

Gen ✓

political affairs

APRIL 1949 • 25 CENTS

LIBRARY
APR 14 1949
DARTMOUTH COLLEGE

WILLIAM Z. FOSTER
 EUGENE DENNIS
 MARVIN REISS
 GEORGE MORRIS
 GUS HALL
 GEORGE PHILLIPS
 JOSEPH CLARK
 JOSEPH ROBERTS
 EXECUTIVE BUREAU,
 W.F.T.U.
 HARRY K. WELLS

- [1] Is the Advocacy of Peace Treason?
- [5] The Struggle for Peace
- [18] The Vatican's "Labor Philosophy"
- [35] Marxist-Leninist Content and Methods in Party Activity
- [48] The Chinese People's Victories and the Warmakers' Dilemma
- [61] The Atom Bomb: Myth and Truth
- [67] Right Socialists: Enemies of Peace?
- [72] Twenty-Five Years of the *Daily Worker*
- [80] To the Working Men and Women of the World
- [83] A Philosopher Exposes Myths About the Marxists (*Book Review*)
- [89] From the Treasury of Marxism

Soviet Economy During the Second World War

by N. A. Voznesensky

The authoritative and documented account of how the Soviet Union met the test of the greatest war in history. How it successfully supplied the needs of its armies and its population despite invasion and occupation of its most highly developed industrial and agricultural territories.

An epic of socialist invincibility.

Reveals in detail how the Soviet leaders were able to dismantle transport and reconstruct major sections of basic industry thousands of miles from the fighting fronts.

This book holds the key to the secret of the Soviet victory over the fascist Axis.

Price: \$1.25

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

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 U.S.A.

VOL. XXVIII,

A Mag

Editorial Bo

by William

U. S. C

THE TH
ments em
of univer
Only th
war and
Italy in
tions agai
War II, th
anything
these stat

French
and indep
day solely
of world
in the M

* Text of
and General
U.S.A., on 1
tively. The
newspaper a
recent decla
Secretary of
of Palmiro
Communist
peace in E
open letter
comment, w
Communist



A Magazine Devoted to the Theory and Practice of Marxism-Leninism

Editorial Board: V. J. JEROME, Editor, ABNER W. BERRY, ALEXANDER BITTELMAN,
JACK STACHEL, MAX WEISS

Is the Advocacy of Peace Treason?*

by William Z. Foster and Eugene Dennis

U. S. COMMUNISTS WILL OPPOSE WALL STREET WAR

THE THOREZ AND TOGLIATTI statements emphatically serve the cause of universal peace.

Only those who plot a third world war and seek to embroil France and Italy in aggressive military operations against our great ally of World War II, the Soviet Union, could read anything un-French or un-Italian in these statements.

French and Italian sovereignty and independence are threatened today solely by Wall Street's schemes of world domination as expressed in the Marshall Plan and the pro-

posed Atlantic war alliance. It is our military and those of the British who have established a General Headquarters at Fontainebleau. Not Russians but Americans have military bases and are intervening in the internal affairs of Greece, Turkey, Iran, China, Canada, Greenland, Brazil, as well as France and Italy.

On February 27 the *New York Times* editorially termed the danger of an invasion of our shores wildly improbable. What the *Times* failed to say, however, was that the threat of aggression against other nations is not wildly improbable—and that this threat emanates precisely from Wall Street and its cartel-connected trusts. It is this which explains the colossal peace-time military budget, the effort to stampede the nation into the Atlantic war alliance and

* Text of statements issued by the Chairman and General Secretary of the Communist Party, U.S.A., on March 2 and March 6, 1949, respectively. The first statement was in response to newspaper requests for their comment on the recent declarations of Maurice Thorez, General Secretary of the Communist Party of France, and of Palmiro Togliatti, General Secretary of the Communist Party of Italy, in respect to war and peace in Europe. The second document is an open letter to President Truman in reply to his comment, which represented a distortion of the Communist Party's peace stand.—Editor.

plunge America and the world into an atomic war.

We Communists join with millions of other patriotic Americans in opposing those who seek a new world war. We strive for peace and friendship between the U.S.A., the U.S.S.R., the new democracies, the colonial and all other peoples. We do not regard a new world holocaust as inevitable. We hold the peaceful co-existence of two different social systems wholly possible. We believe that efforts of the peoples to achieve peace can check the warmakers and create new opportunities to achieve peace. The peace camp is infinitely stronger than the war camp.

It is this which makes the war camp so reckless and ruthless. An atmosphere is rapidly being created in our nation that to work for peace and American-Soviet amity is considered equivalent to treason. The trial of the Communist leaders, the current witch-hunts and other attacks on civil liberties are indicative of today's political climate.

If, despite the efforts of the peace forces of America and the world, Wall Street should succeed in plunging the world into war, we would

oppose it as an unjust, aggressive imperialist war, as an undemocratic and an anti-Socialist war, destructive of the deepest interests of the American people and all humanity. Even as Lincoln while a Congressman opposed the unjust, annexationist Mexican War and demanded its termination, so would we Communists cooperate with all democratic forces to defeat the predatory war aims of American imperialism and bring such a war to a speedy conclusion on the basis of a democratic peace.

American security and American peace lie in world security and world peace—not in any Wall Street-Uber-Alles policy decked out in the trappings of "the American century."

For our part we will work with all those who seek peace, democracy and social progress. The American people, assuming their historic responsibility, must reject the war policies of the Wall Street-Churchill cartelists and their bipartisan puppets and return our nation to the peace policies of Franklin D. Roosevelt, the "Grand Design" and cornerstone of which is firm American-Soviet friendship.

IS IT TREASONABLE TO TALK PEACE?

Dear Mr. President:

Is the advocacy of peace treason?

Is the moral climate of our country such that an appeal to reason

becomes the basis for the charge of treason?

So it would appear. One day you called a writer an s.o.b. because he

dared critic
accepting
Peron. A
traitors m
is not ine
systems c
rests of w
towards t

First, le
In deno
you are,
distorted
question
plied tha
cussed an

upon our

We, of
fantastic
tack upo
which th
ruary 27
probable?
Socialist
20 millio
struggle
danger o

Neithe
the Sovie
the prese
bility res
and its h
capitalist
the DuP
instigate

Beaus
cause w
mongers
Soviet o
hurl at
the viol
does no

dared criticize one of your aides for accepting a medal from the fascist Peron. Another day you termed traitors men who believe that war is not inevitable and that two social systems can co-operate in the interests of world peace—and who work towards that end.

First, let us set the record straight.

In denouncing our plea for peace you are, of course, aware that you distorted our views. You twisted the question originally asked and implied that we Communists had discussed an attack by the Soviet Union upon our nation.

We, of course, did not discuss the fantastic impossibility of such an attack upon our country, an attack which the *New York Times* of February 27 aptly termed a "wildly improbable" event. It is not from the Socialist Soviet Union—which gave 20 million lives in the common struggle against fascism—that the danger of war arises.

Neither the American people nor the Soviet Union is responsible for the present world tension. Responsibility rests squarely on Wall Street and its bipartisan puppets. Only the capitalist trusts, the I. G. Farbens, the DuPonts, the merchants of death, instigate and profit from war.

Because we hold these views—because we work to check the warmongers and promote American-Soviet co-operation for peace—you hurl at us the epithet "traitor." But the violence of your denunciation does not settle the question: Are

your polices leading America and the world to war or peace?

This is the real issue of our day.

We could perhaps earn cheap applause if we hailed your systematic wrecking of Roosevelt's "Grand Design" for world peace through firm American-Soviet friendship.

We might meet your approval if we lauded your revival of the fascist war power in the Ruhr.

Perhaps we would bask in your smiles if we praised the freeing of Ilse Koch, the Krupp bankers and the Nazi generals.

Undoubtedly there would be no harsh Presidential epithets for us if we cheered the proposed budget, nearly half of which will go for guns, tanks, planes and barracks instead of schools, hospitals, housing and increased social security.

We would, of course, never be called "traitors" if we supported the North Atlantic War Alliance and the current drive against the Bill of Rights.

But we regard it as the highest form of patriotism to speak our minds against war and for peace.

We realize, of course, that this is not the first time that patriots have been pilloried for daring to fight for peace.

Jefferson was hounded because he refused to join the jingo cry for war against revolutionary France. For this he and his colleagues were reviled as "traitors," "Jacobins" and "agents of a foreign power."

Lincoln in his day fought from the

floor of Congress the unjust, annexationist, slaveholder-inspired war against Mexico. He was assailed as a second "Benedict Arnold."

Carl Schurz, the celebrated Union general and former Cabinet member, denounced the Spanish-American War as "criminal aggression" and called upon the American people to reverse the imperialist course of the McKinley Administration.

In the light of history, Mr. President, would you call Jefferson un-American and pro-French? Was Lincoln un-American and pro-Mexican? Was Schurz un-American and pro-Spanish?

Were these men "traitors" because they dared to stand up against jingoes, demagogues and calumniators?

Are the millions of Americans who oppose the current Wall Street-Pentagon hysteria and speak the sober voice of reason to be branded apostles of treason?

On our part, we Communists will defend in the future as in the past the highest interests of our country. We will defend in the future as in the past our people from all enemies, within and without. When our Union was in mortal danger, a great Communist leader of his day, General Joseph Weydemeyer, served in the Union army, as did many other members of the Communist League. In the recent anti-Axis war 15,000 Communists served with honor. Among these were four of the de-

fendants in the current trial of Communist leaders indicted simply for advocacy of their views—Robert Thompson, winner of the Distinguished Service Cross, Henry Winston, John Gates and Gus Hall.

We Communists are dedicated to the struggle to make ours a land of peace, prosperity and progress. We will continue to urge the American people to exercise control over domestic and foreign policy alike. We will continue in the spirit of the great American who preceded you as a representative from your state, Senator Carl Schurz of Missouri, who on the Senate floor in 1872 uttered those immortal words: "Our country, right or wrong! When right, to be kept right; when wrong, to be put right!"

Despite all threats and persecutions we will continue resolutely to work for peace. Instead of an aggressive North Atlantic Pact—a resurrected anti-Communist Axis—we shall continue, in company with millions of other Americans, to urge that our nation shall sign a Pact of Friendship and Peace with our great war-time ally, the Soviet Union.

That way lies peace and security for America and the world.

Very truly yours,

WILLIAM FOSTER
Chairman, Communist Party
EUGENE DENNIS
General Secretary,
Communist Party.

by Marvin

THE RE
Lake Su
the Uni
assembly p
ples of
United
which th
hopes fo
peace.

In co
whose n
America
has hap
does the
way of

What is

These
perturb
speak th
peace, t
This con
the cou
against
leashed
is this

which
the chal
ments o
nis pub
Advoca

THE U

In Jun
bered, t
in San

The Struggle For Peace

by Marvin Reiss

THE RESUMPTION THIS MONTH at Lake Success of the third session of the United Nations General Assembly poses sharply before the peoples of the world the fate of the United Nations organization on which they have pinned such mighty hopes for an enduring democratic peace.

In common with all peoples, whose number one hope is peace, Americans are demanding: What has happened to the U.N.? Why does the U.N. seem to be going the way of the old League of Nations? What is the path to peace?

These and like questions that perturb the minds of Americans bespeak the deep popular concern for peace, the will to preserve peace. This concern and will are at bottom the counter-current of the people against the tide of war hysteria unleashed by the monopolists. And it is this popular concern and will which were profoundly voiced in the challenge contained in the statements of Comrades Foster and Dennis published in this issue: *Is the Advocacy of Peace Treason?*

THE U.N.—PAST AND PRESENT

In June of 1945, it will be remembered, the United Nations, meeting in San Francisco for its founding

conference, subscribed to a Charter enunciating the high purpose of guaranteeing the peace and security of the world and of furthering amicable relations and co-operation among the various states. This Charter reflected—and still reflects, despite the machinations of Wall Street imperialism and its satellites—the profound yearning of war-weary humanity for a just and durable peace.

