the role of "mediator," in spite of the fact that the Italian majority has made its decision, then, excuse us, you do not recognize the "right of each people to self-determination," as it is understood. It is one or the other.

And so it goes. So many propositions. So many contradictions. But it is not only a question of contradictions but of practical action taken in carrying out these propositions.

Neither the question of the right of self-determination, nor the question of the unity of the labor movement, arise from some abstract and formal democracy without regard for time and space. On the basis of self-determination and of unity rest the interest of the working class, the interest of true democracy. These interests are the point of departure

and the criterion of all activity of the working class. The history of the labor movement and of the struggle of the masses in general has shown that unity of the working class and of the toiling masses can only be founded and is founded on the basis of well-defined political principles. There is no unity without principles, except that which the enemies within its own ranks create. That, certainly, our Italian comrades know too, because the working class has made heavy sacrifices in the struggle for unity.

Attacking the present basis of the unity of the Trieste workers, our Italian comrades apparently would like some other "unity," "unity" on the basis of joining Trieste, not to Yugoslavia, but to Italy, and on the basis of "other regions under dispute which will remain with us" (that is to say, with Italy). Such "unity" would not be a democratic workers' "unity," but a unity in the service of the imperialist policy of Italy.

We have seen that our comrades offer themselves in the "role of mediators." To whom do they offer their "mediation"? To the representatives of Italian bourgeois parties and their entourage. Between whom would this "mediation" be? Between the revolutionary workers of Trieste, the democrats of Trieste, and the representatives of the Italian bourgeois parties and their entourage; in fact, between Yugoslavia, where the power belongs to the people and which conducts a consistent battle

for peace, and the Italian imperialists. Why do they offer this "mediation"? To turn the Trieste workers from the "wrong road," from the road where their interests and aspirations lead them to live within the bosom of the Federated Peoples Republic of Yugoslavia. What forces our Italian comrades to offer this "mediation"? Above all, their political attitude toward Trieste, which coincides with the attitude of those to whom they offer this "mediation," for if there were no unity of political viewpoint, mediation would not be possible. It follows that that which spurs them on is the fear of losing the masses, which is, in fact, nothing but a lack of power in the face of Italian reaction, a lack of a logically democratic theoretical position on the basis of which they could resist Italian reaction. The existence of such fear among our Italian comrades is demonstrated by the fact that they constantly say that the controlling thought in the Italian reactionary campaign concerning Trieste is the separation of the masses from the Italian party. This campaign evidently has this purpose, but not only this purpose. The controlling thought is the struggle against the Peoples Republic of Yugoslavia.

All the questions of which we have spoken in this article, and particularly the question of the "role of mediators," reveal that the petty-bourgeois forces, nourished on chauvinism, exercise strong pressure on the present leaders of the Italian

working class. In this pressure, in the attraction exercised by the petty-bourgeois forces, can be found the sources of all the theoretical and political deviations, and all the erroneous conceptions of the Italian labor movement today.

The policy of our Italian comrades on the question of Trieste has in fact become a "mediator" for the destruction of the Trieste workers' unity and of all the democratic forces on the Trieste front against reaction, for the destruction of the unity of the Slovene and Italian democratic movements.

The advocates of Italian imperialism could make hundreds of declarations; the fascist agitators, both old and new, could call upon the "sacred right of the Roman Empire" and accuse the Trieste workers of "treason," but they could never succeed in breaking the unity of the Trieste democrats and workers. Nevertheless, the call for the "defense" of the "Italian character" of Trieste, the condemnation of the attitude of the Trieste workers accused of "taking a wrong road," would necessarily lead them to a split, a break in the unity of democratic Trieste and its heart, the unity of the Trieste workers. This break serves only those in Italy and outside of Italy who are, so far as Trieste is concerned, on the battlefield against the Peoples Republic of Yugoslavia, against democracy and the building of the peace in this part of Europe.

When finally, we examine the

questi
two t
fendin
Triest
disput
and t
reacti
od an
Italian
them

question of the two methods, the two tactics, the two means of "defending" the "Italian character" of Trieste and "other regions under dispute"; if we examine the method and tactic of fascist, semi-fascist and reactionary elements, and the method and tactic of the leaders of the Italian labor movement (if we judge them not by their outward appear-

ance, not by phrases, but by their practical meaning, by their results), it becomes clear that the fascist and reactionary elements play the role of admitted representatives of the Italian imperialist position toward the Yugoslav Republic, while our Italian comrades, unfortunately, serve them as hesitant collaborators, as "mediators."

"ENLIGHTENED" AMERICAN IMPERIALISM IN THE PHILIPPINES

By JAMES S. ALLEN

PHILIPPINE INDEPENDENCE is due on July 4. The new status will be formalized at ceremonies at Manila, only a few days after the atom-bomb test at the Bikini Atoll, in the midst of the new American empire of the Pacific. President Truman is expected to grace both events with his presence, in symbolic reminder of the connection between American benevolence and power. And on July 4 we can expect a great flow of oratory about an enlightened nation that willingly passed on its own heritage to an alien but friendly people, now "our" outpost of democracy in the Far Pacific.

Among the Filipino people there will be much bitterness on this day. The Philippines is one of the oldest colonies in the world. It has had three masters. After over three centuries of Spanish rule and another half century of American rule, interrupted by three years of Japanese domination, the Filipino people are

again being cheated of the freedom for which they have fought during their long colonial history. They will have independence only in form. For the United States has made all the necessary preparations to remain dominant in the Philippines even after July 4. The outward trimmings of independence will be bountiful, but its essence will still have to be fought for within the new political framework.

In every sense—the political, strategic and economic—the United States has carefully prepared for this moment. These preparations have not been lost on the Filipinos. Even H. Ford Wilkins, who throughout long years as a correspondent in Manila has displayed not the slightest sympathy for the Filipinos, now records in *The New York Times*: "They are hurt, sceptical, resentful and afraid that America will make their independence just another Tokyo joke with Washington trimmings."

A NEW PUPPET REPUBLIC

Even the trimmings are not entirely Washington's. As a result of the presidential elections of April 23, held under a state of terrorism supported by American arms, Manuel A. Roxas, a stalwart of the Japanese puppet republic, will become the mainstay of disguised American rule in this new era of "independence." The election of Roxas to the presidency is the culmination of the whole line of preceding American

policy, from the moment General Douglas MacArthur led his troops into the Philippines. The objective of this policy was to assure a regime in Manila that could be counted upon to repress the popular democratic movement and help safeguard the American imperialist stake in the Islands. For this purpose there could be no more dependable instrument than that same ruling circle which had sustained American domination preceding the war and which had gone over almost as a body to the Japanese.

To maintain that ruling class in power, it was necessary to turn the scales against the independence fighters who had led the heroic struggle against the Japanese invaders and their Filipino puppets. While Roxas and his collaborationist friends found common ground with the Japanese imperialists, the peasant and labor organizations, joined by various middle class groups, organized a resistance movement that ranks alongside the Chinese guerrilla armies and the partisan formations of occupied Europe for its effective warfare against the invader, its close ties with the people, its thoroughly democratic program, and its heroism.

This movement reached its highest level on the central island of Luzon under the leadership of the Hukbalahap, the People's Anti-Japanese Army, in which the Communists played an initiating and leading role. In addition to killing at least 25,000 of the enemy, this army organ-

ized local democratic regimes, carried through agrarian and other democratic reforms, and organized the people for the independence that was to be theirs as the fruit of victory over the common enemy.

When MacArthur arrived on the scene, he immediately took steps to restore to power in the provinces and localities the old police regimes of the landowners. Leading collaborators with the Japanese were permitted to resume their positions of responsibility within the central government that was reimposed upon the Filipino people, with only brief and token participation of some resistance leaders. The Commanders of the Hukbalahap were twice arrested by the American Counter-Intelligence Corps, and released each time only after huge and powerful demonstrations. With an American Army of 250,000 on hand, U.S. Army units organized or participated in punitive actions against the Hukbalahap and other anti-Japanese guerrillas, and in some places, as in Tarlac and Pampanga, supervised the arrest and persecution of peasant and labor leaders. The Philippine Army and Constabulary were quickly reorganized, trained and rearmed by the United States to police the Islands.

As in Japan, Korea and China, the keynote of American policy was to establish an alliance with the most reactionary forces, even if this meant finding common ground with the very elements which had supported the Japanese aggressors. To restore

and maintain the old imperialist-colonial relationship, even if its political form would change, was the real objective, and this overshadowed all other considerations. President Truman set this need forth clearly in the early stages of the new American occupation of the Philippines when he singled out the task of maintaining "law and order" against the "threat" of a peasant and labor revolt as the most important internal problem of the pre-independence period.

Those strictures against "feudal" elements that occasionally appear in official American pronouncements are entirely in the category of Sunday sermons; for on Monday the feudal landowners and the armed forces at their disposal are called upon to maintain "law and order" against the peasants. The truth of the matter is that American imperialism cannot continue to dominate the Philippines, whether as a Commonwealth or as a so-called independent republic, without the aid of the very same ruling circles that sustained American rule before the war and upon whom the Japanese relied during the existence of their short-lived puppet republic.

U.S. and Collaborationists

For this reason the issue of punishing the Filipino leaders who collaborated with Japan became very embarrassing for the American government. With the exception of former Secretary of the Interior Ickes, not a single Administration spokes-

man has pressed consistently for the trial of the collaborationists.

In the first flush of the liberation, a number of leading collaborators were imprisoned by the U.S. Counter-Intelligence; but these were soon released under bail. Under pressure of the Filipino democratic movement, and with a view to the approaching Presidential elections, President Osmena finally set up a People's Court, where a number of selected and lesser collaborationists have been placed on trial. On the other hand, the whole Philippine government, from top to bottom, is honeycombed with collaborationists.

When the war came to the Philippines, the ruling Nationalist Party carefully divided its loyalty between the Americans and the Japanese. By far the greater number of Nationalist leaders became members of the puppet republic. The collaborationists claim that they had reached an understanding with the late President Quezon who instructed them to protect Filipino interests under Japanese rule, while he officially aligned the Commonwealth government with the Americans. Whether this double-faced game had the sanction of a formal agreement is not the main question, although some evidence has been produced to prove it. In practice, that is what happened.

While Quezon, Osmena and a few other leaders established their government-in-exile under American supervision, the existing political machinery within the Philippines was

placed practically intact at the disposal of the Japanese. After the defeat of Japan the main problem of the Filipino ruling circle was to maintain itself in power by swinging back into the American orbit.

With the exception of a few who have been designated as official culprits to stand trial as collaborationists, the whole kit and caboodle have been welcomed back into the American fold; for without them American imperialist interests would be deprived of their most dependable native support.

The Role of Roxas

More than anyone else in the Philippines, Roxas is the symbol of collaboration with the Japanese. He signed the pledge of loyalty to Japan, sat in the cabinet which declared war on the United States, headed the rice-collecting agency for the Japanese, and signed the puppet Constitution. It is Roxas' fortune that he is known as a dependable instrument by the Americans too. He enjoys the friendship of General MacArthur, who "cleared" him of collaboration charges when he was first captured together with other members of the Japanese puppet cabinet, and gave him a high commission in the U.S. Army. Himself a wealthy landowner by marriage, Roxas enjoys the support of the Spanish Falange, and of powerful Big Business groups, American and Filipino. He was also the favored candidate of U.S. High Commissioner Paul V. McNutt, who

evoked a great popular protest in the Philippines when he declared on his first visit there after the war that it might be necessary to "reexamine" the question of independence.

During the whole pre-election period, Roxas was the instrument of the American authorities in practically reimposing the collaborationist government upon the Filipino people. As President of the Senate, Roxas was second in authority only to President Sergio Osmena. The Senate itself was composed predominantly of collaborationists, eight of the fifteen Senators who took their seats having served in a leading post under the Japanese.

As Chairman of the Senate Commission on Appointments, Roxas was able to maintain in almost all branches of government the same personnel that had functioned in the puppet republic. His Commission passed upon all appointments to the People's Court. His power was sufficient to oust from the Cabinet its two anti-collaborationist members who had led anti-Japanese guerrilla movements, and to pack the Supreme Court with fellow-collaborationists. Most of the members of the postwar House also held positions under the Japanese. Speaker of the House, Jose Zulueta, was a member of the puppet Council of State, as was the floor leader, Eugenio Perez. The Secretary of the House held the same post under the Japanese.

A similar situation is to be found in all branches—in the judiciary,

from the Justices of the Peace to the Supreme Court; in the executive, from Cabinet posts to secretaries of departments; in local administration, from Governors and provincial boards to municipal mayors and policemen; in the reorganized armed forces from the General Staff to the local commands.

Without a thorough house-cleaning amounting to a democratic revolution, it could not be otherwise; for the ruling class as a whole, with the exception of a few leaders who joined the guerrillas or sought refuge with the Americans, went over to the Japanese. It is this doubly-prostituted and thoroughly depraved ruling circle, enjoying nothing but the contempt of the Filipino people, that American imperialism is now maintaining in power.

The Democratic Alliance

In the election campaign the Democratic Alliance, within which were combined the anti-Japanese resistance organizations and the popular independence forces, directed its main fire against the Roxas collaborationist and pro-fascist wing of the Nationalista Party. While supporting Osmena for president, it emphasized its own program of democratic reform and real independence. Despite the fact that the whole weight of the American influence and of the national reaction was thrown against it, the Democratic Alliance succeeded in electing a number of candidates to the legislature. While the Osmena

wing of the Nationalistas tended to shy away from the issue of collaboration, this was the central point of the Democratic campaign. The popular forces knew only too well that those who collaborated with the Japanese would serve American imperialism just as supinely, and block all meaningful democratic advances within the new Republic.

It is quite possible that the Osmena and Roxas wings of the Nationalista Party will attempt to reunite in a common front against the democratic movement. This certainly would be preferred by the American imperialists and by the Filipino ruling classes. The split in the traditional ruling party was in part a continuation of the old struggle for power to take over the mantle of Quezon, in which Osmena, himself a big landowner identified with the sugar interests, made efforts to gain the support of the democratic forces. But the split reflected something more fundamental. Its underlying cause is the great wartime advance of the democratic forces, who influenced the whole Osmena campaign in an anti-imperialist direction. Even if Osmena should now change his position and seek to switch over to Roxas, the split itself cannot be so easily remedied, and may lead to a considerable political realignment within the new Republic.

Unquestionably, the United States completely deserted Osmena in favor of Roxas, after having exploited the full Osmena's position as Presi-

dent to continue the regime established before the war under American law. Having joined the late President Quezon in the United States and taken over the presidency of the regime-in-exile after his death, Osmena provided the link between the pre-war and postwar Philippines, as a sort of legal, living document which could be presented as the American claim to sovereignty. But because he also symbolized for the Filipino people the pledges of the United States to grant full independence, he became more of an obstacle than an aid to the perpetuation of American power in the Islands. From the beginning Roxas had the full confidence and support of the American imperialists.

U.S. FAR EAST POLICY

The essence of the American policy toward the Philippines and the real character of the forthcoming independence can be appreciated fully only against the background of the new phase of American imperialist expansion following World War II. In the Far East, American imperialist pressure upon Asia burst forth with new energy as soon as the war was over.

Thus, the United States took over control of Japan, the key imperialist position of East Asia. It sought immediately to establish a new and vast sphere of interest in China, and not without initial successes. It occupied significant strategic positions close to the Soviet Far East. Taking ad-

vantage of the weakening of the older imperialist powers, the United States increased its pressure for the "open door" throughout Southeast Asia.

The claim to dominance of Asia is backed by the Navy Department's schedule for new bases across the Pacific, which are even now being rapidly constructed or improved before the formal question of their "trusteeship" is settled in the U.N. Other additional claims are still to be put forth by the Army and the Air Force, as well as the Navy, for bases on the Asiatic mainland.

Strategic Control

In this expansionist strategic pattern the Philippines has been assigned an important role. Some military provisions for Philippine "independence" have already been publicized. In connection with the GI demonstrations for more rapid demobilization, the American army command in the Philippines announced that 70,000 men would remain in the islands after July 4. The wartime force of 250,000 is being withdrawn only very slowly, and one official explanation is that these troops act as the rear echelon for our forces in Japan. Still another function of this large force was described by the commanding general as a reserve to put down "trouble" in Indonesia, Indo-China and other parts of Asia. The Navy schedule includes one major operating and repair base and one airfield in the

Philippines as part of the Pacific network. The Army and Air Force have not yet revealed their schedules for permanent bases.

Emphasis upon the military and strategic role of the Philippines in connection with the over-all Pacific program is evident from McNutt's recent appeal for the passage of pending Philippine bills in Congress. Referring to the Philippines as "islands of confusion in a vast sea of unrest—the general unrest of the Orient," the Commissioner defined the special obligation of the United States in the Far East as providing the "police power and moral hindrance to would-be aggressors,"—the implication, of course, being the Soviet Union. He stated that these guarantees could be supplied only by the "armed might of the United States, actual and potential." For this purpose an elaborate network of Pacific bases must be held by the United States, and on these grounds McNutt appealed to Congress to pass the economic bills, of which more later, as a means of winning the confidence of the Filipinos and the peoples of the Orient.

Confidence is a very valuable asset, and it has become rather obvious that the atom bomb and the building up of American power in the Pacific are least calculated to stimulate confidence among the peoples of Asia in American objectives. This is all the more so because of the new alignment of forces and the new issues coming to the fore in postwar Asia.

Colonial Upsurge

If the Far Eastern aspect of the global war was its colonial phase, this war could not help but evoke a powerful upsurge for liberation, of which the Philippine democratic and independence movement is part. The colonial crisis, accumulating for the past quarter century throughout Asia, burst forth in full force after the defeat of Japan. The agitation of the imperialist powers during the war—Japan with its "Asia for the Asiatics" program, and the Allied colonial powers with their pledges for a new "democratic structure"—unavoidably and as an unpleasant necessity helped kindle the sparks of colonial revolt.

The distinction between victor and vanquished has become rather secondary in this new conflict between imperialism and the colonial peoples. Japanese troops, in their new role as hired gendarmes of Western imperialism, are to be found side by side with American, Kuomintang, British, Dutch and French forces in the struggle against the liberation movements. This has brought home to the colonial peoples the common essential interest of all imperialist powers in maintaining their colonial domination.

This realization, after all the aspirations kindled by the war, has an especially damaging effect upon the political and "moral" position of the United States in the Far East. For no small part of the postwar revela-

tion was the discovery that the United States, itself not a big colonial power and during the war a leading critic of the old colonial system, was in effect arrayed with the older imperialist powers against the liberation movement.

The trusteeship proposals as originally advanced by the United States, through which the American imperialists hoped to barge into existing empires and spheres of influence, now prove a dangerous and provocative instrument in a situation where colonialism as a whole is challenged by the subject and semi-dependent peoples. And the political anti-Soviet objectives of the Anglo-American bloc also played a role in subordinating this aspect of the American policy. No sooner was the war over than the American government began to retreat from the "decolonization" policy implicit in the wartime program, as evidenced by its position at the San Francisco and London U.N. meetings, and by its own demands for numerous strategic bases in the Pacific and Atlantic.

It is against this general background that the present status of the Philippines independence question should be viewed.

"PROGRESSIVE" IMPERIALISM

It has long been the fashion to cite the American policy towards the Philippines as proof that American imperialism can perform a "progressive" role, especially in the colonial and semi-dependent world, in con-

trast to the "more" reactionary role of the big colonial powers, especially Britain. In the political broadsheet which Earl Browder publishes under the guise of advice to businessmen, he has advanced essentially the same argument to show the "enlightened" character of the American expansionist policy under the leadership of President Truman.

In this context we are not discussing such historically progressive by-products of imperialist economic penetration into the colonial world as the breakdown of the backward modes of production, the beginnings of industrialization which develop despite the imperialists, the drawing of these semi-feudal economies into the world market, and the emergence of working-class and nationalist-revolutionary movements. These are the by-products and not the essence of imperialist expansion. They are to be found within all imperialist orbits, whether they take the form primarily of territorial empires, as is the case with Britain, or mainly of economic spheres of penetration, as is the case with the United States.

Nor is it necessary to deny that different imperialist powers develop special features, arising out of the peculiarities of their historical development, their relative position in the world economy, and the accelerated uneven development of capitalism, the law first defined by Lenin in his *Imperialism*.

As a result of such factors, which we have not the space to describe

here, British monopoly capitalism developed from the beginning as a great colonial power, with a monopoly of raw material sources, markets, and fields for capital investment within its own empire. This was the base from which British imperialism radiated out into the rest of the world economy, building an outer empire in addition to its own closed political sphere within the colonies.

On the other hand, American imperialism, while building something of a colonial empire in the earlier stage of its expansion abroad, became essentially a "cash-register" or dollar imperialism establishing its own well-defined spheres of influence, as in Latin America, and seeking the "open door" into the territorial empires and spheres of influence of Britain and the other colonial imperialisms. In this process of economic expansion, buttressed where necessary by armed and political intervention of a kind no different than that of Britain, formally independent but economically backward nations were transformed into economic dependencies of the United States.

Tactic and Substance

There would be no need to summarize these rather elementary points, if Browder's thoroughly anti-Marxist position over a whole period had not created considerable confusion. Browder takes one aspect of American imperialism—the fact that it did not develop a large colonial empire on the style of Britain's—and

turns this secondary although important characteristic into the substance of the American imperialist position and policy.

It is misleading and dangerous at all times but especially now to substitute one feature of American imperialism for its real substance, and to interpret a tactic of American policy arising from this peculiarity as the essence of that policy—control of new sources of raw materials, new fields of investment, new markets, extending the exploitation of colonial labor. Thus is created the utterly false picture of the "decolonizing" influence of the United States and of a beneficent economic expansion devoid of imperialist content, at a moment when American monopoly capital is attempting to extend its power throughout the world, moreover, with the aid of territorial annexations in the form of strategic bases.

This approach of Browder's is reminiscent of the traditional Social-Democratic justification of imperialism, particularly of one's own imperialism. It is specially adapted to the American expansionist program with its flowery democratic trimmings and snobbish pretense to progressive world leadership. One need only look at the tremendous handicaps the British working class must overcome as a result of decades of social-imperialist propaganda carried on by the British Labor Party, and, closer home, the direct aid given to American imperialism by the A. F. of L. leadership, to appreciate more

fully the danger of the Browderite line if it is permitted to catch hold in any advanced section of the American working class.

The chicanery involved in presenting the Philippine policy as evidence of the "progressive" and "anti-colonial" nature of American imperialist policy in general is all the more obvious when one considers some of the specific monopoly groups interested in "independence." Over many years, American capitalists with interests in Cuban sugar, domestic beet-sugar refiners and big dairy interests have been among the foremost advocates of Philippine "independence." Cuba is the main supplier of sugar to the United States, and the objective of the American-controlled sugar producers in Cuba, as well as of the big beet-growers in the United States, is to deprive the sugar interests in the Philippines of a tariff-free American market. The dairymen are interested in keeping coconut products, another large Philippine export, off the American market. These powerful lobbies favor independence for the Philippines as a means of obtaining a tariff on these Philippine exports high enough to make the American market unprofitable for them.

This specific economic objective of one group of capitalists as opposed to another with interests in the Philippines does not in itself account completely for the American policy. Broader economic, political and strategic aims are also involved. But this

specific, albeit narrow, economic interest has played an important part in the formulation of the American policy on the Philippines.

The grant of independence to the Philippines at this time, if it should be forthcoming as promised, is neither contradictory nor inexplicable in any fundamental sense from the viewpoint of the basic characteristics and direction of American imperialist expansion.

On the side of the United States this grant, if realized, is intended, to be largely formal, providing certain political and moral advantages in the inter-imperialist and anti-democratic struggle, while maintaining effective domination over the Philippines. On the side of the Filipino people, the problem becomes one of transforming this half-independence into full independence, of carrying through with their own forces a democratic transformation of the country. This is the meaning of the struggle now proceeding in the Philippines.

DIPLOMATIC WEAPON

We have already described the military preparations, as part of the general strategic plan for domination of the Pacific, and for the establishment of internal "security" in the Philippines. At the same time, the grant of "independence" is to serve a number of diplomatic aims. One of these, about which some imperialist policymakers are still dubious, is the general moral effect the grant of in-

dependence is expected to have upon the peoples of the Far East. It is to serve as an example of "enlightened" colonial policy, and as such is intended to do duty in a number of directions at once.

If an attempt is to be made to recoup the prestige lost by the United States, some effort must be made to retain the "democratic" flavoring characteristic of American imperialist policy. In general, it has become more difficult to practice demagoguery in this sphere, because of the great postwar colonial upsurge in which the working class plays a more prominent role.

Besides, the great prestige already enjoyed by the Soviet Union among the colonial peoples is increased by the unequivocal Soviet advocacy of independence and self-determination, in the midst of the colonial crisis. For, while the United States has retreated from its wartime pledges, the Soviet Union has championed the cause of independence at every U.N. gathering, and has resisted every effort to trim down or evade the pledges contained in the U.N. Charter. The grant of Philippine independence is intended to serve as a token of "pure" democratic intentions, as an additional argument to be employed against the Soviet position, while American imperialism attempts to extend its sphere of influence and strategic controls, especially in China, Manchuria and Korea.

Another principal service which

this deed is to perform is in relation to the inter-imperialist conflict, particularly between the United States and Britain. Not itself a big colonial power, the United States can afford the kind of experimentation that Britain can undertake only under the greatest pressures, as a means of staving off the final disintegration of the Empire. What better contrast could there be for the United States than the peaceful transition to independence in the Philippines (if this should take place) and the colonial conflicts now raging in India and other parts of the Empire? This contrast of policy is to serve as encouragement to the moderate sectors of the nationalist movements of India, Indonesia and Indo-China, and as an inducement to the nationalist bourgeoisie of these countries to maintain closer ties with American imperialism.

Obviously, the United States does not intend to grant the Philippines anything approaching complete autonomy in the sphere of foreign relations. Aside from the provisions for American military domination already discussed, other current activities make it plain that Washington intends to dictate Philippine foreign policy. A group of Filipino career diplomats has already been chosen and is attending school at the State Department. We are informed by a State Department release that these men have been chosen, not only because of their aptitude and good character, but also

because of their "proven loyalty to the American and Philippine governments."

FREE TRADE

When one comes to consider the economic steps taken by the United States in preparation for Philippine independence, the essence of the American policy becomes even clearer.

Two bills already passed by Congress, and a proposed amendment to the Independence Act, have aroused widespread opposition in the Philippines. The Tydings amendment, which would permit the United States to retain its present property (including bases) and acquire new property in the Philippines after July 4, was attacked by Osmena during the election campaign as a "curtailment of independence." Others have gone much further. The *Philippines Press*, one of the few remaining democratic organs in the Islands, characterizes the amendment as "an unholy scheme of legalized looting to plunder the Philippines and convert it into a happy hunting ground for American business men." The heat of this comment can be understood only in relation to the two bills which have already been approved.

One of these continues free trade with the Philippines for eight years, to be followed by a 20-year period of preferential trade. The other measure authorizes a grant of \$400,000,000, and an additional loan of \$120,000,000, for rebuilding public works

and especially for restoring the industries destroyed by the war. Both Acts are designed basically to safeguard the colonial economic relationship after July 4.

In various forms, free trade has become a prominent plank of the Administration foreign policy in general, whether directed towards opening the door into rival markets or extending the penetration of American monopoly capital into the colonial sphere already under its own domination. During the war Browder supported the free trade program, specifically as it was worked out in the imperialistic Economic Charter of the Americas at the Chapultepec Conference. In his current bulletin of economics for businessmen, he supports the general policy of "free trade" expansionism. Economic relations with the Philippines throw considerable light on this program.

Free trade was established between the Philippines and the United States in 1909, after the "pacification" of the Islands and as American capital began to be invested in large sums. From 1903 to 1908, while tariff barriers were still in force under the American occupation, less than 40 per cent of Philippine exports went to the United States. But under free trade they reached 80 per cent during the decade preceding World War II. Before 1909, the United States provided 17 per cent of all Philippine imports; under free trade the corresponding figure reached 65 per

cent. This export-import relationship reflects how closely the Philippine economy has been tied to the economy of the United States, a process which was facilitated by free trade.