Hardly was the U.N. chartered, however, but the moneybags of the world, led by the profit-gorged men of the giant American corporations who are motivated by wild dreams of “American Century” world domination, set to work with the aim of wrecking the U.N., of dashing the peoples’ hopes for a lasting peace.

The strategy has been a many-sided one. It involved undermining the U.N. from within by a constant, rat-like gnawing at the fundamental U.N. principle of the unanimity of the big powers; by the lining-up of U.S.-dominated puppets who sought to outdo one another in Sieg-heiling every word of the spokesmen of Wall Street; by the attempts to convert the U.N. into an agency of the U.S. State Department. It involved the by-passing of the U.N. with Truman Doctrines and Marshall

Plans (which served, at the same time, to bludgeon small nations into echoing the warmongering tirades of the Dulleses and the Austins in the U.N. itself). It involved the flagrant violation by Anglo-American imperialism of the solemn decisions of the U.N. condemning warmongering propaganda, providing for disarmament, etc. It involved the most shamelessly demagogic lip-service to the defense and preservation of the U.N., to the accompaniment of the nakedly aggressive deeds of the Wall Street "bipartisans" in China, in Turkey, in Greece.

The beginnings of these developments were to be seen at the first session of the U.N. General Assembly in 1946. But the peoples' memories of the recent holocaust were still too fresh, and so the inheritors of Hitler's ambitions, the U.S. imperialists, were obliged to observe certain vestiges of the wartime cooperation of the powers. Thus, the Soviet-proposed resolution for a general arms reduction and for the banning of atomic weapons was adopted, as was the resolution to exclude the butcher-Franco regime from the U.N. and to withdraw the envoys of U.N. member-states from Franco Spain.

In marked contrast, the 1947 session was surrounded with a charged anti-Soviet atmosphere. The Soviet resolution against war propaganda was passed only after the most bitter opposition by the Western powers, and in amended form at that. The

new role mapped out for the U.N. by the Anglo-American imperialists was manifested in the setting-up in gross violation of the U.N. Charter, of the "Interim Committee," the Balkan commission, and the Korean commission—all of which were given the role of cloaking Wall Street's aggression while brazenly accusing the Soviet Union of aggressive intentions.

The first stage of the third session, concluded last December, signified another, even bigger, step backward. Pressured by the brandishers of the atomic bomb, the U.N. Assembly cynically rejected a number of Soviet proposals to implement the U.N. Charter and previous U.N. decisions. Thus, the resolution to reduce the arms and armed forces of the big powers by a third within a year, and the proposal to outlaw the atomic bomb and establish international control, were both rejected. At the same time, under the aegis of the statesmen representing the U.S. bankers, the Assembly compounded the guilt of the 1947 session in setting up illegal expeditions to fish in the murky channels of aggression by further measures dealing with the Korean and Greek questions and with the "Interim Committee."

Needless to say, the Assembly took no action on the host of other situations and questions which bode no good for the peace of the world. In the light of this, it is easy to see why, in the closing hours of this session,

Decem
(now F
U.S.S.R.)
livered
Western
Assembly
nals of his
toward de
That th
the U.N.
whit bett
mination
session on
of Indon
itude of
vealed by
ary 10).
Yakov M
U.S. and
Pilate, to
matter?"

There w
gestures ir
and Belgi
tion again
present; t
quarrel w
The sce
was like
(in which
chestra pi
violins are
in crescend
ging away
was no on

This b
the U.N.
fact that
led by W
transform
meeting-g

on December 12, Soviet delegate (now Foreign Minister of the U.S.S.R.) Andrei Y. Vishinsky delivered a withering attack on the Western powers, charging: "This Assembly will go down in the annals of history as one which worked toward destroying peace."

That the record of achievement of the U.N. Security Council is no whit better is evident from an examination merely of its recent special session on the brutal Dutch invasion of Indonesia. The hypocritical attitude of the imperialists was revealed by *Time* magazine (January 10). Reporting Soviet delegate Yakov Malik's demand: "Do the U.S. and Britain intend, like Pontius Pilate, to wash their hands of the matter?" *Time* continues:

There were indeed some ablutionary gestures in the council. Britain, France and Belgium opposed any further action against the Netherlands for the present; the U.S. did not want to quarrel with its Western allies. . . .

The scene, said one British delegate, was like Haydn's *Farewell Symphony* (in which the musicians leave the orchestra pit one by one until only two violins are left). "The speeches started in crescendo. Then people began slipping away one by one. At the end there was no one left and nothing to say."

This brief glance at the record of the U.N. underscores the irrefutable fact that the imperialist wolf-pack, led by Wall Street, is determined to transform the U.N., from a potential meeting-ground of the powers to

work out agreement in a co-operative spirit, from a potential barrier to aggression—into a rostrum for anti-Soviet warmongering, an instrument of imperialist intervention in the Balkans and elsewhere, and a cloak behind whose back frenzied war preparations may be conducted with impunity.

But the U.N. does not yet completely or easily lend itself to these nefarious purposes. The Soviet representatives indict the would-be warmakers without letup; they reaffirm before the whole world the consistent Soviet policy of peace, the sincere desire of the U.S.S.R. to settle all outstanding differences with the U.S.; and they, too, speak to all the peoples from the U.N. rostrum, and *their* messages—their calls for disarmament, the banning of atomic weapons, the punishment of the imperialist butchers in Indonesia, etc.—electrify millions in the colonial and dependent countries, in Europe, in the Americas, creating new hopes among all forces working for peace.

The spokesmen of the magnificent new countries of People's Democracy which are making great strides on the road to socialist emancipation—they, too, demand genuine international co-operation and expose the true nature of the Marshall Plan as part of Wall Street's program to smash the sovereignty and economic recovery of European countries and to bribe the peoples for an anti-Soviet, imperialist war.

It is for these reasons—because the

very existence of the U.N. embarrasses the imperialists and complicates their war designs—that they are pursuing more and more the policy of bypassing the U.N., of setting up anti-Soviet political, military, and economic instrumentalities which they dominate completely. And this under the guise of “strengthening” the U.N.!

All this serves to highlight the brilliant correctness of the many warnings sounded by the Communist Party, U.S.A., that labor and the people cannot rely on the U.N. automatically, *per se*, to preserve the peace—that the American people, and in the first place the working class, must wage an unyielding struggle against the cold war policies of the bipartisans, against the guns-not-butter budgets, against the North Atlantic Military Alliance for aggression, and must insist upon the restoration of the policy of American-Soviet collaboration as the cornerstone of world peace. Today, the return to such a policy of peaceful co-operation means that President Truman must be made to accept Premier Stalin's offer for joint discussion—an offer which evoked from the American people, as from peoples the world over, a heart-felt response filled with hope of achieving an America-Soviet Peace Pact.

All this serves also to expose the true nature of monopoly reaction's unbridled assault on the Communist Party, of the redoubled efforts of the financiers to outlaw the champion

fighter and leader in the struggle against imperialism, war, and fascism.

A PACT FOR AGGRESSION

The last issue of *Political Affairs*,* dealt with the immense intensification by Wall Street and Washington since the November elections of economic, military, political and ideological preparations for the unleashing of an aggressive, imperialist war.

The events of each subsequent day offer ever-greater evidence of the frantic desperation, as well as of the chauvinistic arrogance, with which these measures are being pushed by the official and unofficial spokesmen of the Administration, by Congress, the big trusts, and all the “impartial” commentators of the capitalist-controlled press and radio.

Of invaluable service to all Americans, who in the sincere search for peace would separate fact from fiction, is the powerful searchlight of truth thrown on the “North Atlantic” Pact, its background, nature, and purposes, by the statement issued on January 29 by the Soviet Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

Discussing the “Treaty of Mutual Assistance and Collective Defense” concluded in Brussels in March 1948 between Britain, France and the “Benelux” countries, which laid the basis for the “Western Union,” this statement shows the “Western Un-

* See Arnold Johnson, “The Politics of the Truman Administration,” *Political Affairs*, March 1949.

ion” pact
suppleme
tion of E
been set
‘Marshall
politico-n
ings of I
set up t
control o
ism for
aim of c
The S
clear the
colonial

the prete
that woul
nomic st
that Pact
military
repression
and the
within th
the mou
the peopl
ent coun

The S
that the
in trave
paring
Union
democr
and eco
dollar i
however
is inten
tween t
as well
the E
states n
does no

ion" pact to be a "military-political supplement to the economic association of European countries that has been set up to carry through the 'Marshall Plan' in Europe." These politico-military and economic groupings of European powers have been set up under the supervision and control of Anglo-American imperialism for its own interests, with the aim of dominating Europe.

The Soviet White Paper makes clear the fact that this is a bloc of colonial powers, and that on

the pretext of preventing a situation that would endanger the so-called "economic stability" of the signatories of that Pact, they are preparing to employ military measures and every kind of repression against the working class and the growing democratic forces within those states, as well as against the mounting liberation movement of the peoples in the colonies and dependent countries.

The Soviet statement demonstrates that the Western European powers, in travelling along the path of preparing to make war on the Soviet Union and the Eastern European democracies, are becoming politically and economically dependent on the dollar imperialists. At the same time, however, the "Western Union" pact is intensifying the contradictions between the United States and Europe, as well as the contradictions among the European "Western Union" states themselves. The Western bloc does not and will not mean the eco-

nomical stabilization and recovery of Europe, but signifies rather increasing economic difficulties, growing armaments burdens, and intensified internal political difficulties.

Turning to the "North Atlantic" Alliance, the Soviet White Paper announces:

The aims of the North Atlantic Alliance are much more far-reaching than those of the West European grouping, and it is quite easy to see that these aims are very closely interwoven with plans for the violent establishment of Anglo-American world supremacy under the aegis of the United States of America.

The Soviet statement exposes the pressure and preparations for Norway, Denmark, Sweden, Franco Spain, Portugal, and Italy to join this aggressive alliance; it reveals that the member-states are following this aggressive course "because all too often they dare not undertake any real solution of the domestic problems that have matured in their own countries in keeping with the new historical situation"; it shows how Western Germany and Japan are being readied for anti-Soviet aggression; and it indicts the ruling circles of the United States, who

immediately after the termination of the Second World War, began establishing air and naval bases in both the Atlantic and in the Pacific as well as on many remote seas, including areas located thousands and thousands of kilometers from the United States' boun-

daries. Since that time the number of American war bases, far from being reduced, has been considerably multiplied, both in the Eastern and in the Western hemispheres, in the countries of Europe and in the countries of America, Asia and Africa. Entire states, especially from among those situated close to the boundaries of the U.S.S.R., have been prepared to provide convenient bridgeheads for the Anglo-American air forces and other facilities for attacking the U.S.S.R. . . .

No reasonable person could claim that this was being done to provide for the defense of the United States. It is known, on the other hand, that no danger of aggression has existed for the United States since the Second World War which ended in the defeat of the aggressive Powers.

The Soviet statement shows how the U.S. State Department has systematically sought to interfere in the domestic affairs of the Eastern European Peoples Democracies, while simultaneously refusing to keep its agreements with the U.S.S.R., rejecting all offers to negotiate a settlement on the Berlin question, and engaging in a trade boycott of the Soviet Union.

The document issued by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the U.S.S.R. provides a detailed analysis of the U.S. State Department's claim that the Atlantic Alliance is in keeping with the U.N. Charter and is designed to "strengthen" the U.N. It proves that the very opposite is the case: the creation of the various pacts and blocs is without the knowledge

of, and distinctly in opposition to, the U.N.

In actual fact, the knocking together of the North Atlantic Alliance, heading a whole series of specific groupings of states in various parts of the globe, represents the final breaking away of the present policy of the United States and Great Britain from the policy unanimously conducted by the Governments of the United States, Great Britain and the Soviet Union, together with many other nations, when the United Nations organization was being created and its charter drawn up and endorsed. . . .