This is not to say that free trade is the primary cause of this relationship. It is also possible for an imperialist power to dominate a colonial economy without complete free trade, as is the case with semi-dependent Mexico and other Latin-American countries. But free trade does facilitate imperialist domination by retarding native industry, creating a closed market for the goods of the imperialist country, and subsidizing the raw material industries in the colonial economy by guaranteeing them a preferential market in the imperialist country.

American Investment

Underlying this is the basic relationship established as a result of capital investment and trade control by the dominant power. In the Philippines, before the war, about half of all capital investment (excluding real estate and farm lands) was American. Filipinos owned only about 15 per cent, the balance being divided among Spanish capitalists, Japanese, and other foreigners. Practically the entire foreign investment went into the development of raw material industries for export to the "mother" country—like sugar, gold and copra, the three leading Philippine exports—and into transporta-

tion, utilities, and commerce connected primarily with the American exploitation of the Islands.

Free trade is not only a drag upon the colonial economy, preventing industrial development; it also helps maintain the semi-feudal agricultural system, the extremely low standards of living of the people and the extremely high rate of profit in the imperialist enterprises. Since American capital is concentrated in the extraction of agricultural and industrial raw materials, it has a vested interest from the beginning in maintaining the feudal agrarian economy.

Sugar is by far the largest Philippine export, and in the sugar centrals American capital is closely linked with big landowning capital of the Spaniards and the Filipinos. Thus, the old Spanish monopolies, dating back to the great land grants of Spanish rule, such as the wealthy Elizalde family and the Tabacalera combine, as well as the Catholic Church estates, have been great beneficiaries of the free market for sugar in the United States.

The large Filipino landowning families, who form the core of the national ruling class, have, through the sugar centrals and other enterprises established by American capital, become closely associated with the imperialist power. The sugar barons, the copra growers, the export-import companies, and such Filipino capitalists as have been invited into the American-dominated mining industry have become entirely de-

pendent upon the United States market.

With a total capital investment amounting to no more than \$300,000,000, the American capitalists have established effective control over the Philippine economy. This investment has been repaid many times over by the super-profits extracted from the exploitation of the Filipino people. Before the war, sugar centrals acknowledged a yearly profit of at least 50 per cent on their investments, while gold mines paid dividends of from 100 to 125 per cent.

Wages and Education

A few figures taken from the latest Philippine census (1940) will suffice to explode the myth that American imperialism has brought great benefits to the colonial masses, in the form of a higher standard of living and education.

The average daily wage of all classes of labor in 1939 was 61 centavos (one centavo equals one-half cent; one peso, 50 cents). The Philippines being predominantly agricultural, the income of its land workers is an index to the "prosperity" of the country. Before the war, the average peasant, who possessed his own farm, had an income of 1.20 pesos per day, and the sharecroppers of 43 centavos daily. The average daily wage of the farm laborer was 36 centavos. Thirty-eight per cent of all peasants were without a plow; 35 per cent had no work animals.

In the province of Pampanga, the center of the great Hukbalahap resistance movement, only 12.5 per cent of the peasants own the land they cultivate. Of all boys and girls between the ages of 6 and 19, fully 65 per cent had no primary education.

On top of this, the war has further impoverished the people. In Manila, the cost of living rose about eight and a half times over the pre-war cost, while wages lagged far, very far, behind. The price of rice, which is the staple of the people, rose from 30 centavos for about five pounds to three pesos by March, 1945. The Filipino peasant, already so poverty-stricken, lost 41 per cent of his carabao, his work animal, and 71 per cent of his cattle. It will be some years before the rice crop will reach the pre-war level. Food shipments from the United States fall far short of the requirements, and such direct relief measures as veteran's and guerilla fighter's compensation have been by-passed by the U.S. Congress in favor of the imperialist economic bills.

If free trade is designed to maintain the colonial economic status, the so-called grant for war damages has as its purpose the reimbursement of the sugar-central owners, the mining and utility interests, and the coconut oil producers for their war losses. In other words, this fund is to be used to reconstruct precisely those imperialist enterprises which will benefit from free trade, without

any regard for the mass suffering of the people and the agrarian reform necessary to assure an adequate rice crop, the main food staple of the Islands.

ANTI-IMPERIALIST UNITY

The independence about to be extended to the Philippines is designed to continue in essence their colonial status, under a new political form. The American exploitation of the Philippines, even under the guise of an "enlightened" colonial policy, does not differ in any basic sense from the "backward" imperialist rule of Britain over her colonies. Such political rights as were won by the Filipinos were gained as a result of their own strong independence movement and the support they were able to obtain from American anti-imperialists, beginning with the popular outcry in the United States against taking the Philippines, Puerto Rico and Cuba, at the turn of the century. Let no one tell us that the American policy towards the Philippines is proof of the "progressive" nature of American imperialism.

For the Filipino people it is a question of seizing all opportunities arising from this change of political relations to give real substance to independence, to win it in complete form.

For the American workers and progressives it is first of all necessary to understand that the Philippines still lie within the American imperialist domain, that we have a definite responsibility in supporting their democratic liberation movement, and that as a nation we owe a great economic debt to the Filipino people to make up for the long years of colonial super-exploitation under American imperialism. Instead of relief for the American monopolists in the Philippines, we should demand that our government provide fully adequate sums for the relief of the war-stricken Filipino people. We should support the democratic demands of the people, including the punishment of collaborators. American armed forces should be withdrawn.

The decisive thing is to expose and block the imperialist policy, and to aid the Filipino people to establish a republic based on anti-imperialist and democratic forces which will safeguard the sovereignty of the nation and undertake its development, without the military and political interference of the United States. By far the greatest help we can provide is through developing the closest fraternal relations between the labor and progressive movements of the two countries.

THE ACTIVATING FORCE OF MARXIST- LENINIST THEORY*

SEVEN YEARS have passed since the publication of the *History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union*. Before the war more than 20 million copies of this book were issued. At present the *History of the C.P.S.U.* is going through a supplementary printing of 11 million copies. The publication of an additional printing of many millions of copies takes place in response to the lively interest of the Soviet people in the history and theory of the Bolshevik Party. This interest has grown especially now in connection with the great historical role played by the Bolshevik Party during the Great Patriotic War of 1941-1945. The growing desire to study the history and theory of the Bolshevik Party is an expression of the fact that the Party has become even more closely related to the people, an expression of the growth in the political activity and consciousness of the masses.

The Soviet people won their victory in the Great Patriotic War under the guidance of the Party of Lenin and Stalin, which unified and organized their forces and wisely directed them to a single goal. The

intelligence and will of the Party and its unsurpassed organizing ability played the greatest role in winning a victory which has no equal in history. The Party fulfilled this role because under new conditions it creatively applied its great theory, its rich historical experience. It emerged from severe trials enriched and made wiser by the new historical experience. In their desire to understand profoundly the conditions and means which helped to enable our Party to organize the victory of the people in the Great Patriotic War, the Soviet people are turning to the study of the entire history of Bolshevism. This is understandable, for the victory of the Soviet people in the Great Patriotic War was prepared by the whole preceding activity of the Bolshevik Party, by its struggle for the socialist transformation of our motherland.

The importance of studying the history of Bolshevism is determined by the fact that without this a profound mastery of our Party's theory is impossible. It is impossible to grasp the theory of Bolshevism without knowing its history: a study of the history of our Party provides a clear notion of the indissoluble connection between Marxist-Leninist theory and Party policy. The study of Party his-

* Editorial in the *Bolshevik* (No. 23-24, December, 1945) theoretical and political journal of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

tory has special significance for the new reinforcements that entered the C.P.S.U. during the war years; for they have still to master the experience of the great Party of Lenin and Stalin.

* * *

The history of the C.P.S.U. is Leninism in action. It is the history of the political life and struggle of our Party, of its varied practical activity, and at the same time it is the history of its ideological life, of its ideological-theoretical struggle. The whole of the *History of the C.P.S.U.* is permeated by the indissoluble connection between Leninist-Stalinist teaching and Bolshevik action.

The history of the C.P.S.U. shows that in the hands of our Party, theory has become a great transforming force, because the Party has never treated theory as an abstract ideal, as a lifeless "symbol of faith." The Bolsheviks have continuously directed their efforts toward putting revolutionary theory into practice. The Mensheviks and other opportunists only chattered about socialism, without making the slightest effort toward bringing socialist theory to life, toward practical struggle for socialism. Putting up a screen of chatter about socialism, they put off struggling for it to the misty distance of ages and thus helped capitalism fortify its positions.

Characterizing the activities of the Second International, Lenin wrote:

"'Socialism' as a goal in general, in contradistinction to capitalism (or imperialism), is accepted now not only by Kautskyites and social-chauvinists, but even by many bourgeois politicians. . . .

"The whole Second International . . . counterposed socialism to capitalism in general, and for just this too general 'generalization' it suffered bankruptcy." (*Lenin Miscellany*, Vol. XVII, p. 113.)

Bitter experience has convinced the workers of western European countries of the fruitlessness of chatter about socialism; they have paid a high price for the treacherous activities of the leaders of the reformist parties, who, by the splitting policy they conducted in the labor movement, weakened its forces in the struggle against fascist reaction. The Mensheviks in Russia, and right in line with them, the Trotskyites, who later sold themselves to the fascist secret services, in their time also chattered about socialism, and, screening themselves behind this chatter, strove to "prove" the impossibility of the victory of socialism and in alliance with foreign imperialists sought to restore capitalism in our country.

Only the Bolsheviks, guided by Lenin and Stalin, have brought to life the great doctrine of the socialist transformation of society. From the very first steps of their revolutionary struggle the Bolsheviks have steadfastly heeded Lenin's injunction that "All agitation for socialism must be converted from the abstract and the

general into the concrete and the immediately practical." (*Lenin Miscellany*, Vol. XVII, p. 181.)

In the long and stubborn struggle with all kinds of enemies of socialism, who hid themselves behind the screen of accepting it verbally, the Bolsheviks proved in fact that socialism is not an empty dream and does not lie somewhere in the misty distance of ages. They organized and realized the victory of socialism on one-sixth of the earth. In the U.S.S.R. the question of the victory of socialism is "Today . . . no longer a debatable question. Today it is a matter of facts, a matter of real life, a matter of habits that permeate the whole life of the people." (J. V. Stalin Speech delivered at a meeting of the voters of the Stalin electoral area, in Moscow, December 11, 1937.)

The scientific theory of socialism created by Marx and Engels was rendered lifeless by the opportunists, since they deprived it of all practical significance and meaning. While Marx and Engels turned socialism from a utopia into a science, the opportunists, as Lenin pointed out, substituted for scientific socialism a purely philistine, "dream-cloudy" inclination toward socialism in the abstract (see *Lenin Miscellany*, Vol. III, p. 494). Making the axis of their whole propaganda the thesis that socialism is a matter of the very distant, practically indefinite future, the Mensheviks and other opportunists produced something that suited the bourgeoisie. For this

reason the bourgeoisie even saw in them a social bulwark, because without coming out against socialism directly, they distracted the masses of the workers from the practical struggle for the socialist transformation of society. It was precisely this that made Menshevism, opportunism, the most artful and shrewd device for maintaining the domination of the bourgeoisie.

In Bolshevism, however, the bourgeoisie recognized a serious threat to themselves, because the Bolsheviks were conducting a real struggle for socialism, for bringing revolutionary theory to life. In this active approach of the Bolsheviks to their theory is expressed their genuine revolutionary spirit, their actual devotion to the fundamental interests of the people.

Precisely because the Bolshevik Party throughout its whole history fought actively to bring revolutionary theory to life, theory itself in the hands of the Bolsheviks always was and is ever a progressive science, which they unswervingly move forward, enriching it with new ideological acquisitions. The Mensheviks and reactionary leaders of the Second International destroyed theory—destroyed it precisely because, not wanting to realize it in practice, they reduced it to a state of immobility and stagnation, deprived it of its revolutionary soul, distorted and deformed it. They did everything they could to prevent the proletariat from understanding its real opportunities in the struggle for emancipation and from

being inspired by faith in its own forces. The whole practice of the opportunists, which was directed against bringing socialism to life, gave rise to all sorts of "theories" to the effect that socialism is impossible in the immediate perspective, that it is a matter of the very distant, practically indefinite future.

On the contrary, the Bolshevik Party, in the struggle for the revolutionary transformation of society, advanced Marxist science on the path of an ever deeper understanding of the laws of social development. Lenin, Stalin, and the Bolsheviks disclosed that in conditions of a new epoch—the epoch of imperialism—there existed a new disposition of class forces and new possibilities, permitting the toilers, with hope of success and with confidence in their forces, to conduct a practical revolutionary struggle for the socialist transformation of society.

The Mensheviks and other opportunists, who never took seriously the theoretical propositions of Marxism and had no intention of putting them into practice, also did not set themselves the task of spreading the revolutionary ideas of Marxism among the masses. Characteristic of the opportunist leaders of Social-Democracy is a haughtily disdainful view of the masses, according to which theory is allegedly inaccessible to the masses. The opportunists concealed from the masses the revolutionary heart of Marxist theory because they feared that education in the spirit of

Marxism would lay bare before the masses the defects of capitalism and cause its foundations to waver.

In contrast to the opportunists, the Bolsheviks have always taken care that the great ideas of Marxism-Leninism penetrated the masses on an ever deeper and broader scale. This corresponds to the active attitude of the Bolsheviks to their theory. The Bolsheviks have not elaborated theory in order to pigeon-hole its conclusions, but in order to embody them in life. In this the Bolsheviks have taken as their point of departure the position that the masses decide the fate of history. They therefore have considered it their duty to bring advanced ideas to the consciousness of the people, and have never ceased taking care that theory becomes the property of the masses.

Contrasting the Bolsheviks, the Communists, with the Mensheviks and all other opportunists, in his article "Lenin as Organizer and Leader of the Communist Party" (1920), Comrade Stalin pointed out that there are two groups of Marxists and that between them there lies a whole gulf, for their methods of work are diametrically opposite.