In actual fact the North Atlantic Alliance and its associated groupings of states, headed by the ruling circles of the United States and Great Britain, constitute a direct undermining of the United Nations organization. Today these groupings aim at undermining the authority of the United Nations organization, tomorrow they may bring about the destruction of this organization. Not for nothing have the foundations of this organization been systematically undermined in the last three years, which is especially reflected in the striving to do away with the principle of five-power unanimity in settling all the major issues ensuring universal peace and international security, as laid down in the Charter.

The incisive Soviet statement exposes the demagogy of the U.S. State Department's protestations that the Atlantic Alliance is a "regional" agreement for defense. Demanding to know why the Combined Chiefs of Staff have continued to operate in Washington behind a curtain of secrecy after the defeat of the Axis

powers,
policy of
ers in c
"blocs" o
globe. T
itself co
ranges a
to Alger
tion, an
military
at Rio d
by the S
der way
Pact" (C
East, etc
Pact" (w
of the
powers
purpose
the Dut
regard t
statemen
outset th
States ha
entire b
It is t
the so-ca
foreign
these sta
to the ol
policy b
U.S.S.R.,
years pre
and whi
destructi
The e
portant
Street, i
capitalis
ings, con
destrin

powers, it lays bare the insidious policy of the American war fomenters in creating not one, but *numerous* "blocs" of nations in *all* parts of the globe. The "North Atlantic" Pact itself covers two hemispheres, and ranges as far north as Norway, south to Algeria, and east to Italy. In addition, an "Inter-American Pact" of a military nature has been concluded at Rio de Janeiro, and plans inspired by the State Department are well under way for an "East Mediterranean Pact" (Greece, Turkey, the Middle East, etc.) and a "Southeast Asian Pact" (which is the chief significance of the recent conference of Asian powers in India for the ostensible purpose of "doing something" about the Dutch attack on Indonesia). In regard to these maneuvers, the Soviet statement notes that "from the very outset the ruling circles of the United States have taken over control of this entire business."

It is therefore clear that

the so-called "new departure" in the foreign policy of the ruling circles of these states consists in that they revert to the old anti-Soviet course of foreign policy based on the isolation of the U.S.S.R., which they followed in the years preceding the Second World War and which almost led to the complete destruction of European civilization.

The enormous—in fact, the all-important — miscalculation of Wall Street, in keeping with its traditional capitalist contempt for human beings, consists in the monopolists' underestimation of the immense power

of peace-loving humanity and their overestimation of the role of money and atomic bombs. In this respect, the self-appointed global emperors—who openly debate how long it will be before science can launch rocketships into space from which it will be possible, in their view, to ensure domination of the earth; these Dollar Century gentry differ in no way from their predecessors throughout history, not excluding the "geopoliticians" who but recently resided in Berlin. And in like manner, their world-domination plans are destined to be smashed on the rock of the peoples' resistance.

As the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the U.S.S.R., in its above-quoted pronouncement on the North Atlantic War Alliance, states:

... the signing of these or any other similar pacts does not serve as a guarantee and does not yet provide an opportunity for the realization of the aggressive aims set by the inspirers of such pacts.

One should recall in this connection the unanimous support given in democratic circles of all countries to the well-known statement of the head of the Soviet Government, J. V. Stalin, that "the horrors of the recent war are too fresh in the memory of the peoples, and the public forces in favor of peace are too strong for Churchill's pupils in aggression to be able to overpower them and turn them towards a new war."

In redoubling their energetic efforts to frustrate the "new look" Munich-

ism—the line of national betrayal to the hyenas of Wall Street adopted by the reactionary ruling classes—the peace forces of the world are attracting and mobilizing growing masses—and simultaneously earning the venomous hatred of the economic royalists, who cry out in protest against a “peace offensive.”

That is why the Communist Parties of a whole number of countries—France, Italy, Britain, Belgium, the Netherlands, etc.—have courageously voiced the true sentiments of their nations in forthright statements denouncing Wall Street imperialism and solemnly warning that their people will not offer themselves for a new bloodbath.

IS FIGHTING FOR PEACE “TREASON”?

In the light of the foregoing, the true nature and significance of the Statement to the press and of the Open Letter to President Truman issued by William Z. Foster and Eugene Dennis, Chairman and General Secretary of the Communist Party, U.S.A. (reprinted in this issue of *Political Affairs*) would appear to be as clear as daylight.

In dramatically projecting the people's deep yearnings for peace, raising high the banner of working-class internationalism, and indicting the Wall Street monopolists as the chief enemy of the American people no less than of world peace, Comrades Fos-

ter and Dennis have performed a service of inestimable patriotic value to all Americans.

In an atmosphere of unprecedented terror and persecution directed against the Communist Party and the whole democratic, anti-war movement, the Communist leaders have bravely cut through the hysteria and placed the guilt for war preparations and warmongering where it belongs: on Wall Street imperialism. This message is reaching, and must continue to reach, millions of peace-loving Americans. It cannot but bring home to our whole people, and especially to the working class—at a time when the immense economic, political, and social effects of Wall Street's war drive are manifesting themselves in every home, factory, and farm in the form of a developing crisis, increasing lynch terror and discrimination, and the scrapping of basic democratic rights—that we ourselves, the American people, are paying heavily and will suffer even more heavily in the future, as a result of this monopoly drive to war and fascism. The result can only be the growth of the conscious, organized peace movement in the United States—and further encouragement to the world-wide peace camp.

But beyond this, in warning Wall Street that if it should succeed in plunging the world into war the Communists “would oppose it as an unjust, aggressive, imperialist war, as an undemocratic and an anti-

Socialis
est inte
and al
Comrad
the hig
the nat
people
proletar
history
in turr
able fu
and sig
ration.

The
of scie
Lenini
and a
and to
social
capabl

Befo
outrag
they're
They
fascist
tions!"
down
ries of
ler-Ge
cated.

This
munis
Histor
ican v
have
capabl
people
afoot,
comm
troph

Socialist war, destructive of the deepest interests of the American people and all humanity"—in so doing, Comrades Foster and Dennis attain the highest peaks of true defense of the national interests of the American people against the monopolies and of proletarian internationalism. Only history—our sons and daughters, and in turn their descendants—will be able fully to assess the immense value and significance of this heroic declaration.

The leaders of our Party—the Party of scientific socialism, of Marxism-Leninism—are performing a duty and a service to the working class and to the nation which no other social force in our country is today capable of assuming.

Before the recent war, the voice of outraged humanity cried out: "Look, they're burning the books in Berlin! They are setting Germany afire with fascist brutality and war preparations!" Germany has not yet lived down its shame, its guilt. The memories of the crimes committed by Hitler-Germany are not quickly eradicated.

This is the fate which the Communist leaders would have us avert. Historic, proven leaders of the American working-class movement, they have not flinched from the inescapable duty of warning our whole people that aggression is once more afoot, that new crimes are being committed and even more catastrophic ones planned—and that the

plotters, the criminal war incendiaries, are the ruling clique of our own country, the two hundred families, the profiteering men of the trusts.

In deliberately distorting this historic document, in heaping their calumny on the Communist leaders, in basely attempting to paint the Communists and the whole peace movement as "traitors," the agents of finance capital are acting as desperately—and ultimately as vainly—as have all the doomed ruling classes throughout history. Their frenzy and hysteria will not long sit well with a people and a working class which has nothing to gain and everything to lose from the crises, mass unemployment and misery, chauvinism and lynchings, assaults on democracy, and the hatching of aggression which is the hallmark of imperialist capitalism. These stark facts indict dying capitalism, and in the first place its final citadel, Wall Street, as the real traitors to our country's traditions, to the people's aspirations for peace, economic security, and true democracy.

No, Mr. Truman! Despite all your demagoguery, your bravado, your fake 200 per cent "Americanism," growing hundreds of thousands in our country, growing millions throughout the world, are learning that you and your "bipartisans," acting on behalf of profit-mad, bloodthirsty Wall Street, are the real betrayers—the betrayers of the Roosevelt peace policy

of U.S.-Soviet co-operation, of the people's peace which was to follow the anti-fascist war, of the colonial movements for national liberation to which you pay lip-service, of the election campaign promises on which you rode to office, of every decent human value and aspiration of the American people and of all peoples!

It is *you* who are before the people's bar of justice, and it *you* who cannot answer, frankly and straightforwardly, that question which our Comrades Foster and Dennis, in the very spirit and words of truth, term "the real issue of our day": "Are your policies leading America and the world to war or peace?"

But need we really ask?

Do you not, on behalf of your banker-general masters, really tell us—albeit deviously and in the manner of the Japanese "thought-control" police-state? Do you not answer with the frame-up indictment and trial of the Communist leaders launched by your Southern Bourbon Attorney-General, Tom Clark, and a hand-picked jury of lily-white bankers and insurance executives—a trial presided over by a Wall Street jurist who arrogantly metes out class "justice"?

Does not every word and deed of your Administration carry the brand—Made in Wall Street—and the purpose—war and fascism?

THE STRUGGLE FOR PEACE

The article by Comrade John Williamson, "Rising Unemployment

Marks Start of Crisis," published in the *Daily Worker* on March 25, declares:

The National Committee of the Communist Party firmly believes that this new unemployment situation marks the onset of another crisis of over-production. It threatens to develop into a full-blown cyclical crisis, with all its attendant mass misery and economic chaos.

This statement points out further that:

By intensifying the war drive, Wall Street is aggravating the crisis and heaping new burdens on the shoulders of all the toiling people. Unable to solve the crisis, the monopolists and all their agents are becoming more and more desperate, are increasingly resorting to police-state rule, are turning to fascism and imperialist war.

It is clear that as the problem of finding markets for the growing "surpluses" becomes ever more severe, the aggressiveness and desperation of the cartellists can be expected to grow apace. This can only result in a speeding-up of Wall Street's war drive in accordance with the illusory hope of "cushioning" the crisis by expanded war production—and in accordance with the more grandiose dream of "finally" settling "all" the problems, of "resolving" all the contradictions of imperialism at one fell swoop by a new imperialist world war for world domination by U.S. finance capital.

But the developing economic crisis

—which
"solved,"
and war
it great
to "sell
and to c
The
immens
ing pec
plover
unempl
ment),
wages,
sharp c
tainous
tions—a
off the
war pro
In
against
burden
leaderst
sive for
provide
the peo
That t
lying d
in the
up; in
trade-u
increas
up by
worker
comple
Taft-H
mands
grams
lic heal
are fun
people!

—which will be *deepened*, not “solved,” by increased warmongering and war preparations—also will make it greatly more difficult for reaction to “sell its program” to the people and to carry through its plans.

The developing crisis is heaping immense new burdens on the working people: growing mass unemployment and “creeping,” “hidden” unemployment (part-time employment), speedup, sharply reduced real wages, etc. These stark facts—in sharp contrast to the swelling, mountainous profits of the giant corporations—are helping to tear the mask off the purpose and nature of the war preparations.

In their growing resentment against these conditions and these burdens, the masses are looking for leadership. Where the Left-progressive forces come forward and boldly provide this leadership the mood of the people to struggle breaks through. That the workers will not “take it lying down” is evidenced particularly in the mounting resistance to speedup; in the pressing demands of the trade-union rank and file for wage increases despite the road-blocks set up by the labor bureaucrats; in the workers’ growing insistence for the complete repeal without delay of the Taft-Hartley Act; in the pressing demands for the enactment of programs of educational assistance, public health, and housing. These moods are further evidenced in the Negro people’s rising insistence for an end

to filibusters and “compromises”—better said, collusion—with the filibusterers; for an end to the year-in, year-out division of labor between Administration demagoguery and Congressional stand-pat for keeping the Negro people enchained.

The people want peace. Even though the Marshall Plan demagoguery has made inroads among the masses, it is only because it is peddled as a measure for peace, as well as for jobs. The warmakers, the underminers of the U.N., would not dare to carry on propaganda for their North Atlantic Pact, except by cynically presenting it as a “guarantee for peace” and a “bulwark of the U.N.”

The major political task is to help the masses make the connection between the Atlantic Military Alliance and the cold war, and their deteriorating living and working conditions, between their aspirations for peace and their mood to struggle for jobs, social welfare, and democratic rights. It is necessary to help them see the connection between the trade-union bureaucrats’ pro-imperialist policies and their pussy-footing—and actual sabotage—all the way down the line on such vital issues as wage increases, Taft-Hartley repeal, speedup, and so on.

The war hysteria of the bipartisans, of the press war-lords and their hirelings, of clerical reactionaries, and of Wall Street’s labor lieutenants, is not the voice of the people. The masses want peace. Truman’s election vic-

tory was due in great measure to the oft-repeated avowal — mistakenly trusted by the people—that he was committed to a policy of peace. The American people, in their will for peace, cannot and do not go along with Truman's cynical rejection of Premier Stalin's proposal for a meeting to settle the outstanding differences.

The American monopolies and their Administration fear above all the potential mass mobilization of the people's peace sentiment. That is why they are resorting to every possible measure to silence the slightest protest, and where they cannot silence, to let loose a wave of hysteria. Thus, the shocking spectacle — fraught with such grave dangers to what little there is left of the people's democratic rights—presented by the police-state sabotage, together with fomented extra-legal terrorization, on the occasion of the momentous Cultural and Scientific Conference for World Peace convening on these shores.

The effort of the warmakers to throttle the people's will to peace, is revealed in the colossal frame-up trial of the leaders of the Communist Party, the veteran and proven champion of peace. None but the most gullible can fail to make the connection between the savage attack upon the integrity, the very existence of the Communist Party, and the savagery of the present war hysteria. Communism on trial is peace on trial.

The peace-desiring people of America must be made to realize that here is a gigantic conspiracy to railroad the vanguard fighters for peace in the hope of making it easier to launch a criminal, aggressive, imperialist world war. The peace-loving people of America must be made to realize that in this fateful hour, the beginning of the fight for peace is the defense of the Communist leaders, of the Communist Party.

The Communists have demonstrated in the past and reaffirm and demonstrate today, full readiness and desire to work jointly with all Americans who cherish peace and strive to safeguard the peace, regardless of differences in ideology and political philosophy. This is the hour for stressing the bond that unites all decent Americans: the urge for peace.

This is the fateful hour for generating *the broadest possible action*—on a small scale and on a mass scale, locally and nationally—in the shops and communities, in the trade unions and other mass organizations, on the campuses and in the churches, in every walk of life. Such action must have as its central slogan the people's demand that President Truman meet with Premier Stalin in order to conclude a decisive settlement of outstanding differences—an American-Soviet peace pact.

If an unimaginably horrible war is to be averted—and it can and must be averted!—such a settlement must

take p
Soviet
an At
sion—
expres
people
ing cl

Am
ers, al

i
r
P
t

take place. But a peace pact with the Soviet Union—the people's answer to an Atlantic Pact for military aggression—will only result from the fullest expression of the will to peace of the people, in the first place of the working class.

American trade-unionists, workers, all progressives and peace-loving

Americans must make their voices heard.

End the cold war! Scrap the Atlantic Alliance for aggression!

Defend the hard-won democratic rights of the people!

Stop the war preparations! Jobs and homes—not guns!

For an American-Soviet Peace Pact!

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

V. I. Lenin, *Imperialism: The Highest Stage of Capitalism*, p. 120.

The Vatican's "Labor Philosophy"

by George Morris

THE ASSOCIATION OF Catholic Trade Unionists (A.C.T.U.) and a chain of some 100 labor schools operated by it, diocesan and Jesuit institutions, have developed into one of the principal channels of clerical reaction in America. They are the machinery for training "Catholic Action" cadres in the ranks of the organized labor movement. In the recent period the hierarchy's agents have increased their aggressiveness and revealed more boldly their real objectives in the American trade-union movement.

The Archbishop of Portland, invited to deliver the invocation, but really to keynote, the C.I.O. convention in that city, submitted to that gathering the A.C.T.U.'s seven-point "industry council" program which, he said, "admirably summarized" the Papal perspective for labor. He asked its adoption by the C.I.O.

Responding to the address, President Philip Murray said the proposal of the Archbishop "encompasses the program" of the C.I.O. and is being followed.

The leaders of the C.I.O., in asking the convention to reaffirm endorsement of the Bishop's proposal, did not inform the delegates that it is

the A.C.T.U. program they were asking them to endorse. In fact, the C.I.O. leaders challenge the charge that it is the A.C.T.U. program; they went to the extent of a 5,000-word article in the *C.I.O. News* to develop the claim that it was Murray who originated the "council" plan at the start of the war.

A discussion on the origin of the plan would be of only academic value. The question is, what is behind that "plan" and why do the A.C.T.U. and other Roman Catholic publications attach such importance to its endorsement by the C.I.O.?

Before entering into a discussion of this question, we deem it necessary to state that it is not the intention of this article to discuss the religious doctrines of the Roman Catholic Church, or the religious sentiments of the millions of the Catholic faith. We are solely concerned with the role of the Vatican State, and its hierarchy, as a *political* force and influence in the trade unions of the United States.

The A.C.T.U. plan is a "simple" one. It calls for "planned and organized" production and distribution, not through the government, because

that v
by "re
nershi
true
fore, s
as an
The f
setting
indust
sentat
ernme
the p
indust
These
shoul
Counc
and o
econo
Tha
for el
the w
racy"
Its
is bas
cyclic
maril
XIII
Anno
taking
ence,
practi
lems
olic h
to us
phlets
is "L
is th
Cath
unfor
grant

that would "destroy freedom," but by "re-creating the basic natural partnership" of capital and labor. "The true aim of organized labor, therefore, should be to recover its position as an equal partner with capital." The first step in that direction is the setting up in each industry of a "joint industry council" composed of representatives of industry, labor and government which should "undertake the planning and organizing of its industry for the general welfare." These councils, federated by regions, should form a National Economic Council to undertake the "planning and organizing for the entire national economy."

That, we are told, is the remedy for class conflict and for depressions, the way to bring "industrial democracy" to America.

Its program, says the A.C.T.U., is based on the much publicized encyclicals of the Popes on labor, primarily the *Rerum Novarum* of Leo XIII in 1891, and the *Quadragesimo Anno* of Pius XI in 1931. The latter, taking into account 40 years' experience, amended the former in some practical respects to meet new problems confronted by the Roman Catholic hierarchy. The *Rerum Novarum*, to use the title of one of the pamphlets issued by the Paulist Fathers, is "Labor's Charter of Liberty." It is the textbook and bible of the Catholic Labor Schools. Most people, unfortunately, take the title for granted and seldom look into the

actual text of the encyclicals upon which the "Catholic philosophy of labor" is based.

WHAT DID LEO XIII SAY?

Few people know that the *Rerum Novarum* was issued in a move by the Vatican to stem the rapid spread of Socialist consciousness among the workers of the world and the flow of millions of workers into the growing trade-union movement. The year 1891 saw the two-year old Socialist International spreading rapidly and building a mass base in many countries, particularly those with predominantly Catholic workers. The Socialist parties were as yet not dominated by the treacherous opportunism and class collaboration revisionism of later days. They still based themselves on the principles of the class struggle.

Catholic workers by the millions entered the Socialist parties and Socialist-led unions, although forbidden to do so by their Church. Strike struggles swept through numerous lands with Roman Catholic workers actively engaged in them. Leo XIII, therefore, began as follows in his "charter of liberty" to labor:

It is not surprising that the spirit of revolutionary change, which has long been predominant in the nations of the world, should have passed beyond politics and made its influence felt in the cognate field of practical economy. . . . Therefore, Venerable Brethren, as on former occasions, when ✠

seemed opportune to refute false teachings, We have addressed you in the interest of the Church . . . so now We have thought it useful to speak on the Condition of Labor . . . the danger lies in this, that crafty agitators constantly make use of these disputes to pervert men's judgements and to stir up the people to sedition.

The document then attempts to refute the fundamental position of the Socialists. In every case the Vatican aimed for the uninformed, prejudiced mind and made use of the most common distortions of Marxism. Thus, Leo XIII exploited the "divide everything" idea falsely ascribed to Socialists:

To remedy these evils the Socialists, working on the poor man's envy of the rich, endeavor to destroy private property, and maintain that individual possessions should become the common property of all, to be administered by the State or by municipal bodies.

From the above distortion, so often found in N.A.M. advertisements today, Leo XIII concluded that Socialism deprives the workers of the "liberty of disposing of his wages." The *Rerum Novarum* deliberately ignores the repeated declaration of Marxists since the *Communist Manifesto* of 1848, that socialization is aimed not at the individual private possessions of a person but at the means of production and exploitation in the hands of the capitalists and landowners. Leo XIII also attempted to deal with

the agrarian problem affecting predominantly Catholic countries, and particularly the vast land holdings of the Roman Catholic hierarchy. To the Marxist demand for land reform and abolition of the big estates, Leo XIII said, ". . . those who assert this do not perceive that they are robbing man of what his own labor has produced." The owners of land have made it fruitful, said Leo XIII, as though the big landowners, who would be the losers, had achieved their vast holdings by personal tilling. He lumped the peasant with the big landowners, and asked:

Is it just that the fruit of a man's sweat and labor should be enjoyed by another? . . . The authority of Divine Law adds its sanction, forbidding us in the gravest terms even to covet that which is another's: "Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's wife; nor his house, nor his field, nor his manservant, nor his maidservant, nor his ox, nor his ass, nor anything which is his."

Thus, land reform and socialization of the huge multi-billion dollar monopolized industries would be an act against God's commandments, and the "laws of nature," warned the *Rerum Novarum*, in the name of the Lowly Nazarene, of course! The landowners whose lands have in recent years been distributed among East Europe's peasantry certainly like such use of the Scriptures.

Leo XIII also exploited another common lie against the Marxists—

that t
and r
the St
the de
and c
cialist
parent
dence
justice
ence
In
uses t
again
Social
ple to
ery,"
the
profit
tural
An
varun
man
and c
toilin
The
other
natur
Leo
Th
but
vain
bitter
be w
suffe
lot o
may,
succe
the i

Ex

that they aim to destroy the family and replace "paternal authority" by the State. That was largely aimed at the developing public school system and child labor restriction. "The Socialists, therefore, in setting aside the parent and introducing the providence of the state, *act against natural justice*, and threaten the very existence of family life," said Leo XIII.

In language which Big Business uses today for its main ammunition against Socialism, Leo XIII said the Socialist state would subject the people to "odious and intolerable slavery," and kill incentives because of the "community of goods." The profit incentive is viewed as "the natural right of mankind."

Another section of the *Rerum Novarum* describes the role of the Roman Catholic Church in paralyzing and discouraging the struggles of the toiling people against exploitation. The fact that some people exploit and others labor and suffer, is a law of nature and "must remain as it is." Leo XIII continued:

The Socialists may do their utmost, but all striving against nature is vain . . . the consequences of sin are bitter and hard to bear, and they must be with man as long as life lasts. To suffer and to endure, therefore, is the lot of humanity; let men try as they may, no strength, no artifice will ever succeed in banishing from human life the ills and troubles which beset it.

Exploited people, says this "Labor's

Charter of Liberty" must take their lot meekly and look somewhere beyond this earth for relief from suffering. Advice against struggle and militant resistance runs throughout the document:

God has not created us for the perishable and transitory things on earth, but for things heavenly and everlasting; He has given us this world as a place of exile, and not as our true country . . . and no man can hope for eternal reward unless he follow on the bloods-stained footprints of his Savior. "If we suffer with Him we shall also reign with Him" . . . and God Himself chose to seem and be considered the son of a carpenter—nay, did not disdain to spend a great part of His life as a carpenter Himself. . . . Nay, God Himself seems to incline more to those who suffer evil: for Jesus Christ calls the poor blessed.