Characterizing the Mensheviks and opportunists, Comrade Stalin said: "The first group usually confines itself to the superficial recognition of Marxism, to solemnly proclaiming it. Unable, or not wishing to study the essence of Marxism, unable, or not wishing to apply it in practical life, it transforms the living

revolutionary propositions of Marxism into dead, meaningless formulae. It bases its activities, not on experience, not on the results of practical work, but on quotations from Marx. It takes its guiding lines and directives, not from an analysis of living reality, but from analogies and historical parallels. Discrepancy between word and deed—such is the principal disease from which this group suffers.”*

This discrepancy between word and deed, which the opportunists made their principle and norm of behavior, led in the final analysis to their repudiating more and more even a verbal acknowledgment of Marxism, to their going over to the position of bourgeois ideology, to their becoming plain servants and accomplices of the policy of the imperialists.

The Bolsheviks saved Marxism and developed it further.

Characterizing the Bolsheviks, the Communists, Comrade Stalin said: “The second group on the other hand transforms the center of gravity of the question from the superficial recognition of Marxism to its realization, to its application in practical life. Indicating the path and means of realizing Marxism for various situations, changing the path and means when the situation changes—this is what this group concentrates its attention upon mainly. It takes its directives and guiding lines not from

historical analogies and parallels, but from the study of surrounding conditions. In its activities it relies, not on quotations, and aphorisms, but on practical experience, testing every step it takes by experience, learning from its mistakes and teaching others to build a new life. This, properly speaking, explains why in the activities of this group there is no discrepancy between word and deed, and why the teachings of Marx fully preserve their living, revolutionary force.”*

This unity of word and deed, a unity of revolutionary theory and revolutionary practice, permeates the whole history of our Party. This is why it is impossible to master Marxism-Leninism without studying the history of the Bolshevik Party.

The *History of the C.P.S.U.* shows the unity and integrity of Marxism-Leninism in all its component parts and discloses the all-sided connection between the policy of our Party, its strategy and tactics, with its ideological and theoretical principles. The *History of the C.P.S.U.* is a classical work of Marxism-Leninism. It provides a theoretical generalization of enormous political experience, a demonstration of the indissoluble connection between the policy of our Party and its world outlook and theory of social development, and a disclosure of how the Party of Lenin and Stalin has enriched and advanced Marxist theory.

* * *

* Joseph Stalin, *Lenin*, International Publishers, New York, Little Lenin Library, vol. 16, p. 5. Editors.

* *Ibid.*, p. 6. Editors.

In his work, *Dialectical and Historical Materialism*, Comrade Stalin developed further the Leninist ideas on the unity of method and theory in the world outlook of the Bolshevik Party.

This unity is embodied in the fact that both method and theory are consistently revolutionary. In Marx's words, his dialectic is "in its essence critical and revolutionary." And, as Comrade Stalin points out, "it is precisely this critical and revolutionary spirit that pervades Lenin's method from beginning to end."* Marxist-Leninist dialectic is a weapon in the struggle for the revolutionary transformation of capitalist society, for the victory of the new over the old—in its essence it looks forward into the future. But the Marxist-Leninist method has the special property that it exists in unity with materialist theory. For materialist theory liberates man from false, idealist notions and ideas of a "supreme reason" and "supreme will" as predetermining everything in this world, including the division into exploiters and exploited, etc. Materialist theory gives the toilers firm ground in the struggle against outlived social orders and for a progressive reconstruction of society.

Counterbalancing the revisionists, who rejected Marxist dialectics, Lenin and Stalin showed that dialectics is the revolutionary soul of Marxism, that the Marxist world outlook is an

indivisible unity of the Marxist dialectical method and Marxist philosophical materialism.

Similarly, dialectical materialism and historical materialism are indissoluble. The all-embracing proof by Lenin and Stalin of the inseparability of dialectical materialism and the materialist conception of history has great significance in the struggle against opportunists and revisionists, who have tried from different angles to undermine the foundations of the Marxist world outlook. It is known that double-dealing with regard to Marxism has been exemplified in the case, for example, of Bogdanov and other empiriocritics who in words acknowledged historical materialism, but rejected dialectical materialism.

Lenin and Stalin razed to the ground these attempts to set Marx's historical theory in opposition to the philosophy of dialectical materialism. With exhaustive completeness they showed that it is precisely the extension of all the propositions of dialectical materialism to the cognition of social phenomena that leads to a genuinely scientific explanation of social development.

The *History of the C.P.S.U.*, created by Comrade Stalin, liquidated the harmful gap between Marxism and Leninism that had existed in the sphere of propaganda, the estrangement of Leninism from dialectical and historical materialism, from party history. The Central Committee of the C.P.S.U., in its decision "On the Organization of

* Joseph Stalin, *Foundations of Leninism*, International Publishers, p. 27. Editors.

Party Propaganda in connection with the Publication of the *History of the C.P.S.U.*," reunited into one whole the artificially split-up component parts of what is a simple Marxist-Leninist body of doctrine—dialectical and historical materialism and Leninism—and made the connection between historical materialism and the policy of the Party. The *History of the C.P.S.U.* is a guide of this sort, in which the indissoluble unity, integrity and successorship of the teachings of Marx and Lenin, the unity of Marxism-Leninism, are demonstrated. Set forth in it is the new element introduced by Lenin and his disciples into Marxist theory on the basis of a generalization of new experience in the struggle of the proletariat in the epoch of imperialism and proletarian revolutions.

Already in his work *Foundations of Leninism*, Comrade Stalin pointed out that "... Lenin's method is not only the restoration, but also the concretization and further development of the critical and revolutionary method of Marx, of his materialist dialectics."* In the same work Comrade Stalin indicated the new that was introduced by Lenin in the development of Marxist philosophical materialism. Comrade Stalin wrote: "... None other than Lenin undertook the very serious task of generalizing, in line with the materialist philosophy, the most important achievements of science from the time of Engels down to his own

time, as well as of subjecting to comprehensive criticism the anti-materialistic trends among Marxists."*

Accordingly, it is impossible to study Leninism, the theory and history of our Party, apart from dialectical and historical materialism, which is a component part of Marxism-Leninism.

In the history of philosophical and social thought there have been not a few theories which contained attempts to explain the historical process and interpret phenomena of social life. Among these theories there were also those that served only to obscure sense. But all even of those social theories that carried within them certain kernels of truth shared the same fate: they could not become reliable guides for historical action, because the basic line of historical development was not correctly represented in them—they could not disclose the motive forces of the historical process.

Only Marxist-Leninist theory provides a genuinely scientific explanation of social development and is a fully reliable guide to correct action. This is proved by the history of the Bolshevik Party, which in all its steps had as its guiding star Marxist-Leninist theory and emerged from the struggle victorious. The history of the Bolshevik Party is therefore the brightest testimony to the force and vitality of Marxist-Leninist theory. The *History of the C.P.S.U.*, in shedding Marxist illumination on

* *Ibid.* Editors.

* *Ibid.*, p. 29. Editors.

every step in the history of our Party, shows how our Party applied theory and moved it forward in concrete historical surroundings, and in so doing it teaches Party cadres and the Soviet intelligentsia by concrete historical examples how to find correct guidance in the theory of Marxism-Leninism.

No other party in the world has had such a rich and scientifically generalized political experience, such advanced theory, as the Bolshevik Party. Only the Party of Lenin and Stalin relies in its activities on knowledge of the laws of social development, tested by great historical practice. The *History of the C.P.S.U.* has generalized the enormous historical experience of the Bolshevik Party.

Now that the fascist aggressors have been destroyed and our country has entered a period of peaceful development, the Bolshevik Party and the Soviet people face new tasks

in the sphere of building our economy and culture, tasks for further strengthening the military-economic might of the U.S.S.R.

As a result of the victory over the fascist aggressors, big shifts have taken place in the life of states beyond our borders, in their mutual inter-relations, and there have been changes in the role played by individual states on the international arena.

We are faced with a new page of historical development, one that our cadres must comprehend in order to orient themselves freely in the whole internal and international situation. Hence the necessity for a continued unremitting theoretical and political arming of our cadres, for a systematic study by them of the works of Lenin and Stalin, for a profound mastery of the theoretical and ideological foundations of our Party and its historical experience.

ON
NAT
NEC

(Fr
Boar
A C
cuss

It is
that,
peop
to th
for
Belt,
our
lack
man
ther
rank
the
the
wro
W
stag
alw
den
figh
and
Bl
pos
nat

ON SELF-DETERMINATION FOR THE NEGRO PEOPLE

By WILLIAM Z. FOSTER

(From a speech at the National Board, C.P.U.S.A. March 28, 1946. A Contribution to the Current Discussion.)

I.

IT IS A FACT we must reckon with that, for the most part, the Negro people have not responded favorably to the slogan of self-determination for the Negro people in the Black Belt, a slogan first put forward by our Party in 1928. Because of this lack of response, which amounts in many cases to vigorous opposition, there are some comrades in our ranks who conclude incorrectly that the slogan of self-determination for the Negro people in the Black Belt is wrong.

Well-defined nations, at certain stages in their development, almost always spontaneously put forth a demand for self-determination and fight to realize it in one form or another. The Negro people in the Black Belt constitute a nation. They possess the basic characteristics of a nation, stated as follows by Stalin:

A nation is a historically evolved, stable community of language, territory, economic life, and psychological make-up manifested in a community of culture.

Despite the fact that the Negro people in the Black Belt possess these qualities of nationhood, they nevertheless do not raise the demand for self-determination. Why is this so?

In my judgment, the basic answer to this question is that the Negro people, although a nation, are still a relatively young nation. They have not yet matured politically to the point where they will conceive of, and fight for, the slogan of self-determination. Nations, like classes, grow and develop; they do not spring full-fledged from the brow of Jove. (Our American working class, for example, with no mass party of its own and with its head full of capitalist ideology, is still far from political maturity.) Nations must pass through a period, more or less extended, of growth and maturation. The Negro people are now in the midst of such national development.

During the past 150 years, from one end of our Hemisphere to the other, more than a score of new nations have come into existence. Some of them, including our own, had great difficulty in acquiring a national consciousness, as well as the various other attributes of nationhood. Indeed, several of them, particularly in Central America, have not yet fully developed a vigorous sense of nationhood, much less won full national independence. In other

parts of the world also, including nations and autonomous regions in the Soviet Union, we have in our time seen peoples maturing into national consciousness. In India, too, there are many peoples who do not yet demand self-determination for themselves, but support the general demand for a free India.

The Negro people in the United States are developing their nationhood under extremely difficult conditions. Nevertheless, they are developing it. Coming to the United States, dating back almost 300 years, from all parts of Africa, they found themselves enchained by chattel slavery. This made it impossible for them, until the Civil War, to develop all the characteristics of a nation. But, even under slavery, they did develop certain national characteristics such as a common homeland, a common speech and a common psychological make-up flowing from their traditions of oppression. It was only with the abolition of slavery in 1865 that the Negro people had an opportunity to develop the higher qualities of nationhood. Since then their progress toward nationhood has been phenomenal. They have in varying degrees registered tremendous strides in science, in politics, in agriculture, in labor unions, in the armed forces, in educational pursuits, in general culture, in sports, in all walks of life. They have now developed a strong proletariat and a well-marked, even though weak, bourgeoisie. This na-

tional progress is all the more remarkable in view of the brief time in which it has occurred and the extremely difficult conditions under which it has taken place. Let us not forget that there are still many thousands of American Negroes who were actually born chattel slaves.

II.

The Negro people are rapidly developing their nationhood under conditions of repression hardly equalled in any other country in the world. In the North, as a national minority, they have to face widespread discrimination in every phase of social life, and in the South, where the great bulk of them live, they suffer under the weight of the infamous Jim Crow and semi-feudal system. Not long ago several Indian comrades asserted to me that the Negroes in the South were in an even worse condition of oppression and discrimination than the Untouchables of India. Despite all these difficulties, however, the progress being made by the Negro people has been one of the most striking features of American life during the past 80 years.

There are three special features that raise ideological difficulties to the acceptance of the slogan of self-determination by the young Negro nation. The bourgeoisie seized upon these to mask their fierce national repression. The first of these ideological difficulties is the race question. Ever since Negro

slaves
the e
tify
gro
logica
theor
gro i
logica
for th
white
discri
conse
fierce
racial
ism th
them
prosa
deter
them
white
this
crimi
more
as a
A s
devel
ness a
do w
Amer
groes
Amer
word.
minat
them
of A
and t
ing t
strong
young
devel
them

slaves were brought to this country, the exploiters have attempted to justify their oppression upon the grounds that the Negroes are biologically an inferior race. This is the theory of white supremacy and Negro inferiority. It has been the ideological basis, not only for slavery, but for the entire system of Jim Crow, white supremacy practices, and other discriminations against Negroes. In consequence, Negroes naturally fight fiercely against this whole concept of racial inferiority and the segregationism that accompanies it. This makes them highly suspicious of any proposals, even slogans of national self-determination, that would seem to set them apart from the bulk of the white population. Preoccupation with this burning question of racial discrimination tends to obscure the more basic conception of their status as a nation.

A second ideological barrier to the development of national consciousness among the Negro people has to do with the general question of American democratic traditions. Negroes rightly feel themselves to be Americans in the fullest sense of the word. And, despite all the discrimination that is directed against them as a people, they are also proud of American democratic traditions and their contributions to establishing them. Consequently, with this strong spirit of Americanism the young Negro people do not readily develop the conception of being themselves a nation, even though

they are an oppressed nation within the broad American nation.

A third obstacle to the development of full national consciousness among the Negroes as a people arises from the fact that, situated literally in the bosom of the strongest and largest capitalist nation in the world, it is difficult for them, a relatively small and the most impoverished section of the American people, to conceive of themselves as taking a stand as a nation within this great American nation, and as demanding the right of self-determination. Such an assertion of nationhood on their part would be an act demanding very high national consciousness.

III.

The foregoing are some of the major reasons why the young Negro nation has not yet reached the point of political maturity where it fully understands itself to be a nation and where it demands the right of self-determination. But that the Negro people are on the way to achieving such consciousness of nationhood is made obvious by observing their general orientation as a people.