It need hardly be said here that the world's millions of Catholics have in actual life not been guided by the above directives of the Vatican. Even the most faithful churchgoing workers fight tooth and nail, at times for many months, for even a small improvement of their lot on earth. They don't accept the dogma that the lot of the worker under capitalism was so ordained and that an effort to change it is disobedience to the will of God.

THE VATICAN'S "CONCESSIONS"

Cognizant, however, that its admonition would have little effect on

the faithful who are far more concerned with material and cultural things on earth than promises in the hereafter, the Vatican did concede that something might be done to relieve the lot of the "poor"—but not through the class struggle:

The great mistake that is made in the matter now under consideration is to possess oneself of the idea that class is naturally hostile to class; that rich and poor are intended by nature to be at war with one another . . . it is ordained by nature that those two classes should exist in harmony and agreement, and should, as it were, fit into one another, so as to maintain the equilibrium of the body politic. Each requires the other; Capital cannot do without Labor, nor Labor without Capital.

It is based on this section of the document that the Vatican's labor ideologists have been building a reactionary utopia of labor-capital peace through so-called "Industry Council plans," with employers opening the gates of "partnership" to their employees. The *Rerum Novarum* sets forth within the limits of this class collaborationist concept what it calls "Workingmen's Rights." It is those "rights" that are supposed to add up to a "Charter of Liberty."

It is the "natural right of man" to join an association of workmen, says the *Rerum Novarum*, but, it adds more emphatically, "there are times, no doubt, when it is right that the law should interfere to prevent asso-

ciation; as when men join together for purposes which are evidently bad, unjust, or dangerous to the State. In such cases the public authority may justly forbid the formation of associations, and may dissolve them when they already exist."

It need hardly be added that Leo XIII had in mind this pattern of a Taft-Hartley Law for suppression of the fast-growing Socialist-led unions like those of most European countries. The police state authority over unions that he suggests is a familiar pattern today, especially in the clerical dictatorships of South America, Quebec, Portugal, and Spain. But what type of union is a Roman Catholic permitted to join? There are unions, Leo XIII said, "in the hands of invisible leaders" managed on principles "far from compatible with Christianity." This leaves Roman Catholics the choice to ". . . either join associations in which their religion will not be exposed to peril or form associations among themselves." And the Pope added:

No one who does not wish to expose man's chief good to extreme danger will hesitate to say that the second alternative must by all means be adopted.

On that decree the movement for separate Roman Catholic trade unions was initiated. The much vaunted right to join unions was simply recognition of the fact that Catholics were joining unions anyway. This

was an
cial Cat
what lil
employ
patroni
ions for
from th

On t
noted t
tice on
But, he
few wh
ciples a
ary cha
it is to
a polic
of the
restrain
save th
tious a
ers fr
should
busters

Reg
admon
their e
and c
them
minds

It is r
influen
are ge
just sh

As
called
obtain
other
is one
and j
earner

was an effort to divert them into special Catholic-controlled unions, somewhat like the generosity of American employers in the twenties when they patronizingly provided company unions for the employees to keep them from the wicked "outside" unions.

On the right to strike, Leo XIII noted that on occasions there is justice on the side of the workman. But, he added, ". . . there are not a few who are imbued with bad principles and are anxious for revolutionary change and whose great purpose it is to stir up tumult and bring about a policy of violence. The authority of the State should intervene to put restraint upon these disturbers, to save the workmen from their seditious arts, and to protect lawful owners from their spoliation." This should make our present-day union-busters feel like "good Catholics."

Regarding hours of labor, Leo XIII admonished employers not to require their employees to "labor on Sundays and certain festivals" or to work them so hard as to "stupefy their minds and wear out their bodies." It is noteworthy that where clerical influence does hold sway, workers are generally squeezed to the point just short of exhaustion.

As to wages, state regulation is called for only to see that "each shall obtain its own" but "not under any other circumstances." A "just wage" is one sufficient for the "reasonable and frugal comfort" of the wage earner. Throughout the document

the emphasis is on the workman's right to enough for "self-preservation" and "existence." But there is nothing to indicate a right to anything even a little better.

As regards child labor, the *Rerum Novarum* merely cautions employers not to place children in factories "until their bodies and minds are sufficiently mature." When a child becomes "mature" for factory work was never explained by the Vatican. But its opposition to state authority to determine that, has to this day been one of the main obstacles to obtaining enough state ratifications in the United States (notably New York) to place a child labor ban in the Constitution.

To woman the Papal philosophy assigns a position of social inferiority, of subjection. The woman "is by nature fitted for home-work," said Leo XIII, "and it is that which is adapted at once to preserve her modesty and promote the good bringing up of children."

With respect to the problem of relief for unemployed in need, the *Rerum Novarum* boasts of the Church's role to "spare them the shame of begging" and adds:

At the present day there are many who, like the heathen of old, blame and condemn the Church for this beautiful charity. They would substitute in its place a system of State-organized relief. But no human method will ever supply for the devotion and self-sacrifice of Christian charity.

Charity, as a virtue, belongs to the Church; for it is no virtue unless it is drawn from the Sacred Heart of Jesus Christ; and he who turns his back on the Church cannot be near to Christ.

From the above it should be clear that the *Rerum Novarum* is hardly more than a "liberalization" of feudalism to meet the onrushing tide of the working-class movement. At best it is the kind of "charter of labor" that American capitalists were willing to concede in post-Civil War days. Actually it was the Roman Catholic hierarchy's feeble and belated effort to reply to the *Communist Manifesto* of 1848 and to retard the developing socialist consciousness among Europe's Catholic masses.

ADJUSTMENT FOR WHAT?

Ideologists of the A.C.T.U. like Norman C. McKenna in his pamphlet, *The Catholic Worker and His Union*, boast that the Vatican adjusts its views to changing conditions. He cites the *Quadragesimo Anno* of Pius XI of 1931. Pius XI did not amend the reactionary character of the 1891 document; he took some practical measures for its possible application in face of the continued trend among the Catholic masses to turn away from Vatican directives such as those noted above.

In keeping with the general line of the imperialists, Pius XI noted that since the issuance of the *Rerum Novarum* a split had occurred in the

camp of the Socialists, and that the consistent adherents of Marxism, the Communists, must now be the main target. He virtually exempted the Right wing of Social-Democracy from the Vatican's wrath.

Pius XI also saw that Leo XIII's directive to form Roman Catholic unions hardly took hold among the Catholic workers. Catholic unions remained small and weak while the "neutral" (non-clerical) unions embraced millions of Catholics. Already in 1912, as McKenna notes, Pius X granted the bishops the right to permit workers to enter non-Catholic unions where unavoidable, provided they have their own parallel associations to look out for their religion and "morals." Pius XI flatly lifted the ban on joining "neutral" unions but he also specifically decreed as McKenna points out, that "there must always be" special associations of Roman Catholics to look after their "spiritual welfare" in the unions.

The *Quadragesimo Anno* provided the specific directive for the formation several years later of the Association of Catholic Trade Unionists (A.C.T.U.) in the United States and similar groups in other countries. These clerical-labor formations are given the task of carrying the Vatican State's "labor philosophy" into the unions under the apparent assumption that the Roman Catholic Church has a super-role over all other faiths in looking out for the "morals"

and "sp
worker

there n
aim at
religiou
in turn
to whic
which
duct.

The
eign S
of fact
by the
unions
duction
along
gesimo
weapo
assault
cratic
state, s
tions.

cannot
upon
to wh
the r
patter
Rome.

CLER

Pius
manag
the R
the pa
dle a
forms
He ca
form

and "spiritual welfare" of organized workers. Pius XI decreed:

... side by side with these unions, there must always be associations which aim at giving their members a thorough religious and moral training, that these, in turn, may impart to the labor unions to which they belong the upright spirit which should direct their entire conduct.

The "zeal" called for by this foreign State has sprouted in the form of factional and disruptive activities by the A.C.T.U. in many American unions. That also marked the introduction of strife into labor ranks along religious lines. The *Quadragesimo Anno* became the hierarchy's weapon on the labor front for its assault upon the traditional democratic separation of Church from state, schools or other public institutions. The language of the encyclical cannot be mistaken. It frankly calls upon Catholics to shape the unions to which they belong according to the reactionary anti-working-class pattern mapped out for them in Rome.

CLERICAL COMPANY-UNIONISM

Pius XI also clarified the labor-management co-operation section of the *Rerum Novarum*. He bemoaned the passing of the Guilds of the middle ages which he termed model forms of employer and worker unity. He called for the reinstatement of that form adapted to the machine age.

Pius XI, drawing much from the experience of our open shoppers (and no doubt American cardinals) of the "prosperity twenties," called for profit-sharing and stock-ownership, so common in our speedup plans, as the Vatican's concept of labor-capital partnership. He declared:

Those who hold that the wage contract is unjust . . . are certainly in error. In the present state of human society, however, We deem it advisable that the wage contract should, when possible, be modified somewhat by a contract of partnership. . . . In this way wage earners are made sharers of some sort in the ownership, or management, or the profits.

It is on the basis of this directive that Rev. William J. Smith, director of the Jesuit Crown Heights Labor Schools, declares in his book, *Spotlight on Labor Unions*, that the "Multiple Management" plans of the McCormick Co. in Baltimore, the profit sharing of Lincoln Electric of Baltimore (both non-union), and Eric Johnston's profit sharing forms, are "models" of what Pius XI meant.

"Collective bargaining in the clothing industry approximates the idea which we advocate for all industry," writes Smith. The late Sidney Hillman and David Dubinsky are praised for "even leading their employers along progressive and profitable paths." Rev. Smith apparently refers to the "efficiency plan" (1941) of the International Ladies Garment Workers' Union which called for modern-

ization of New York plants and a cut in wages for the workers, to permit competition with the non-union "out-of-town" areas. In the men's clothing industry, the reference is obviously to the "Taylorization" and "stabilization" of labor that has leveled off wages nationally to a level lower than in any of the needle trades. The workers in those industries could well testify to the "beneficial" consequences under those plans.

The real content of the papal encyclicals on labor adds up to a pattern of Red-baiting company unionism, trimmed with clericalism, aimed to befuddle the minds of the workers as regards their real problems and to divert them from struggle for better conditions. The fact that the Roman Catholic labor ideologists have to draw on the clothing and garment industries and open shops as their "models" for labor-capital "partnership" only indicates the scarcity of examples that might even look attractive. No capitalists would permit labor even to peep through a keyhole into their affairs, much less take "partnership." They foster spurious "partnership" plans only where no unions are in the way. They exploit such plans for speedup of production and as bulwarks against real unions.

The papal encyclicals, however, have been and are fully applied in the countries where fascism and clericalism reign and where legitimate

unions are banned. The corporative state idea is also based on the "industry council" principle with representatives of "labor" and industry peacefully umpired by the fascist state. Copying much from American company unions of the 'twenties, Mussolini's government often stepped in to rule against employers on some trivial matter to demonstrate its "impartiality." On all basic matters the employers were pretty sure of a ruling in their favor.

The corporative form is in operation in Franco-Spain, Salazar's Portugal, and with some modifications, in Brazil, Argentina, and other Latin-American lands dominated by clerical fascism. But the A.C.T.U. and other Vatican agencies never point to those lands as examples of the application of their "labor policy." That, obviously, would let the cat out of the bag. Only on one occasion did the *Wage Earner*, organ of the Detroit A.C.T.U. (edited by McKenna), editorially (January 1948) greet General Charles deGaulle's plan patterned after a corporative state economy.

While the formal launching of the A.C.T.U. took place in 1937, the hierarchy began application of its program some years earlier through the nationwide radio broadcasts of the fascist Father Charles E. Coughlin of Detroit's Church of the Little Flower. Coughlin's *Sixteen Principles of Social Justice* corresponded closely to the demagoguery that is now

the ha
activiti
lin's
set for
work
Home
ings,
"labor
minati
cious,
Cough
came
the U
mount
ment.

By
entere
tion h
to wis
but a
can. F
bor an
paper,
tactics
and tr
labor

THE
COLL

The
A.C.T.
plan"
work
ter co
be "p
for th
that h
toward
Comm
respec

the hallmark of the A.C.T.U. The activities of the organizers of Coughlin's network of clubs, the pattern he set forth for a union of automobile workers, and the elements like Homer Martin who rated his blessings, soon brought the Vatican's "labor philosophy" to its logical culmination—the spawning of a vicious, anti-Semitic "Christian front." Coughlin's screed, *Social Justice*, became the chief pro-Hitler organ in the United States. Popular anger mounted against the Coughlin movement.

By the time the United States entered the war—a war clerical reaction had apparently expected Hitler to win—Coughlinism was anything but a popular labor base for the Vatican. For some time before Pearl Harbor and the suppression of Coughlin's paper, the hierarchy reoriented its tactics by slowly shelving Coughlin and trotting out the A.C.T.U. and its labor schools.

THE SAME OLD CLASS-COLLABORATIONISM

The immediate purpose of the A.C.T.U. in its "industry council plan" is the fostering of illusions that workers could avoid struggle for better conditions; that capitalism could be "planned" and "made to work" for the welfare of all the people; and that hence there is no need to look toward a socialist solution and to the Communists for leadership. In this respect the A.C.T.U.'s position coin-

cides with that of Right-wing Social-Democracy generally and of the regular run-of-the-mill reformist labor leaders.

Philip Murray flatly denies that there is a class division or class struggle in America and adds that it is even hard to distinguish a worker from a representative of management (*American Magazine*, June 1948). A. F. of L. leaders have long ago expressed that view. Their class collaboration schemes of the 'twenties have no doubt contributed to the thoughts in the *Quadragesimo Anno*.

But not all reformist-minded labor leaders are necessarily guided by clerical encyclicals. Class collaboration and reformist illusions were rife in labor's ranks years before the Popes showed any interest in labor problems. The encyclicals, essentially, sought to encourage a new social base for such concepts among the mass of Catholic workers in an effort to strengthen the rotting props beneath clerical reaction.

The more conscious partners of clericalism today are the Social-Democrats, more specifically the "Marshall Socialists." The *Quadragesimo Anno* recognizes that "profound changes" have taken place in the camp of the socialists.

The Jesuit, Rev. Gerald C. Treacy, one of the leading interpreters of the encyclicals on labor, says in his catechism *Industry at the Crossroads*:

What will result if moderate social-

ism continues to change? It may happen that its program will not differ from the Christian Social program.

In a practical sense clericalism and Right-wing Social-Democracy have everywhere come much closer. Their principal bond of unity is their mutual hatred of the Soviet Union and the rest of the Socialist world, as indeed all struggles for social emancipation and national freedom. Both the Vatican and Social-Democracy lose their social base where real Socialism advances. Both of those forces make up the principal components of the reactionary coalitions in most countries in Europe accepting Marshall Plan dictation.

In the United States this combination is the core of the anti-Soviet warmongers. In the trade unions it is the main instigator of Red-baiting disruption and factionalism, and the support for a great deal of the content in the Taft-Hartley Law.

Symbolic of that combination was David Dubinsky's visit to the Vatican last summer in the company of Jay Lovestone, the renegade from Communism who is his director of international affairs. The same combination of forces was responsible for the split in the World Federation of Trade Unions, especially for the C.I.O.'s withdrawal. Social-Democrats, notably Dubinsky's bureaucracy, have been the heaviest financial contributors for the Vatican-inspired secessions from the labor federation in Italy.

The Marshall Plan tightened the bond between the Social-Democratic leaders and the Vatican. Both provide social props for support of Wall Street's drive for world supremacy. Their coalitions in Italy, France and West Germany have become a refuge for "reconstructed" former Nazis, fascist Vichyites and collaborationists.

The basic theory through which the A.C.T.U.—S.D. coalition takes on a "liberal" face is the old one of "making capitalism work" by means of "planning" its economy. Social-Democracy already lived through such illusions in the 'twenties when its ideologists talked of "organized capitalism" and collaboration with the capitalists for reforms that would "grow into" socialism. The workers of the United States were similarly befuddled with illusions of endless "prosperity" based on labor-management co-operation for limitless production.

The economic crash of 1929 and its repercussions throughout the capitalist world, spelled disaster for all those theories and illusions. Hunger and insecurity swept from country to country as tens of millions were thrown out of jobs. The world hardly had to be told that the very essence of capitalism is its planlessness and chaos.

As long as the leaders of Social-Democracy were able to keep their followers under illusions that class collaborationism was the "easy" path

to soci
restrain
to the
prev
Comm
victory
where
govern
bankru
"capita
experie
lions
follow
make
advanc
Europ
Nov
archy
tered i
them
trappin
the res
olic m
spaces
have r
ist for
this ef
them
worke
The
being
to be
capita
is serv
the so
in the
other
for a
find t
ient a

to socialism, they were also able to restrain their militancy, blind them to the approaching fascist danger and prevent them from uniting with the Communists to block fascism. The victory of fascism in the countries where Social-Democracy once had governmental power, spelled the final bankruptcy of its plans to make "capitalism work." It took the costly experience of the war to bring millions of Europe's Social-Democratic followers to the Marxist path and make possible the great new socialist advances in Eastern and Central Europe.

Now the Roman Catholic hierarchy seeks to renovate the same shattered illusions and theories and trim them with clerical authority and trappings. The object is to draw on the reserves among the Roman Catholic masses to fill those vast empty spaces left by millions in Europe who have moved Leftward. The imperialist forces, on their part encourage this effort to expand a social base for them among the Vatican-influenced workers.

The Marshall Plan as a whole is being advanced, ostensibly, as a plan to beat Communism by "making capitalism work." Thus, the program is serving to encourage illusions in the so-called "industry council plan" in the United States and in many other prescriptions to win capitalists for a "planned" capitalism. Some find the papal encyclicals a convenient authority; others, like Truman,

advance the "planning" idea in the name of the "Fair Deal"; others still, see it as the essence of "liberalism." But already the new crisis, despite the Marshall Plan, is developing and throwing millions out of jobs, and is beginning to disillusion the present-day followers of both the clerical and social-reformist pied pipers of a labor-management "peace" utopia. Experience will shift those millions Leftward just as millions of European Catholic workers and Social-Democratic followers moved into the ranks of the Communists and Left-led trade unions.

THE PRACTICAL RESULTS

As noted above, the "planners" of capitalism cannot point to a single capitalist enterprise that showed willingness to apply their "plan." But there is a two-fold practical effect: the labor supporters of the program have become the principal missionaries for the Marshall Plan among the workers here and in Europe; in the factories and unions they control, they carry out a surrender policy on wages and co-operate for speedup of production. The latter flows from the former. Co-operation with Big Business for a warlike anti-Soviet foreign policy inevitably leads to sacrifice of the workers' interest also on the domestic front.

Thus it developed that the Reuther-Socialist-A.C.T.U. combination in the auto workers' union brought forth the General Motors "double esca-

later" wage agreement tying wages to the cost of living index and initiating the trend toward wage cuts when other workers asked for a "fourth round" raise. The same coalition favored the employers again by sidetracking wage increase demands for 1949.

The most valuable A.C.T.U. service to employers is in its Red-baiting disruptive activities in the unions led by progressives. The A.C.T.U. very rarely has organized groups in unions dominated by the Right wing. It has no other purpose but to disrupt progressive-led organizations. It was the first to seize upon the Taft-Hartley anti-Communist affidavits as weapons against progressive union officers. The Vatican's agents initiated the practice of Right-wing union raids upon progressive organizations and they even encouraged scabbing, on the ground that doing so against progressive-led workers is "good Christian" practice.

In line with their theory that the "Christian spirit" could bring employers and union leaders together, they developed the practice of obtaining the aid of employers for their disruptive internal union objectives and for their candidates for office. A.C.T.U. interference in the affairs of unions is largely guided by full-time priests assigned by bishops to serve as chaplains of their branches. Father Charles O. Rice, chaplain of the Pittsburgh branch, and close friend of Philip Murray, issued a

handbook titled *How to de-Control Your Union of Communists*. He even advises his followers how to seat their forces in a membership meeting and how to heckle most effectively.

In Pittsburgh the A.C.T.U. went so far as to launch a parish census. The priest of each respective church helped register members of their flock and obtain their answers to a series of questions indicating to what degree the parishioner is willing to fight "Communism." A crass example of clerical strike-breaking was the role of Father August Giesen in Fairmont City, Illinois, where employees of the American Zinc Co. had been on strike for many months. Red-baiting against the progressive-led union of the strikers was the main weapon of the company. Father Giesen, calling strikers to receive holy communion, added in his invitation card, "With Christ at our side we can lick Communism and the strike."

The clergy of a city is often mobilized by the hierarchy to lend an active hand to A.C.T.U.-supported candidates in an important election within a union. On one occasion, in St. Louis, an estimated 80 clergymen were called for such a mobilization. The priests canvass members of the affected union in their flock and they are often known to threaten workers, either directly or by strong implication, with excommunication if they don't support the A.C.T.U.'s side.

In actual numbers the A.C.T.U. is not large. But its forces are concentrated

trated v
them—i
unions.
and in
open a
caucuse
relying
count l
to rally
and pro
of cour
ion is t
Their s
admirat
Dubins

A MEN
BE FO

The
in its
stooges
Commu
numere
"anti-C
have a
vation.
and its
rating.
"zeal"
forces

As th
proletar
and Soc
Commu
add ex
anti-C
who ha
tion, b
offer of
acquiri

trated where the corporations need them—in the progressive-influenced unions. Its active groups are small and invisibly directed. They are more open as part of "anti-Communist" caucuses. The A.C.T.U. "activists," relying on the name of their outfit, count largely on religious prejudice to rally support for their candidates and proposals. They state vehemently of course, that exploitation of religion is the last thing in their minds. Their stock evidence is to cite their admiration for non-Catholics like Dubinsky and Reuther.

A MENACE THAT MUST BE FOUGHT

The U.S. Chamber of Commerce, in its handbook directing shop stooges on practical steps to "fight Communism" noted that the most numerous potential recruits for an "anti-Communist" caucus in the shop have a "patriotic or religious" motivation. In this respect the A.C.T.U. and its publications are given an A-1 rating. But, warns the Chamber, "zeal" alone is not enough. These forces often lack experience:

As their allies they may have some proletarian groups such as Socialists and Social-Democrats and non-Stalinist Communist groups . . . they merely add experience and militancy to the anti-Communist faction. . . . Those who have patriotic or religious motivation, but lack experience, at first can offer only zeal and numbers, the while acquiring experience. (*Communists*

Within the Labor Movement, U. S. Chamber of Commerce, 1947, p. 42.)

From the foregoing it should be apparent that the Vatican's drive for the trade unions of America is a menace. Unfortunately it is too often underestimated and the meaning of its "Council Plan" is overlooked even by some progressives. Its divisive influence in labor ranks, its bigotry, and its antithesis to America's most progressive traditions must be exposed.

But it should also be recognized that the A.C.T.U. and the entire Vatican position in the labor movement are very vulnerable. The presumption that A. C. T. U. - Social-Democratic leaders could maintain a smooth relationship with the employers over a prolonged period of "stabilization" has no base. The declining economic curve, unemployment and wage cuts, already shatter the hope that they could successfully exploit "prosperity" illusions. As in the automobile, textile, shipbuilding and other industries, the sentiment of the rank and file is rising against them because fancy blueprints of "industry council plans" don't secure jobs or wage standards. Under the leadership of progressives, such rank-and-file sentiment could shatter this company-unionism with clerical trimmings more easily than it was possible to do in the 'twenties and 'thirties.