Where are the Negro people going? What are they doing to solve the problem of repression? What is the route they are taking in their forward march? These are some of the major questions to which we must find the answers. And we can find them, not in wishful thinking as to what the Negroes should or should not do, but in studying what

the Negroes are actually thinking and doing about these matters. In applying the principles of Marxism to this complex problem we must be careful to avoid schematism; we must, as Lenin often counselled, listen carefully to the voice of the people. We must use our theory, not as a dogma, but as a guide to action.

In order to establish just what the orientation of the Negro people is, it may be helpful first to point out some of the goals toward which they are *not* heading. First, they are not looking, as a people, for the solution of their problems by intermarriage and absorption into the general white majority of the nation, as appears to be taking place in some Latin-American countries. At the same time, they fight against the white supremacy barriers to the right of intermarriage. Second, they are not planning to emigrate from the United States to Africa, as Garvey (and various other exodus proponents since Civil War times) would have had them do. Third, they are not dispersing their national organizations and giving up their struggles and simply relying upon the goodwill and generosity of the American bourgeoisie to provide them with economic, political, and social equality, as Browder recommends they do. And, fourth, they are not looking forward to a time when, in the South, they will have a Negro Republic. Where, then, are they heading as a people, and what is their orientation?

Under the pressure of their difficult situation, the Negro people are developing along a triple-phased course.

First, the Negro people, along with their white allies, are fighting militantly and resolutely for economic, political and social equality, and first-class citizenship, and not without very substantial successes. They are seeking to integrate themselves on a basis of equality into every American institution and into all fields of endeavor. The measure of their efforts in this direction is indicated, among other developments, by such movements as those against lynching, against the poll tax, and for full rights in the armed forces, for fair employment practices, etc.

Second, in order to carry through successfully these struggles for equal rights, the Negro people are energetically organizing themselves, and more and more on a national Negro basis. The N.A.A.C.P., the National Urban League, the National Negro Congress, the United Negro and Allied Veterans of America and other organizations have greatly increased in numbers and influence during the past decade or two, while in the sphere of trade union organization the Negro workers have made most striking progress.

Third, along with this organized fight for equality, the Negro people are also gradually developing their national culture and national consciousness. Specifically Negro culture is showing great vitality, so much so

that it has already profoundly affected American culture in general. As for the development of their national consciousness, one of its most striking manifestations is the extent to which Negroes nowadays have lessened their talk of "race" consciousness and increased their tendency to consider themselves as "the Negro people." They have also developed a marked community of feeling with the colonial peoples of the world who are now fighting for national liberation.

All this signifies that the Negro people are on the path that leads to national struggle, organization, and consciousness. It is the way that leads to the eventual adoption of the slogan of self-determination, with corresponding practical demands for economic and political freedom. Today, both in the North and the South, the Negro people have put forward immediate demands appropriate to those of an oppressed national minority, seeking equality within the given state. But they will eventually advance economic and political demands that will raise their program for the South to the higher level of national liberation.

With their process of increasing struggle, improving organization, and developing national consciousness, the Negro people at this time are orientating in the general direction of statehood in the Black Belt within the general confines of the U.S. There are no separatist tendencies among them. Rather than toward a

Negro Republic in the South, they are much more definitely moving toward relationships roughly analogous in certain respects to those of the French-Canadian people toward the rest of the Canadian people. This is what the living practice of the Negro people teaches us now, and these lessons must not be ignored or misunderstood.

IV.

The Communist Party deservedly has a high prestige among the Negro people. This is because our Party, ever since its formation, has fought resolutely beside the harassed Negro masses. We have relentlessly struggled against the outrageous lynchings, against the Jim Crow system, and against anti-Negro discrimination and white chauvinism in all fields. We have also fought tirelessly for all the demands of the Negro people, and for the unity of the Negro masses and the white progressive forces. Our Party can rightfully claim much of the credit for the political progress made in recent years by the Negro people.

A weakness in our Party's work, however, has been the inept way we have handled the question of self-determination in the Black Belt of the South. Our adoption of the slogan of self-determination in 1928 marked a big step forward in our Negro work; but, unfortunately (save for the Browder revisionist period, when we dropped the slogan altogether), we have quite generally

interpreted it in a Leftist manner. This has tended to make it unacceptable to the Negro people. Among the major improvements necessary in our presentation of the slogan of self-determination are the following:

(a) We must not brush aside the question of race, as we have done too often in the past. On the contrary, we must fully evaluate the role racial prejudice plays in the oppression of the Negro people and show its relation to the larger, more basic political question of the *national* oppression of the Negro people.

(b) We must attune our advocacy of the slogan of self-determination more closely to the general stage of national development which the young Negro nation has attained. We must pay closer attention to the incipient national moods, ideas, and movements now developing among this oppressed people, and adopt as a major task the awakening of the Negro people's consciousness of nationhood. We must pay particular attention to solving the land hunger of the Negro people. We must not present the slogan of self-determination to the Negro people in a manner that assumes that they are a

nation fully matured politically.

(c) We must not, either by direct advocacy or by implication, create the impression that self-determination in the Southern Black Belt would necessarily lead to the creation of a Negro Republic. Instead, we must show that self-determination may take various forms, of which separation is but one. This is all the more necessary because the Negro people are in no sense orientating themselves at present toward the setting up of a separate Republic. We must study more carefully the whole question of bi-national and multi-national states, as they exist in various parts of the world.

(d) We must more concretely connect the question of Socialism with the fight of the Negro people against racial and national oppression. We must show them that while their present fight for economic, political, and social equality, and their eventual struggle for national self-determination, are indispensable for their welfare and freedom, it will only be under Socialism that they, together with the white toiling masses, will finally achieve full liberty, equality, and prosperity.

PL
OF
IM
THE
atom
analy
point
of n
man
nucl
way,
inab
relat
these
nefit
tem,
elopi
and
scien
dom
discu
here,
Repe
of
Boar
retar
Atom
point
TH
the c
thal,
Vall

PLANNERS OF ATOMIC IMPERIALISM

By JOSEPH CLARK

THE EPOCH-MAKING development of atomic energy warrants careful analysis in all its aspects, from the point of view of the dialectic laws of motion in recent physics to the many-sided social implications of nuclear power. In a most dramatic way, atomic energy reveals the inability of our capitalist production relationships to cope with and release these tremendous forces for the benefit of mankind. The capitalist system, in its imperialist stage of development, knows one definite use, and plans for one definite use of this scientific achievement: for world domination and war. We shall discuss but one phase of the problem here, the policies outlined in the *Report on the International Control of Atomic Energy* prepared by a Board of Consultants for the Secretary of State's Committee on Atomic Energy, which was appointed on January 7, 1946.

The Report was prepared under the chairmanship of David E. Lilienthal, Chairman of the Tennessee Valley Authority. Other members of

this Board of Consultants were Chester I. Barnard, President of the New Jersey Bell Telephone Company, Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer, Professor of Physics at the University of California before the war, Dr. Charles Allen Thomas, Vice President of the Monsanto Chemical Company and Harry A. Winne, Vice President in charge of engineering policy at the General Electric Company. It was then presented on March 17, 1946, by the Secretary of States' Committee on Atomic Energy, headed by Dean Acheson, to Secretary James F. Byrnes.

Byrnes offered the Report to the public with high recommendation, "not as a statement of policy, but solely as a basis for . . . discussion." Nevertheless, the views presented have wide currency in official circles; they indicate a trend and a basic approach which must be stripped of its abstract moral and social attributes and evaluated in terms of the real policies being pursued by the State Department today.

ATOMIZING PEACE

The Lilienthal Report has widely been hailed as a positive step forward in scientific circles and among liberals in the United States. Where some liberals have been critical, they have sought to distinguish between the Report itself and the introduction by Dean Acheson. A reading of both documents, however, will reveal not the slightest contradiction between them. Acheson's letter of transmittal is a faithful summation

of some of the most dangerous implications of the Report.

We can assume that among the scientists who greeted the Lilienthal Report there were those who did so out of concern for international control of atomic energy. They are fearful of the consequences of atomic war; they favor the utilization of this force for peaceful, constructive purposes. Unfortunately, they do not carry their cold, scientific analysis away from the laboratory and into the everyday world of politics. As for the liberals, they must have forgotten that nothing can exist in a vacuum. For, certainly, the Report was prepared at a specific time, under certain conditions—at a time marked by an Anglo-American drive spearheaded by U.S. imperialism to wreck world peace, and under conditions created by a wave of anti-Soviet incitement unparalleled since the axis "Anti-Comintern" pact and propaganda.

If the liberals forgot the time and the circumstances under which the Report was made, the least they could have done was to tell what the Report actually proposes: continued U.S. production of atomic bombs, while barring this "knowledge and know-how" from other countries, and establishing an international agency through which the U.S. can intervene in the control of the sources, and dominate the development, of atomic energy anywhere in the world.

While agreeing with the atomic

scientists who have said again and again that there is no secret about atomic energy, this Report does assume that: "Today the United States has a monopoly in atomic weapons. We have strategic stockpiles; we have extensive facilities for making the ingredients of atomic bombs and for making the bombs themselves. . . ." The Report's proposals for international control of atomic energy take into account "that this monopoly could not be permanent." The Report adds, "There have been valid differences of opinion on the time which it would take other nations to come abreast of our present position, or to surpass it; but it is generally admitted that during the next five to twenty years the situation will have changed profoundly."

The proposals are furthermore made on the basis "that some part of our monopoly we hold in common with the United Kingdom and Canada."

The starting point of the recommendation for an Atomic Development Authority under the United Nations is the premise that "the control of raw materials is an essential prerequisite for all further progress and it is the first job that the Authority must undertake." The main function of the A.D.A. will be control of the vital uranium and plutonium raw materials essential for the use of atomic energy and production of atomic bombs.

We need to bear in mind that the control of these raw materials will

be the
func
we
our
"lost
opol
shou
clear
this
divic
categ
oper
divu
infor
sche
whic
ther
mati
the c
tions
prob
categ
some
been
elop
its c
categ
til t
som
oper
invo
It
A.D.
wor
the
rials
reso
does
stock
Ach
the

be the first and the most important function of the Authority. Further, we should note the manner in which our current "monopoly" is to be "lost." The report states "Our monopoly on knowledge cannot be, and should not be, lost at once. . . . It is clear that the information, which this country alone has, can be divided more or less roughly into categories. This acceptance and operation of the plan will require divulging certain categories of this information at successive times. A schedule can outline the point at which this must occur. In particular, there is a limited category of information which should be divulged in the early meetings of the United Nations Commission discussing these problems. There is a more extensive category which must be divulged some years hence after a charter has been adopted and the Atomic Development Authority is ready to start its operations; and there are other categories that may be reserved until the Authority later undertakes some of the subsequent stages of its operations, for instance, those that involve research on weapons."

It should then be recalled that the A.D.A. will intervene all over the world to prospect for and determine the existence of the vital raw materials and exercise control over those resources, while the United States does not stop its own production and stockpiling of atomic bombs. Dean Acheson writes fully in the spirit of the proposed "stages" of develop-

ment of the A.D.A., when he says in his letter of transmittal: "The plan does not require that the United States shall discontinue such manufacture either upon the proposal of the plan or upon the inauguration of the international agency."

Here is a calculated plan whereby American imperialism can best preserve its head-start in developing the means of atomic warfare. In the introduction to the Report, the consultants recognize "the already launched international atomic armament race." Their plan creates an international agency whose primary undertaking is to establish control over the sources of atomic energy while the United States continues to build up what it trusts is, and will remain, a pre-eminent position in the production of atomic bombs.

So that there may be no question about this, the consultants conclude: "Should the worst happen and, during the transition period, the entire effort collapse, the United States will at all times be in a favorable position with regard to atomic weapons." That is stated in the Lilienthal Report, not in the Acheson introduction.

Even while the international agency is being established and it begins to exercise control over the nations' sources of uranium and plutonium, the plan calls for the brandishing of the atomic weapon as an instrument of imperialist politics. This is not only a logical assumption flowing from the current behavior of the

State Department, but is admitted in the report. "The extent to which special precautions need to be taken to preserve present American advantages must be importantly influenced by the character of the negotiations and by the earnestness which is manifested by the several nations in an attempt to solve the common problems of international control. These questions lie in the domain of highest national policy in international relations."

Let us come down from the rarefied atmosphere of the Board of Consultants and translate that amazing admission into terms that are real in the world today. American oil and banking interests, to cite but one example, desire strong military influence in the Mediterranean. Oil investments in Saudi Arabia and Yemen and on the Iranian Island of Bahrein demand it. Surely such pressures lie "in the domain of highest national policy in international relations." And let us assume that the Lilienthal proposal were accepted by the United Nations. The United States Government would decide "the extent to which special precautions need to be taken to preserve present American advantages" and, having worked for the creation of a bloc against the Soviet Union, it could very well use the proposed A.D.A. as a means for furthering its policies regarding this or any other instance of its plan for imperialist domination. It brandishes the very weapon which is supposed to be in-

ternationalized under the plan, as a means of applying U.S. imperialist pressure on the rest of the world.

Furthermore, while reserving the right to decide how much information U.S. imperialism will feed the A.D.A., "The first major activities of the Authority must be directed to obtain cognizance and control over the raw materials situation." In other words, what would add to the existing "advantages" of U.S. imperialism becomes a matter of immediate application. But "all the other operations of the Authority are certainly subject to scheduling." As quoted before from the Report, this principle of scheduling and stages does not apply to control over the raw materials; that "is the first job" for the Authority.

To illustrate further how the Lilienthal plan would work if it were immediately projected, the outstanding fact of present international relations must be emphasized. When President Truman introduced Winston Churchill at Fulton, he started a whole chain of pronouncements and policies, all adding up to one thing: an Anglo-American Axis created in the spirit of the "anti-Comintern" Axis. Suffice it to point to the "teamwork" which exonerated British imperialism in Greece, Indonesia, Syria and the Levant and which created a hysterical war atmosphere against the Soviet Union on the Iranian issue.