Secondly, the A.C.T.U. is no less

vulnerable for its injection of religious dividing lines in the trade-union movement. The A.C.T.U. claims it has no religious objectives in the labor movement, but its defenders scream "bigotry" when criticized. Their cry only reveals their own cunning effort to capitalize upon the faith of co-religionists for reactionary, fascistic ends.

It is to the credit of the American labor movement that religious lines have never seriously marred its 150-year history. Unions have pretty generally been guided by the Jeffersonian principle of separation of church from state. Even the most conservative unions, though often influenced by racism, have not allowed religious lines to develop within their ranks.

The issue is not one of religion. On the contrary, it is recognition of the fact that *no religious freedom is real unless it is guaranteed by a freedom to obtain a job and rights within a union without fear of religious bias.* The question has no essential bearing on the faith of the millions of church-going Roman Catholics, but only on the fact that a foreign power, a reactionary hierarchy headquartered in the Vatican State, is exploiting the faith of these millions for support of reaction.

As the strike-breaking Cardinal Spellman demonstrated so well in the New York gravediggers' strike, the program serves the anti-labor interests of the employers perfectly.

There is still another danger. The drive of clericalism in America's trade-union movement also invites resentment and counteraction from Protestant workers. While such alarm is justified, there is also danger that it could be channelized by reactionaries into bigotry and religious warfare with serious consequences for the labor movement.

In their less hysterical moments, Daniel J. Tobin, president of the Brotherhood of Teamsters, and C.I.O. President Philip Murray, both Roman Catholics, condemned the A.C.T.U. for intrusion in union affairs and for inviting division along religious lines in the labor movement. The former even noted the help Hitler received in Germany because of the division fostered in union ranks by leaders of Roman Catholic unionism. Murray, recently, greeted the convention of the A.C.T.U.

Large numbers of Roman Catholics, too, are resentful of the A.C.T.U. activities and condemn it in even harsher terms than others. Catholic workers in the United States, largely concentrated in the industrial centers, show a militant trend—the very trend the Vatican seeks to reverse. This is most apparent in the militancy shown by such predominantly Catholic groups of workers as the longshoremen, railway clerks, miners, teamsters, electrical, shipbuilding, leather work-

ers and steel a

This Roman their f ing, d other field w Nor d degraed, fied, tend t Cathol injunc

Caro strike and G an il meani the C dinal, strike, picket some the C superv said, strike

The by the attorn tion in The i and th worke dinal's "mora His I scare" union,

ers and big sections of the textile, steel and automobile workers.

Thirdly, an increasing number of Roman Catholics resent the use of their faith as a cloak for strikebreaking, disruption of unions and such other practices. They feel this is a field where a church has no business. Nor do they like to see their faith degraded. Hence it is most unjustified, as some non-Catholics may tend to do, to presume that every Catholic worker blindly accepts the injunctions of the hierarchy.

Cardinal Spellman in the recent strike of gravediggers of the Calvary and Gate of Heaven cemeteries gave an illuminating example of the meaning of the Papal postulates on the *Conditions of Labor*. The Cardinal, in the seventh week of the strike, personally led through the picket lines for strikebreaking duty some 100 to 200 students training for the Catholic priesthood. He daily supervised the gravedigging and said, "I admit to the accusation of strikebreaker and I am proud of it."

The gravediggers, although misled by the A.C.T.U. and an A.C.T.U. attorney, forced a strike for a reduction in weekly hours from 48 to 40. The issue was clearly one of hours and the five-day week. But when the workers would not accept the Cardinal's terms it suddenly became a "moral" and "Communist" issue. His Eminence invoked the "Red-scare" even against the A.C.T.U.-led union, which was an autonomous

unit of the Food, Tobacco and Agricultural Workers of the C.I.O. The Cardinal arrogantly rejected all moves for a settlement, even when the strikers slavishly took an anti-Communist oath and promised to leave the C.I.O. union. When a delegation of the strikers' wives begged him to name any priest he wished to "arbitrate" the issue, he turned them away with a flat rejection.

Cardinal Spellman was above all interested in giving reaction leadership in the art of union-busting, and assurance that they would have the full backing of the hierarchy in such a policy. It need hardly be added, that in so doing he quite effectively exposed the big lie upon which the A.C.T.U. was built, that the Roman Catholic hierarchy and its encyclicals are a "liberal" influence in the labor movement. The Cardinal, rather, underscored their clerical reactionary content. Even when the A.C.T.U.-guided strikers literally crawled for forgiveness, the Cardinal cynically replied, "They are getting repentant kind of late." The strikers finally switched to a union approved by the Cardinal and settled without a penny above the original offer and with Leo XIII's six-day week intact.

The Cardinal's interpretation and application of the *Rerum Novarum* and the *Quadragesimo Anno* is obviously more authoritative than the A.C.T.U.'s. In the eyes of those who dream of the days of old, when unions were "in their place" the

demonstration given by His Eminence was decidedly a triumph.

The A.C.T.U.'s role thus is revealed as a strikebreaking force, a cover for company unionism, a factional splitter of the trade unions and as a political buttress for Wall Street's program. It should be fought vigorously by all workers irrespective of religious or political differ-

ences. 16,000,000 organized workers testify to the defeat given to the enemies of labor in their effort to prevent unionization. Labor's unions, forged through struggle, must be protected. Labor's enemies must not succeed in their efforts to paralyze and company-unionize the organized workers.

"Communists are also often accused by red-baiters of persecuting Catholic workers. This is a monstrous falsehood, too. Communists recognize the Catholic workers have the same economic and political interests as all other workers—they want peace; they want democracy; they want prosperity. So the Communists hold out the hand of solidarity to Catholics for the joint accomplishment of these democratic objectives. The Communists spare no efforts in fighting against religious bigotry, holding that in these critical days it is especially disastrous to engage in religious quarrels, from which only reaction can profit. At the same time, the Communists consider it politically necessary to condemn the clerical-fascist policies now being followed by the Vatican and by the many powerful figures in the Catholic hierarchy in the United States."

William Z. Foster, *American Trade Unionism*, p. 356.

by Gu

IN ITS
Wall S
to beh
class b
minist
and m
ences
Axis i
ments
emerge
master

I. T
on the
fiber o
these o
placed
Browd
favora
the at
campa
Comm
and gr
For
wines
With
the cap
resour
ideolog

* Exce
Industria
in Ohio

Improve The Marxist-Leninist Content and Methods in Party Activity*

by Gus Hell

IN ITS PLANS to enslave the world, Wall Street is giving high priority to beheading the American working class by seeking to destroy the Communist Party. As a result of a careful and methodical study of the experiences of the late "anti-Communist" Axis in setting up fascist governments along parallel lines, a plan emerged for the United States. This master plan has three distinct parts.

1. The first step calls for an attack on the Marxist-Leninist ideological fiber of the Communist Party. In these calculations, great reliance was placed on the wishful thought that Browder's revisionism had created favorable conditions for this phase of the attack and that a concentrated campaign would quickly disperse the Communist Party into small factions and groups.

For more than three years we have witnessed this full-scale offensive. With unlimited funds at its disposal, the capitalist class has mustered all its resources for this campaign. This ideological barrage has consumed and

still does consume the greater part of the time on the radio and space in newspapers and books, of the tons of magazines, of church sermons, after-dinner speeches, and movie footage. The United States Government Printing Office has issued millions of pieces of literature as its share in this fabulous political-ideological hysteria campaign. It is a campaign waged by the world's most powerful capitalist class, a class which is, nonetheless, suffering from an inferiority complex.

2. The second part of this anti-Communist crusade called for the isolation of the vanguard Party from its mother-earth, the people in general, and the working class in particular. The central weapon for achieving this is to discredit our Party, to label the Communists as "agents of a foreign power." This label is designed to destroy the effectiveness of the Party by repeating the same hollow charge to every activity—the Communists "are not really interested" in the problems of the American people, but are carrying on their activities only because they fit the "interest of a foreign power."

* Excerpts from a Report to a Conference on Industrial Concentration of the Communist Party in Ohio, delivered on February 13, 1949.

3. The final section of the plan calls for direct attacks: indictments, arrests, deportations, jailings on technicalities, physical assaults, and other forms of force and violence. These methods are geared to accompany the attempts through courts and the United States Congress to legalize the work and membership of the Communist Party. The very latest edition is the attempt to legalize the Communist Party by actions of state legislatures.

A new twist in this war of ideology is the attempt to convince the Communist Party that it is dying and dispersing. The *U.S. News & World Report* says that our Party is "declining"; the Hearst papers proclaim that the Party is "disintegrating"; and Earl Browder announces that the Party is "friendless, isolated, and lies in ruins." As "proof" of the isolation of the Communist Party from the working class these gentry point to the betrayal of a Quill, a Curran, and a Sheyfitz, of a Budenz, of a Browder. Thus, the very developments that are testimony to our ideological unity and strength—the rejection of the very individuals and their politics that would have brought about the isolation of the Party—are here given as "proof" of that isolation. The strength and influence of a Communist Party cannot be measured by its relations with some top officials in the trade unions. A working-class party's strength can be measured only by its ability to lead in struggle and to reflect correctly

the needs and desires of the masses in a given situation.

The struggles are sharpening. Wall Street is intensifying its plans for world conquest and its attacks on the Communist Party. But a number of facts clearly stand out. The timetable originally set has been thrown off schedule. Ever-greater numbers of Americans are seeing the attack as part of a pattern of emerging American fascism. Growing sections of the population are identifying their interests with the defense of the Communists.

Our Party is rebuffing the attacks, and, in doing so, is strengthening itself in the process. The Marxist-Leninist ideological fiber of the Party is today at its best. The ranks of the Party are solid. The Party has strengthened its ties with the people. The Communists have won back the honorable position of being the best, most militant, and most capable leaders in the struggles of the people. The Party's spirit, discipline, and work reflects utmost confidence in its ability to fight back, and in its policies, program, and leadership. The fighting morale and spirit of the Communist Party is high.

There are a few places where the attack has obliged the Communists and progressive forces to retreat. The developments in the maritime, transport, and chemical workers' unions are such examples. But these retreats are temporary in character, and are being utilized to regroup and reorient the forces. There are already

many
the re
fully a
progre
move
ganiza
ing an
of thei

Beca
Marxis
guide,
these a
to app
class t
condit
buffing
go into
dence,
use the
cism—
lutely,
correct
pear. T

In a
are un
The p
drive
realize
stroy t
minist
to dir
line f
Theref
temati
moral
leaders
Whi
the dr
affects
jority
Comm

many signs clearly indicating that the regroupings have been successfully accomplished and that the Left-progressive forces are starting to move with new strength, better organization, and a deeper understanding and conviction of the correctness of their policy.

Because in 1945 we returned to Marxism-Leninism as our theory and guide, our Party today is able to meet these attacks. We are learning how to apply this science of the working class to our American problems and conditions. Our Party today is rebuffing the attacks and is ready to go into future struggles with confidence, because we have learned to use the Leninist method of self-criticism—the method of boldly, resolutely, and publicly attacking and correcting all weaknesses as they appear. This we will continue to do.

In any warfare, the advance units are under the most concentrated fire. The profit-mad capitalist class, in its drive to enslave the world, fully realizes that it must attempt to destroy these advance units—the Communist Party—and simultaneously to direct its fire against the front-line forces—the working class. Therefore, the class enemy is systematically trying to disperse, demoralize, and win over part of the leadership of the labor movement.

While fully understanding that the drive toward war and fascism affects and involves the great majority of the American people, we Communists must fully see and un-

derstand the specific, decisive role played by the working class in this struggle.