Dean Acheson says that the preliminary disclosures (not pertaining

to be
woul
on th
But l
Great
respe
make
ain a
the "
The
Brita
Cana
anti-S
ing
gives
role
junio
"mor
Amer
for at
Un
atom
liber
Lilien
which
unde
plan
negat
bomb
again
"an i
all in
in th
natio
duct,
of in
safe,
the A
It wi
raw
duce

to bomb manufacture) of A.D.A. would not have much material effect on the development of atomic bombs. But he recalls that "we are excluding Great Britain and Canada" in this respect. The body of the report itself makes plain the special role of Britain and Canada in sharing some of the "advantage" of "the monopoly." The relationship established between Britain, the United States and Canada cannot be separated from its anti-Soviet context and its war-making implications. While the plan gives full recognition to the special role Britain and Canada enjoy as junior partners in the atomic bomb "monopoly," it enables the Anglo-American Axis to use the A.D.A. for atomic politics.

Undoubtedly, what impressed the atomic scientists and those sincere liberals who were taken in by the Lilienthal Report was the end result which was supposed to be obtained under the projected plan. Here is a plan which does not just establish negative conditions by policing atom bomb manufacture and issuing edicts against atomic warfare. It proposes "an international agency conducting all intrinsically dangerous operations in the nuclear field, with individual nations and their citizens free to conduct, under license and a minimum of inspection, all non-dangerous, or safe, operations." This agency will be the Atomic Development Authority. It will have the authority to mine the raw materials, manufacture and produce atomic energy, aid in research,

and develop atomic energy for constructive purposes as well as for the manufacture of atomic bombs. All nations will be represented. On the surface, then, it appears to be a plan for international security and peace. But in examining the stages through which A.D.A. will develop, it emerges as an open endeavor to counteract any future developments in other countries that might threaten the "monopoly" we now possess. Recognizing that any modern industrial nation can develop the atomic bomb, it produces a means for exercising control over the raw materials needed to produce such bombs at the same time that U.S. imperialism continues to produce and stockpile the bomb. Simultaneously our "monopoly" is used as a weapon in the negotiation of international control of atomic energy. While no authority will intervene in U.S. production of atomic bombs, and no other nation will be given the "know-how" of U.S. atomic bomb production, U.S. imperialism will demand the right, through A.D.A., to secure all the information it desires about the resources and potentialities of atomic developments in other countries. The object is clear: to maintain the existing U.S. monopoly and offset any additional developments in other lands in the field of atomic energy.

THE REAL BASIS OF CONTROL

The single biggest fact that is ignored by the Report is the basis

upon which we can establish peace today—friendship and unity of the Big Three, the United States, Great Britain and the Soviet Union. Such unity brought victory over the fascist Axis. Only such unity today can end the crisis which threatens a new world war. As long as the United States pursues a policy of "getting tough" with the Soviet Union it is absurd to think that conditions exist for a mutually satisfactory settlement of the international control of atomic energy.

The Lilienthal Report is supposed to be a guide for the American representative on the United Nations Atomic Energy Commission. That representative has already been named by President Truman—Bernard M. Baruch. Baruch's clear-cut advocacy of the Big Business point of view, his hatred for Communism, his antipathy for the Soviet Union, illustrate still further the uses for which the Lilienthal Report is designated. Fittingly enough, Baruch named as his advisors a group of men distinguished by their Wall Street connections. They are John Hancock, Wall Street banker; Ferdinand Eberhart, New York investment banker; Herbert Bayard Swope, publicist and big businessman; and Fred Searls, New York mining engineer. Not only are they spokesmen for the monopoly section of capitalism, in the ideological sense, but they are the big monopolists themselves. On so crucial a question as

atomic energy the ruling class trusted no one but members of its top layers. Even the scientists were excluded.

Tremendous public interest was aroused by the struggle against military control of atomic energy. No less important is public discussion and action on the question of real international control of atomic energy. Labor in this country has a very special interest in the issue because it is "our" imperialism which is using the atomic bomb as an instrument of policies that are leading our nation toward atomic warfare. Essential to intelligent discussion of this issue is a correct evaluation of the Lilienthal Report. Any study which does more than scratch the surface of that Report reveals that there is no conflict between the anti-Soviet policies Byrnes pursued in the Bronx and Paris and the atomic policies proposed for our representative on the United Nations Atomic Energy Commission. Rather than dispelling the use of atomic energy as a factor making for suspicion, conflict and war, the Report intensified that conflict. It is a logical continuation of imperialist power politics in economic and diplomatic affairs.

The Lilienthal Report is based upon exactly such politics.

It is the politics of imperialism against the politics of the peoples, who have fought for and desire to build world peace and guarantee the freedom of nations.

Stat
tati
Pale
can
tine

Mr.
of
It r
setti
of t
in
of t
the
Ter
sepa
been
Uni
gare
mis
on
Org
the
gare
of t
by
Stat
nua
tine

ARAB-JEWISH UNITY FOR THE SOLUTION OF PALESTINE'S PROBLEMS

By MEIR VILNER

Statement of Meir Vilner, Representative of the Communist Party of Palestine, before the Anglo-American Inquiry Commission for Palestine, on March 25, 1946.

Mr. Chairman, Gentlemen
of the Committee:

IT IS A STRANGE THING that instead of setting up the Trusteeship Council of the United Nations Organization, in accordance with the resolutions of the San Francisco Conference, on the advancement of the Mandated Territories towards independence, a separate Inquiry Commission has been set up by the British and United States Governments. We regard the setting up of such a commission without any authorization on the part of the United Nations Organization as an open breach of the San Francisco Charter. We regard this step as one of the attempts of the British Government, assisted by the Government of the United States, aimed at securing the continuation of the status quo in Palestine, *i.e.*, the continuation of the

colonial oppression of our country. The fact that the Soviet Union has been excluded from the working out of a solution for our country's problems is further proof that the initiators of this Commission lack any interest in advancing the freedom of the peoples of Palestine. As is widely known, the Soviet Union has been the only one among the Great Powers which, in the most consistent manner, has defended, at each of the international conferences, the right of the colonial peoples to self-determination and independence.

The motive for our appearance before this Commission is our wish to contribute to the removal of the tension between Jews and Arabs which has increased during the past weeks. Our aim is to contribute to the cause of cooperation between the two peoples of our country in order to ensure peace and security, and to ensure the advance of democracy in, and the independence of, Palestine. The tension in our country has been increased as a result of the manner in which the inquiries have been conducted by this Commission. This Commission is presenting the problem of our country as a question of antagonism between Jews and Arabs instead of regarding it as a problem of oppression by British imperialism of Jews and Arabs alike. This tension has also been increased by the chauvinist evidence submitted by the official Jewish and Arab leadership, by Mr. Ben-Gurion and Professor Weizmann on the one hand, and by Mr. Gemal Husseini and Mr. Auny Abd-ul-Hadi on the other.

"DIVIDE AND RULE"

We consider that the basic difficulty concerning the problem of Palestine does not consist in a collision of interests between Jews and Arabs. The present antagonism is a consequence of constant incitement and intrigues conducted during the past 28 years on behalf of British imperialism. The following examples may serve as proof of the application of the policy known as "divide and rule":

Stimulation by [the British] Government of the Arab and Jewish economic boycott; the existence of two different standards of wages, one for Jewish and one for Arab workers; the appointment of chauvinist and reactionary elements to important public posts (e.g., to the post of town mayor); the support given to the reactionary forces among both peoples by the anti-democratic electoral system which helps to raise chauvinist elements, among Jews and Arabs to the post of municipal councillor; the intrigues conducted between the municipalities of Jaffa and Tel-Aviv by the incorporation of Jewish quarters into Jaffa and of Arab villages into Tel-Aviv; the suppression for many years of the progressive forces fighting for Jewish-Arab cooperation, as well as discriminations still existing against these forces as regards the freedom of their press.

During its years of rule, the colonial regime has done its utmost to make Jewish-Arab cooperation im-

possible, for such cooperation might seriously endanger the continuation of its rule. In its policy of "divide and rule," the Mandatory Power is leaning, on the one hand, on the interests of the Jewish big bourgeoisie, which hopes to carry out its program of political and economic domination with the aid of British imperialism. On the other hand, the Mandatory Power is leaning on the representatives of Arab landlords and big capital which are interested in preserving the backward feudal system in Palestine with the aid of British imperialism.

During its period of rule, the policy of the Mandatory Power has been neither pro-Jewish nor pro-Arab; it was and is directed solely to promote British imperialist interests. The present political, economic, and social situation in Palestine is proof of this. After 28 years of British rule, neither Jews nor Arabs have a decisive voice in the affairs of the country. Only British officials have a determining voice in its fate. The chief economic branches of the country—banking, insurance, electric power, the potash enterprises, and others—are mainly in the hands of British capital.

Indirect taxes, the lack of progressive labor legislation and social legislation, the lack of care for the small peasant and tenant, the setting aside of a great part (up to 25 per cent) of the annual budget for police and prisons, as against only 8 per cent for educational, health and social services, all go to prove the low economic and social standards of the

popul
Esp
prob
supp
maint
relati
pres
prop
and r
and l
As a
peasa
social
Powe
lution
divert
tenan
tions
The
Palest
tegic
tinu
of th
econo
which
Memo
the p
imper
Ha
war,
to sh
its co
imper
the A
Since
main
any c
count
condi
and fo
it is th
Jews

popular masses in our country.

Especially serious is the agrarian problem, since the Mandatory Power supports the great landowners in maintaining the backward agrarian relations existing in the villages. The present situation is one of big landed proprietors existing on the one hand, and masses of small farmers, tenants and landless peasants on the other. As a result of this the masses of peasants and tenants live on a low social standard. The Mandatory Power, being uninterested in the solution of the agrarian problem, diverts the minds of the peasants and tenants towards racial discriminations over the issue of land sales.

The Mandatory Power sees in Palestine one of the important strategic strongpoints enabling it to continue the oppression of other parts of the Empire. The political and economic oppression of our country, which we outlined in detail in our Memorandum, is intended to defend the profits and expansion of British imperialism in this part of the world.

Having been weakened during the war, British imperialism was forced to share the exploitation of part of its colonial wealth with American imperialism, as is exemplified by the Anglo-American oil agreement. Since the Mandatory Power bears the main responsibility for the lack of any democratic institutions in this country, for the low level of social conditions of the popular masses, and for the lack of security, and since it is the source of the conflict between Jews and Arabs, the abolition of the

British Mandate and the immediate transfer of the Palestine problem to the Security Council of the United Nations Organization is, under present conditions, the only way of assuring the achievement of independence for our country and avoiding disturbances of peace with it.

A PARADOXICAL SITUATION

We are here to voice heavy accusations against the Mandatory Power and to defend the national and social interests of all inhabitants of this country, Jews and Arabs alike.

The alien power has succeeded in creating the following paradoxical situation; a Commission appointed by the British Government in co-operation with the U.S. Government is to judge between Jews and Arabs, whereas the Security Council of the United Nations Organization, in active cooperation with the factors directly interested, *i.e.*, the Jews and the Arabs, ought to judge the policy of the British Government in Palestine. Two peoples are living in Palestine, both wishing a free and peaceful life; therefore, every proposal for a political solution must be based on full equal rights for both national groups. We are convinced that a Jewish-Arab agreement is necessary and possible. All problems of this country can and must be solved by Jewish-Arab agreement based on the following foundations:

1. An independent and democratic Arab-Jewish state.
2. Establishment of democratic and elected institutions—legislative and

executive—which express the bi-national character of the country and are based on the unshakable principles of equality of civil and national rights for both peoples.

Democracy in, and the independence of, the country will create the preliminary conditions for free development of Jews and Arabs without any discrimination. A democratic and independent regime in Palestine will strike a mortal blow at imperialist intrigues, which aim to disturb the peace and to incite one people against the other. Such a regime will create the conditions for the realization of a plan of economic development and for raising the standard of living of the popular masses of Arabs and Jews.

The historical experience of the multi-national Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, in which different peoples live in brotherhood, freedom and equality; the experience of peaceful relations created between the peoples of the Balkans during the last few years, thanks to the abolition of the decisive influence formerly exercised by foreign finance magnates and the big landowners, and thanks to the achievement of full political and economic independence by these countries—all this proves that only conditions of independence and democracy of the dependent countries can make possible and create a regime of brotherhood of peoples and social advance.

Instead of abolishing the British Mandate and furthering the independence of this country, the at-

tempt is being made to institute an Anglo-American regime called "Anglo-American Trusteeship." This is in complete contradiction to the San Francisco Charter and to the vital interests of Jews and Arabs in Palestine. The meaning of such a "settlement" would only be an increase of colonial oppression. An international settlement, in a democratic spirit, of the Palestine problem, instituted by the United Nations Organization, can mean only:

1. Immediate repeal of the Draconic Emergency Regulations which subject everybody in Palestine to the discretion of any British policeman or soldier.

2. Legal guarantee of the basic democratic rights to all citizens without discrimination: freedom of conscience, organization, printing and press (except for fascists).

3. Immediate establishment of a democratic, elected, countrywide institutions, the recognition of Palestine as an independent Arab-Jewish state and withdrawal of the British Army from this country.

Equality of civil and national rights will be assured by a democratic constitution to be elaborated by representatives of the Jews and the Arabs, and by guarantees of the United Nations Organization.

We feel it our duty to sound a warning against all intrigues aiming at the partition of this country. The partition of this country would spell disaster to Jewish and Arab citizens alike. First of all, it would strangle any possible economic development

Second
perialis
would
"states"
rulers.
would
and Ar
From
for par
gram a
for the
rule an
between
it is ev
does n
proble
plicatio
The
transfo
means,
tion o
power
Jews de
Arabs a
result o
continu
Jews ar
HOW
EUR
The
Jewish
descrip
been n
way.
The
sequen
pression
interest
the op
Jews. F
am ha

Secondly, it would strengthen the imperialist regime, since partition would mean dependence of both "states" upon the imperialist British rulers. Thirdly, such an arrangement would widen the gulf between Jews and Arabs.

From this it follows that the plan for partition is an imperialist program designed to find a new form for the continuation of the old British rule and for the increase of tension between Jews and Arabs. Therefore, it is evident that any such program does not help the solution of the problem, but leads to its further complication.

The demand that Palestine be transformed into a Jewish State means, in fact, a demand for the partition of the country. The colonial power is interested in having the Jews demand a Jewish State and the Arabs an Arab State. The inevitable result of both these demands is the continuation of colonial rule over Jews and Arabs alike.

HOW TO ASSIST EUROPEAN JEWRY

The sufferings endured by the Jewish people in this war are beyond description. Six million Jews have been massacred in the most cruel way.

The persecution of Jews is a consequence of the system of class oppression. The exploiting classes are interested in diverting the wrath of the oppressed masses towards the Jews. Racial hatred and anti-Semitism have been fostered for many

generations by the exploiting classes. Fascism, the most cruel enemy of democracy, is the most cruel form of cannibalistic anti-Semitism.

Therefore, the fate of European Jewry and of the Jewish people as a whole depends, above all, on the fate of democracy. A better future for the Jewish people will be ensured only to the extent to which democracy is developed.

The best assistance to European Jewry is the destruction of the remnants of fascism and the destruction of anti-Semitism. The lack of sincerity in the proclamations of sympathy by the Governments of Britain and the United States towards the Jewish people is evident from the fact that they encourage the forces of reaction and anti-Semitism in Europe, the forces of General Anders (the assassins of Jews in Poland), the forces of Mikhailovich, and the Franco regime. Even in their own countries they grant full freedom to fascists and anti-Semites.

Secondly, the lack of sincerity on the part of the Governments of Britain and the United States is expressed by the closing of their countries to Jewish refugees and Jewish displaced persons.

Thirdly, this lack of sincerity is reflected in the detention for such a long period of time of tens of thousands of Jews under the hardest conditions in camps within the British and American zones of occupation in Germany.

It is imperative to put an end to the scandalous existence of such

camps in Germany! It is necessary to transfer the Jews to normal life at once! It is necessary to stop the encouragement given by the British and American Governments to the assassins of the Jews in Europe!

We reject the conception that the Jewish problem will be solved by the establishment of a Jewish State in Palestine. Even those who demand a Jewish State admit that nine-tenths of the Jewish people will remain where they are at present. The solution of the Jewish problem cannot be brought about by immigration but by the victory of the forces of democracy, by the complete uprooting of anti-Semitism and fascism. The full solution of the Jewish question will only be achieved by the victory of Socialism.

We demand that the problem of Jewish displaced persons be solved by an international settlement along the following lines:

1. The refugee camps must be abolished immediately.

2. Within the framework of the international settlement, those Jewish inmates of camps who want to do so are to be given the opportunity to immigrate into Palestine, the U.S.A., Britain, and other countries.

3. Contact is to be permitted to be established between the representatives of the democratic governments and the Jewish communities in Europe and the Jews in camps in Germany in order to enable those Jews who wish to do so to return to their countries of origin where democratic systems exist.

The demand that Palestine be

transformed into a Jewish State prevents Jewish-Arab agreement on the question of immigration. Such an agreement is possible if the question of the participation of Palestine in the solution of the problem of Jewish displaced persons will not be connected with the political, anti-democratic plans of the Jewish Agency representatives.

On the other hand, the absolute extremist and uncompromising attitude of the representatives of the Arab Higher Committee, also prevents any agreement.

At the same time, it must be pointed out that the situation in which the question of immigration has become one of the most important points of antagonism between Jews and Arabs is a result of the encouragement given to the reactionary Jewish and Arab forces by the Mandatory Power during all the years of its existence. Thus, the Mandatory Power has succeeded in diverting the minds of large sections of the Jewish and Arab public from the prime problem of our country—the struggle against colonial rule and for the independence of Palestine.

We are sure that Jews and Arabs will achieve agreement on the question of immigration as part of a general democratic agreement on all the problems of Palestine. The existence of British colonial rule in Palestine is the principle factor hampering a Jewish-Arab agreement. The abolition of the Mandate and the evacuation of the British forces from Palestine will help to accelerate the achievement of this agreement.

BOOK REVIEWS

LESSON FOR AMERICA

By STANLEY RYERSON

THE LESSON OF GERMANY: A GUIDE TO HER HISTORY, by Gerhardt Eisler, Albert Norden, Albert Schreiner. International Publishers, New York. Price \$2.25.

In the opening passage of *Germany, Revolution and Counter-revolution*, Engels speaks of the signal, crushing defeat suffered by the revolutionary forces of 1848, and points to the need of performing a very necessary piece of work: "the study of the causes that necessitated both the late outbreak and its defeat; causes that are not be sought for in the accidental efforts, talents, faults, errors or treacheries of some of the leaders, but in the general social state and conditions of existence of each of the convulsed nations. . . ."

It is in this light that we, today, must conduct a searching study of the causes that led to the establishment of a fascist dictatorship in Germany, and to the ensuing catastrophe of a second world war. In America, particularly, it is of the utmost urgency that the whole labor movement and democratic camp should speedily grasp the reasons for the defeat of the German working class in 1933, and how that defeat at the hands of fascism led to unspeakable disaster for the German nation,

and to the unparalleled suffering that World War II inflicted on mankind.

The forces of imperialism which imposed the Nazi tyranny on Germany and powered its drive for world domination are in essence the same as those which today threaten the peace of the world. And the policy of working class and people's unity, which could have spared Germany and the world the horrors of fascism, is the one which, under new conditions, must prevail, if we are to avert disaster in America and worldwide atomic war.

The Lesson of Germany, written in the United States by three German anti-Nazis, is a valuable, sorely-needed contribution to the understanding of the fascist menace. In its concise outline of the main stages in Germany's development from the time of the Peasant War in 1525 down to the present, the book lays bare the grim causality that engendered the Third Reich. One is struck, not only by the way in which repeated triumphs of reactionary classes prepared the ground for the ultimate degradation, but, even more, by the lost opportunities at historic turning points, when the chance to change the direction of development to a progressive course was let slip. The insight into those lost opportunities is at the

heart of the lesson—and the warning—of the German experience.

Monopoly capital, particularly its leading circles, the men of the Steel Trust and the big banks, established the Nazi terror regime. Therefore, an understanding of the *concrete* peculiarities of capitalist development in Germany will help to illuminate the historical process whereby reaction established its bases of operations in that country. At the same time, it is the *general* significance of the class forces, their character and movement, that provides the compelling lessons for American democracy. This book covers both of these aspects, explicitly and by inference.

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

German imperialism developed within a framework that bore the imprint of an era of retarded development. The defeat of the early peasant rising and the devastation of the Thirty Years War, combined with the country's unfavorable position in relation to the merchant empires that arose in Western Europe, stunted the growth of the German bourgeoisie. The bourgeois-democratic revolution met with defeat when the liberal bourgeoisie joined forces with feudal reaction against the proletariat. The German state was unified, not in a victorious democratic revolution, but "from above," and by a *Junker* and bourgeois-conservative alliance.

Thus, the defeat of the 1848 revolution, under the conditions that prevailed in Germany, laid the groundwork for the participation of reactionary Prussian landlordism in the ruling circles and the state machinery; and

this in turn was to prove a bulwark of counter-revolution in the upheaval of 1918.

It is in imperialist reaction that the evil roots of fascism are to be found. The Pan-German Society, consisting of leading industrial and feudal magnates, was founded in 1891; and as the authors point out, it operated through the Conservative and National Liberal parties. Its doctrines were later taken over and "embellished" by the Nazis. The ideologists and agencies of reaction grew and were nurtured within the old-line parties long before the crystallization of a mass fascist party. That fact surely has its counterpart in the political scene in the United States.

The ideology of racism is the outgrowth of imperialist chauvinism. The German "master race" theory reached its climax in the ravings of Goebbels and Hitler, and found its bestial application in the mass murder factories of Maidanek and Oswiecim; but its primary source lay in the lust for world domination of the German imperialist monopolies. In this connection, the blunt reminder given by Stalin in his interview on Churchill can by no means be taken lightly:

In this respect, Mr. Churchill and his friends remind one remarkably of Hitler and his friends. Hitler began to unleash war by announcing his racial theory, declaring that only those people speaking the German language represent a fully valuable nation. Mr. Churchill begins to unleash war also by enunciating a racial theory, maintaining that only nations speaking the English language are fully valuable nations, and are called upon to decide the destinies of the entire world.

Anglo-Saxon chauvinism, which is a most powerful ingredient in the

ideol
no n
of th
lish-s
tor c
again
Ame
succe
look
To
of th
the v
—the
form
impe
other
the l
hatre
the p
drea
rulin
Ch
nific
empl
the n
In
thro
Cour
varia
revol
cover
made
Bolsh
his a
Eber
GER
Ju
fincl
strug
so in
mar
with
for i

ideology of British imperialism, is by no means an insignificant component of the ideology of reaction in the English-speaking, monopoly-capitalist sector of North America. The struggle against fascism and the war danger in America cannot be fully developed or successfully waged if that fact is "overlooked."

Together with the chauvinist myth of the "master race," fascism employs the weapon of anti-Communist hysteria—the "Bolshevik menace." While the former is the fantastic expression of the imperialist drive for the subjugation of other nations and for world conquest, the latter is the expression of the class hatred of the monopoly capitalists for the proletariat, and of their hysterical dread of their inevitable downfall as a ruling and exploiting class.

Characteristically—and most significantly—this weapon was likewise employed by Churchill, and furnished the main burden of his call for war.

In 1918, when the Kaiser was overthrown and Workers' and Soldiers' Councils were taking form from Bavaria to the Baltic, the betrayal of the revolution was carried through under cover of anti-Communist hysteria. "We made an alliance in the struggle against Bolshevism," said General Groener, of his alliance with the Social-Democrats Ebert, Noske and Scheidemann.

GERMAN SOCIAL-DEMOCRACY

Just as in 1848 the liberal democrats flinched from carrying through the struggle and betrayed the revolution, so in 1918 the leaders of the new Weimar Republic chose to form an alliance with reaction rather than to struggle for its defeat. And the artisans of this

new betrayal were the leaders of the Social-Democratic Party.

In reality, the Ebert-Hindenburg alliance represented a conspiracy against the democratic Revolution and aimed at: retaining the Imperial officers' corps as the backbone of the new army; maintaining the bureaucratic state apparatus; and rescuing the landed estates of the Junkers and the factories of the Pan-German industrialists (pp. 78-9).

German Social-Democracy exemplified in classical form the operation of monopoly-capitalist influence within the ranks of the labor movement. The authors of *The Lesson of Germany* point to the idealized presentation of imperialism given by these "Socialists":

The right-wing of German Social-Democracy had long spread the idea that an enlargement of Germany's colonial empire and an expansion of outlets for German capital would also benefit the workers and therefore deserved the support of German labor (p. 65).

The social basis for this perversion of working-class ideology and policy was the corruption of sections of the labor movement by monopoly capital:

After a period of ascension, which made the German working class the pride and hope of every progressive group in the world, it fell more and more under the influence of the upper strata of the labor movement. These forces, corrupted by German imperialism, embodied the typically German spirit of servility and philistinism toward the reactionary ruling classes, their ideas, and their institutions" (p. 208).

On the home front, the Social-Democrats "justified" their capitulations to reaction by echoing the anti-Communism of the big bourgeoisie. In foreign policy, they employed the same device. Today, Bevin echoes the Tory imperialist Churchill with slanders against the Soviet Union as "the main threat to world peace." In post-1918 Germany,

the Social-Democratic leaders had set the same pattern: one of their chief spokesmen, Hoersing, declared that Soviet Russia "has developed into the greatest menace to Europe, in fact, to the entire world" (p. 122).

On this side of the Atlantic, the Dorothy Thompsons and Dubinskys in the United States and the Coldwells in Canada play the same wretched game, that of spokesmen of imperialist reaction within the "liberal-labor" camp.

Fascism came to power in Germany at the behest of monopoly capital within that country, and with the active encouragement and assistance of finance-capitalist circles in Britain and America. Only the united action of the working class heading an anti-fascist people's coalition could have barred the road to fascism. Rejection of such unity by Social-Democracy made possible the accession to power of Hitler; and the same policy of betrayal in Britain and France made possible the carrying through of Munich, and opened the road to war.

The fight for anti-fascist working-class and people's unity, in struggle against the main monopolist centers of reaction, and against all capitulations to monopoly pressure however it may be disguised—this is the one and only guarantee of fascism's defeat. It is to the undying shame of Social-Democracy that it chose, throughout the entire period of fascist advance, to serve monopoly capital as "a bulwark against the Left." It is to the undying honor of the Communists that they fought with all they had, to avert the impending catastrophe.

Yet Communist policy itself has to be hammered out in unceasing struggle against hostile pressures; and the au-

thors of this book correctly point to the shortcomings in the German Communist Party's approach to the struggle for anti-fascist unity. In addition to the elements of sectarianism in the Communists' fight for Communist-Socialist unity, the authors point out that:

After the [economic] crisis set in, the Communists continued to advance the slogan of a socialist Germany. They hoped that in the course of the depression millions of Germans, particularly workers, would be convinced of the necessity to break the power of the German financial and industrial trusts and the big landowners and establish socialism. But they overlooked the fact that in clinging to the slogan of a socialist Germany as a way out of the crisis, they played into the hands of the Social-Democrats who were not even ready to defend the bourgeois Weimar Republic, the most elementary democratic liberties, or the most urgent social demands of the people (p. 145-6).

THE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE GERMAN PEOPLE

On the vitally important question of historic responsibility for the crimes of the Hitler regime, the authors state squarely: ". . . the German nation, including the great majority of the workers, became an instrument of Nazism" (p. 194). And further:

The great mass of the German people followed the Nazis, rejoiced in their victories, participated in their outrages, profited from their booty, or passively tolerated their barbarous rule. The heroes of the underground swam futilely against the current of the entire Nazi-infected nation. . . . The existence of this underground does not free the German nation of its guilt; rather is the fate of this underground one more proof of Germany's submission to Nazism" (pp. 205-6).

The defeat of German fascism was brought about not from within, but by the armies of the United Nations. The extirpation of fascism in Germany,

which requires the uprooting of the monopolist and feudal classes from which fascism sprang, is the joint responsibility of the United Nations and the reviving working-class and democratic forces within the country. While the working class failed to play its part in preventing the coming to power of fascism, and in working for its downfall, it remains true that it did provide the primary source for such resistance as did develop, and that, by virtue of its class position in society, it is the inevitable antagonist of the classes that breed reaction.

Not only is this judgment being confirmed in the Soviet zone of occupation, where the terms of Crimea and Potsdam are being carried out to the letter; but the Anglo-American violations of those agreements, and the attempts to preserve in Western and Southern Ger-

many the power of monopolist reaction, give heightened emphasis to the responsibility of the working-class and people's forces for seeing to it that the uprooting of reactionary power is indeed carried through. Fulfillment of this task is a prime necessity for the winning of the peace. The fight for policies directed to that end is part and parcel of the developing struggle against imperialist monopoly in the United States, Britain and Canada.

The Lesson of Germany brings to that struggle a greater clarity of understanding, one that is born of the terrible and bloody experience of a nation subjugated by fascist bestiality, demagoguery and terror. This book is indeed a positive contribution to the battle against fascism in America. This time, if the world is to survive, the camp of democracy must be the one to triumph!

SOVIET POLICY IN DISTORTED FOCUS

By JOHN STUART

SOVIET POLITICS AT HOME AND ABROAD, by *Frederick L. Schuman*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf. 1946. \$4. 663 pp.

It is almost impossible to define the thesis of Professor Schuman's book. He says many things and in fact has written several books in one. The total is a baffling agglomeration of ideas without unifying substance. There are sections on the life of the Soviet community which reveal painstaking research and serve admirably to refute those who take their data from the Hearst press and the books of Max Eastman, Wil-

liam A. White, and David Dallin. On the other hand, Schuman can write unmitigated nonsense. He has walked into the trap of eclecticism and he has walked into it with such deliberateness that even the acceptable features of his book are blurred and diluted by the bias which ruled his pen. The warmongers will be able to make capital of his work because they can say that even this "sympathetic" student of the U.S.S.R. warns in effect against Communism and Communists.

In a preface full of thunder and technicolor, Schuman describes his credo. In essence it is that of the opposi-

ticated petty-bourgeois academician who seemingly admires the Soviet Union at the same moment that he is opposed to its "illiberal methods." He is persuaded that the "good society is one in which a maximum measure of personal liberty and representative democracy is combined with a maximum diffusion of private enterprise and ownership of property." This is his economic focus as well as the springboard from which he leaps into Soviet institutions, life and politics. It delineates exactly what can be expected from the book. The sum of it is a collection of useful fact and citation leading in one direction, while his petty-bourgeois prejudices pull in another.

The reader, then, cannot look for anything monistic in the way of a philosophy. And yet that is the one prerequisite for intelligent dealing with the U.S.S.R., just as some perception of its monistic, historical-materialist philosophy is the only gateway to grasping Soviet history. Schuman has a greater degree of awareness that the U.S.S.R. is not a jerry-built house than certain other writers have shown. But at the core he is only a rebellious liberal, critical of the "corruption of Democracy by Money" without being able (or willing) to resolve his rebellion. He is both "anti-capitalist" and anti-proletarian. He moves at a furious pace between both classes, rationalizing his oscillation as objectivity and worshipping it as the source of freedom. His movement between irreconcilable contradictions is expressed in a belief that "unless the best of two worlds can be brought together in a new synthesis, One World will be irreparably shattered and all the hopes of liberalism will wither and perish." That has all the sound of sage

opinion, but it reveals his failure to see the seamless cloth out of which the Soviet Union is cut. Recently the Soviet publicist, A. Sokolov, in reply to the same fond hope of another writer, remarked that it reminded him of one of Gogol's characters who wished for a lover having the nose of one of her suitors and the lips of another.

The net weight of what Schuman has attempted is what he himself acknowledges. It will please neither the friends of the U.S.S.R. nor its defamers. Professor Schuman apparently takes great comfort in his isolation from the two categories. For one, it conforms to the most severe stipulations for academic aloofness in a dispute that shakes the world; for another, he has the dubious pleasure of being both "for" and "against"—always a requirement for bourgeois academic security. But on the face of it the posture is ludicrous, no matter how it is rationalized. It leads to a bankruptcy of scholarship and a dead end in thought. Its crowning achievement is cynicism wrapped in egotistical calculation. If Professor Schuman hopes thereby to keep his academic robe unsoiled, he is merely perpetuating self-illusion. Mr. Rankin will love him no more than Mr. Dies did a few years ago.

The base on which Schuman builds his pyramid—Soviet men, manners and means—is not the solid concrete of economics or the social and political institutions arising upon it. His "homage" to Marx is typical *Time-Life* bluster. "Marxism," he writes, "was founded and propagated as a gospel for urban 'wage-slaves.'" Marxism is presented with stale cynicism as a sect with religious dogma and the Marxists as priests of a mystical faith. Unlike others

who have written "critiques" of Marxism, Schuman does not even attempt one. He finds solace in the fact that it has been done and that anything he might add "would be a work of super-erogation." In other words, he refuses, even if he could, to grapple with Marxist science. And after having "annihilated" Marxism through anonymous "annihilators," at the close of the book he feels competent to imply (it takes extraordinary courage to say) that Marxism is quite dead. The joke, of course, is on Professor Schuman; for never has a ghost been so alive and never has one so haunted the world or built such a country as the Soviet Union.

In approach, then, Schuman is largely diplomatic and political, and his is a peculiar politics. For all his effort he cannot get at the dynamo which generated the October Revolution. He cannot or will not see the clash of antagonistic classes issuing from the production relations of Czarist society out of which the Revolution was born or how those opposites are in ceaseless conflict throughout the capitalist world.

PSYCHOPATHOLOGY AND POLITICS

This is revealed in gross form in the "theories" by which Schuman explains the leaders of the October Revolution as well as its renegades. The theories are mere refurbishments of tattered notions presented by other Schumans and they are a not too unfamiliar admixture of psychoanalysis, crude materialism, and Christian socialism. But perhaps his forte is Freud, or equating Freud with Schumanized Marx.

Thus, in probing the beginnings of Soviet society, he is led by his psychologism toward a one-sided, subjective explanation of the development of the Bolshevik Party, Lenin's and Stalin's leadership, the struggle against opponent elements and ideologies, etc. The *id*, the *ego* and the *super-ego* clash with historical materialism and out of the bloody fracas Professor Schuman emerges as the self-declared victor. Soviet society, instead of being the product of objective, dialectically developing historical forces in inter-action and conflict, is merely the outcome of the revolt against the father-image. "Sons," he writes, "have unconsciously hated their fathers, even while consciously loving them, long before Sigmund Freud dramatized the fact. Priest and policeman, Pope and Prince, God and King, Church and State are father symbols. Young men who have become atheists and professional challengers of the *status quo* have displaced their private father-hatred onto public objects." And further, in explanation of Trotsky's corruption: "Repressed insecurities and contradictions drove Trotsky to seek domination, to resent rivals, and at the same time to turn against whatever might have led him to his goal. In his response to Lenin as a father-image, love predominated over hatred in the later years of their relationship. In his response to Stalin, emerging as a new father-image, hatred predominated over love."

All the common-sense ridicule that can be heaped on the psychopathological school of politics will not suffice to exorcise its influence or expose its anti-Marxist purpose. Schuman may write that Marxism falls short of being a "reliable psychology"; but it is pre-

cisely Marxism, "the science of the general laws of motion—both of the external world and human thought" (Engels), which places psychology on its feet instead of letting it stand on its head in the middle of an idealistic puddle.

"Men make their own history," wrote Engels in *Ludwig Feuerbach*, "whatever its outcome may be, in that each person follows his own consciously desired end and it is precisely the resultant of these many wills operating in different directions and of their manifold effects upon the outer world that constitutes history. Thus it is also a question of what the many individuals desire. The will is determined by passion or deliberation. But the levers which immediately determine passion or deliberation are of very different kinds. Partly they may be external objects, partly ideal motives, ambition, 'enthusiasm for truth and justice,' personal hatred or even purely individual whims of all kinds. But, on the one hand, we have seen that the many individual wills active in history for the most part produce results quite other than those they intend—often quite the opposite; their motives therefore in relation to the total result are thus of only secondary significance. On the other hand, the further question arises: What driving forces in turn stand behind these motives? What are the historical causes which transform themselves into these motives in the brains of the actors?"

Can Freudism answer these questions? Can "father-hatred" offer a reply? Can Professor Lasswell with his psychopathological school of politics in which Professor Schuman is an honor student shed light on the issue Engels

presents? Flight to Freudism becomes an escape from class conflict, from understanding its economic base and the driving forces of history which respect no man's "father-hatred." Freudism may be comforting to a middle-class historian who finds harbor from the world's storms by a return to reactionary idealism, but it will not illuminate Soviet society, the struggles it has faced or the range of its future problems.

The utter sterility of the psychopathological school reveals itself in Schuman's inability to grasp the real content of the battle against Trotsky and Trotskyism. In place of a fruitful dialectical analysis, we are given a stream of words. "The actual fire of controversy," he writes, "over principles was far too small to give rise to such tremendous clouds of smoke, surcharged with lightning, thunder and poisonous fumes. A crucial role was played by personality problems and by the varying capacity of different groups of revolutionists to adapt themselves to environmental changes."

To continue to write seriously in this vein of Trotsky and the Trotskyite camp, whose exposed fifth column activities proceeded from their fiendish hatred of the Soviet Union and the Marxist-Leninist principles on which it is founded, is to close one's eyes to history's confirmation of the *political* treason of Trotskyism. Certainly, Schuman himself answered Schuman when, reviewing Trotsky's "biography" of Stalin, he branded Trotsky a fascist!

REALPOLITIK AND REALITY

As one reads more and more of Schuman he seems to be blown about by

all the wandering winds of bourgeois historiography. His eclecticism includes a little from Lasswell, a smattering from Keynes, a pinch of Freud, tidbits from Machiavelli, Beard, Mackinder, and heaven knows what else. And, of course, included is *Realpolitik*. He is almost impervious to the full meaning of monopoly capitalism as the basis of the relations among the capitalist states in the imperialist epoch. If he has any conception of the market problem under capitalism, it has not helped him elucidate the foreign policies of what he calls the Atlantic Community or Atlantica. He is prepared to concede (and how that concession is self-defensively qualified!) that the central thesis of Lenin's *Imperialism* "has in some measure been confirmed," and that "few reflective observers of the world scene in the wake of World War II will care to argue that the explanation is completely wrong." Why it is not completely right, Professor Schuman is not at liberty to reveal.

But without a thorough understanding of the economics of imperialism there can be no understanding of its negation in the economics of socialism. All foreign politics then become power politics, immoral and pragmatic. For Schuman, because of its pre-war struggles for collective security, the U.S.S.R. is less Machiavellian than the imperialist states, but it is Machiavellian nonetheless. The outcome is a series of contradictions, utopian blueprints, and plain unmitigated nonsense. Here is a random sampling. *Contradiction*: "If London and Washington are unable to accept Soviet 'mastery' of the Balkan and Danubian lands, or if Moscow is unable to accept Anglo-American mastery of the Western and Mediterranean

regions, there will be no peace." And on the very next page: "Equally fatal [for the peace] are all projects for 'western blocs,' 'Soviet Blocs,' 'Anglo-American Unions,' or other regional coalitions directed against counter-coalitions." *Utopian blueprint*: "The ultimate task of Soviet Muscovy [read Socialism] and the Atlantic Communities [read capitalism] and one which is no longer a nebulous aspiration but a grimly practical necessity—is to translate into political terms on a world scale the timeless vision of the unity of man [read World Federation]." *Unmitigated nonsense*: "The Kremlin holds aloof from the groping struggles of the colonial slum peoples for a place in the sun."

Professor Schuman is especially bent on his world federation or single world government idea. Because to him *all* world politics are essentially power politics, he would excise these politics through a world parliament. But, in the present context of world relations a world parliament could only be a sham and a fraud. How realistically this is manifested by the rough-riding of imperialism, American and British, in the U.N., toward the destruction of world peace.

Short of socialism a single world federation is fantasy. As it is envisaged by the utopians today it can only provide a weapon against the elementary need of maintaining the vital cooperation of the Big Three. Schuman's confused advocacy of it now contributes to concealing the nature of the world struggle and of the drive of monopoly capital toward war—the real power politics. There is, of course, no politics without power. But power for what and in whose interests? The basis of power is

economics, and capitalist economy in the monopoly stage cannot sustain itself without lusting and hunting for markets abroad. In *Anti-Dühring* Engels wrote that "the expansion of the market cannot keep pace with the expansion of production. The collision becomes inevitable, and as it can yield no solution so long as it does not burst the capitalist mode of production itself, it becomes periodic." That was a fundamental truth about capitalism in the epoch of free competition. Under imperialism, in the epoch of monopoly, the market problem is infinitely more critical, indeed insoluble, leading to wars, to violent redivisions of the world's markets.

Socialist economy has no such problem. The market is bottomless and production is limited only by the power to produce, while consumption is as great as production with the exception of the part used to expand and increase productivity. There can never be overproduction and crises. Therein is the heart of Soviet foreign policy on a world scale. Therein are its non-aggressive roots, its desire and need for peace.

These are the facts and they exist quite apart from Professor Schuman, and no matter how he distorts them in Machiavellian terms they will continue to exist. There, finally, is the basic difference between the power wielded by the Soviet Union and that wielded by the imperialist states.

In his closing pages Schuman announces the "end of the proletariat." Marxism cannot win in the West, he says. Russia was an exception. Despite him, Marxism lives and proves its resourcefulness with each passing day. Marxism is dead only in those morbid minds horrified by its strength and by the capacity of the Communist Parties, through their growth and influence, to refute their defamers. If Professor Schuman thinks that he is the first one to have wrapped Marxism in shrouds, let him quickly forego the illusion. Others, including the non-academic Hitler, have tried to serve as morticians, only to find the "corpse" display greater vitality after each burial. The march of the world proletariat cannot be stopped. And Marxism lights the way where the Schumans would darken it with their pettifogging and obscurantism.

exist
human,
seem in
continue
basic dif
led by
led by

an an-
tariat.
est, be
Despite
its re-
ng day,
morbid
and by
Parties
ence, to
or Schu-
one to
ouds, le
Other
ler, have
y to find
vitality
a of the
stopped
where the
with their
n.