The Communist Parties of France, Italy, Czechoslovakia, Poland, and other important countries are large, and have millions of followers among all sections of the population, because above all else they speak for and lead the working class of their respective countries. We know the historic and objective facts that account for the different level of development in our own country. Among other things, this uneven political maturing of the working class reflects the uneven development of capitalism itself. However, we would make a great error, were we to hide our weaknesses behind these objective developments.

The Communist Party in Ohio is a Party of steelworkers, coal miners, machinists, auto, rubber, and electrical workers, and workers in other basic industries. This places heavy responsibilities on our Party. Among these responsibilities is the necessity to be doubly alert and vigilant against any weaknesses of our own making or influences of the enemy, in this very decisive sector. We must learn to be as vigilant against, and uncompromising with, weaknesses, as we are jubilant about our successes.

With this in mind, I want to discuss a few of the signs of weaknesses that have made their appearance in the work of the Party in Ohio.

Since the Emergency Convention,

opportunism has not appeared in our Party as a rounded-out policy, a thesis, or a platform. From this it does not follow that, therefore, our Party is exempt and forever immune from this enemy class influence. In a class society, the ideological struggle is forever present. Since 1945, opportunism has not walked in full-grown through the front door; but it has sneaked in through the back door. It has made its appearance only as signs or manifestations. In most cases, the carrier of this germ of capitalist class ideology is unaware that he is doing so. The manifestations are usually covered up by rationalizations and "Left" phrases, or by silence. In the struggle against these manifestations of Right opportunism, generalizations on the question are not enough, and by themselves are not very effective. It is possible for one to be guilty of Right opportunistic practices in one's own work, and still go along with the most vigorous condemnation of opportunism in general, or as it appears in the work of others, or of other Communist Parties. Therefore, these manifestations must be fought against concretely, in the surroundings of their appearance.

In his Report to the Fourteenth National Convention of the Communist Party, our Labor Secretary, Comrade John Williamson, affirmed that "the outstanding feature of the present situation is the readiness of the workers to struggle if issues are made clear and proper

leadership is given." This Report was adopted and accepted as a part of the Convention's estimate of the present situation. The test as to the real understanding of, and agreement with, this estimate or, for that matter with any policy, is in the application.

Let us examine some of the manifestations of Right opportunism.

We had a few Comrades who said: "Yes, the above estimation and the policies flowing from it are correct, generally speaking, but in my shop or industry we have a different situation. In my shop, the workers are more backward, and what is generally correct does not at this time apply to them." Some held: "It is generally correct, but I come from a small shop, and you know we can't start on these small shops while the big monopolies go free." Then there were those from the big shops who said: "True, this is a big shop. But it is only one in a monopoly chain, and therefore you cannot win a struggle in only one shop out of a big chain." Then there is the tune pitched in another key: "Right now production is high. Workers are working overtime and making good money. Therefore this is not the time to initiate struggles." Six months later, this comrade stated: "Now production is going down. Therefore now is not the time to initiate any struggles. The bosses don't care if the workers strike." Or: "We must wait until the other unions start the struggle."

Then
argues
raising
discrim
ers in
situatio
are be
Southe
two co
ideolog
white
closely
to be f

Thes
are a
nism. V
up, the
estimat
is true
special
acterist
but on
come e
ditions
become
tunism
ty's po

Now
worker
has be
gotiato
ance p
tiate a
"proces
argues
year. S
the m
lot of
"keepi
ing th
cases,

Then we have the comrade who argues: "The Party is correct in raising sharply the struggle to smash discrimination against Negro workers in industry. But in my shop the situation is different. The workers are backward. There are many Southerners," etc., etc. Here we have two concurrent streams of bourgeois ideology: opportunism in general, and white chauvinism. These are very closely related, and are very often to be found flowing together.

These rationalizations, obviously, are a cover-up for Right opportunism. When put together and added up, they signify the rejection of the estimate and policy of the Party. It is true that we must take note of special circumstances, of special characteristics in a shop or in a local, but only to take special steps to overcome existing obstacles. "Special conditions" must never be allowed to become the cover for Right opportunism, for the rejection of the Party's policies in practice.

Now let us look at the advanced worker who has fallen into a rut and has become the "annual contract negotiator" and "a year-round grievance processor." He helps to negotiate a contract once a year, and then "processes," or files grievances and argues about them the rest of the year. Some grievances are settled; the majority are not. He spends a lot of time "holding down" things, "keeping everything quiet," "keeping the status quo." In most such cases, he has fallen for the class-

collaborationist idea that a "clever" trade-union leader can "negotiate" a victory without a struggle by the workers.

The capitalist class has very methodically cultivated and elevated into prominence the "clever" negotiator type as the "respectable" trade-union leader. To the workers, such a trade-union leader begins to look like an "impartial" arbitrator, and not as their leader in struggles. He very quickly loses the respect and confidence of the workers who elevated him to office.

This specific manifestation of opportunism is usually covered up by the rationalization that "our contract or grievance procedure makes action of any kind almost impossible." Such thinking might sound convincing, but it does not correspond to the facts; it is actually a self-imposed prison. The management will always argue that a labor-management contract is a "truce" in the class struggle. But while doing so, they continue to speed up production and cut piece rates to increase profits. For a union leader to accept this class-collaborationist idea in any form is a betrayal of the working class.

The "clever" negotiator notion flows from the basic illusion that the capitalist class is or that certain members of that class are fair, reasonable, and "intelligent," and therefore they can be won over or convinced by "clever" arguments. All remnants of this dangerous illusion must be

systematically and consciously destroyed.

The same general weakness also shows up in a tendency to think in terms of placing demands and of organizing struggles around issues that the employer would consider "reasonable" demands that will not create too much "hardship," and issues that can easily be "agreed to" without a struggle. This reflects the ideology of the beggar. It results in being satisfied and grateful for crumbs thrown to the working class. It is part of the ideology of the capitalist class, which holds that for some reason or another the capitalist class is the rightful master of the means of production and resources, and therefore the workers should be satisfied and grateful for any concession. Even the slightest tendency to think along these lines leads to policies of class collaboration in practice.

The basic, simple truth—that the capitalist class will compromise or negotiate only if it sees mass action or the solid organization and ideological conviction that can make such action possible—must be the foundation of a class struggle trade-union policy.

A younger brother to the above weakness is the tendency toward reliance on spontaneity. Here, there is theoretically no opposition to the idea of struggle, but before leadership is given, according to this view, one must wait until some "spontaneous action" takes place. Such

"spontaneous" struggles often do not materialize, or else are usually unsuccessful because of lack of preparation and because they are very often provoked at a time most unfavorable for the workers.

A vanguard Party cannot rely on spontaneity as the basis for its activity and leadership. Lenin once stated that a vanguard Party must boldly project issues and demands which the workers "only dare whisper about to their closest friends." A leader must initiate and project the issues, organize the struggle, find the proper form for each stage in the struggle, and encourage and build enthusiasm and confidence of victory in the struggle. He must systematically destroy the enemy's ideological arguments, expose the weaknesses of the enemy, and help the workers draw significant lessons from their battle. A vanguard Party must at all times dig for, unearth, and expose all the hidden forms of exploitation, and not merely lead struggles that flare up spontaneously. If elements of reliance on spontaneity are permitted to go unchallenged, they will develop and grow into full-scale rejection of the policy of class struggle.

MARXIST LEADERSHIP

Joseph Stalin, in the *History of the C.P.S.U.*, states that Lenin in his *What It To Be Done?* "brilliantly substantiated the fundamental Marxist thesis that a Marxist party is a

union
ment
of this
every
challen
quirem
Party.

A P
does n
tal Ma
"for so
or leat
by pub
ism in
this "
reason
the or
and so
presen
history
the da
first is
of Mar
is a re
cialism
same—

The
that t
workin
ism" r
essenc
strugg
giving
strugg
reform
neccion
gles a
the w
thing
before
empha

union of the working-class movement and socialism." The mastery of this thesis, as a guide for the everyday activity of the Party, is a challenge and a fundamental requirement for all organizations of the Party.

A Party, or a member of the Party, does not give life to this fundamental Marxist thesis by adding a slogan "for socialism" at the end of a speech or leaflet; this "union" is not made by publishing literature about socialism in the abstract. And of course this "union" is not made by the reasoning that "socialism is not on the order of the day in America," and so we can leave it out of our present-day activities and wait until history will place it on the order of the day in some distant future. The first is an error flowing from a lack of Marxist understanding; the second is a rejection of the struggle for socialism. The result of both are the same—no struggle for socialism.

The fundamental Marxist thesis that the "party is the union of the working-class movement and socialism" must be the content, the very essence of our leadership of every struggle at all times. This means giving a Marxist content to all struggles for partial demands and reforms. It means making the connection between the present struggles and the future, the part with the whole. This idea is not something new. The Party has stated it before. But without periodic re-emphasis, additions, and continuous

struggle for improvement in application, a policy becomes musty, is left on the shelf and forgotten or used only for abstract lectures on Sunday.

Let us take the issue of speedup and see how this problem appears to different elements in the leadership of the trade-union movement.

(a) The approach of the Right-wing, class-collaborationist leaders derives from their slogan, "The more you produce the more you have." In practice, such trade-union leaders often sit on "joint committees" to devise new means by which to speed up production. To them, speedup is not an issue, but a "joint responsibility" of labor and "management."

(b) To the reformist Keynesian type of trade-union leaders, the essence of this issue is summed up in their slogans, "A fair day's work for a fair day's pay"—"A guarantee for a reasonable profit." This is also a class-collaborationist policy, but these trade-union leaders are obliged to give lip-service against speedup, and when forced, may even go along with some actions.

(c) To a Marxist, the approach and content flows from the profound truth that all speedup, in all its multitude of forms, only increases the workers' rate of exploitation and results in a greater profit for the capitalists.

The "high production" and "fair day's pay for a fair day's work" notions are as old as the capitalist system itself. These slogans are be-

coming worn-out from use in the hiding and concealing of the highway robbery that is capitalism. Almost a hundred years ago, Frederick Engels exposed this slogan as follows: "Labor is, besides the earth, the only source of wealth. . . . The produce of the labor of those who do work gets unavoidably accumulated in the hands of those who do not work, and becomes in their hands the most powerful means to enslave the very men who produced it." American capitalism, like capitalism everywhere, has used these slogans to disguise the fact that it expropriates, grabs, the total product produced by the working class and returns to the workers in the form of wages just enough for a bare existence, and often less. Thus, in 1948 the capitalists of our country amassed 34 billion dollars in the form of profits (before taxes), while 31 per cent of all American families received less than \$2,000 per family (in 1947).

There cannot be, and there is not, anything "fair" about the system of capitalism. This is why, if the workers are really to benefit from greater production (*without speedup*), the whole system of exploitation and profits must be done away with and replaced by a more advanced system, socialism.

This theoretical understanding offers a guide to an effective program of action. The need at all times is for organized actions against speedup. The exact form and character of these struggles must depend on

the concrete circumstances and relationship of forces.

During such activities *all* the workers participating must be taught that speedup is going to result only in more profits at their own expense. By the use of highly skilled "time study" men, the exploiters have been squeezing more out of the workers every minute, hour, and day. One of the immediate results is that in an industry such as auto, the Wall Street barons have squeezed every bit of energy out of the workers in ten years' less time than in most other industries, and so the auto worker's span of working life is ten years shorter.

The workers must be shown that it is not only the immediate boss who is involved, but rather that speedup is a part of the whole system of exploitation and profits. The content of the struggle must be of such a nature that *all* workers will see that only a constant and united struggle can slow down this frenzied drive for profits. At the same time, the content of our leadership must guarantee that more and more sections of the workers will draw the conclusion that only a basic change, the scrapping of the system, will end this insanity forever.

Let us see how the struggle for equal rights for the Negro workers in general, and for upgrading specifically, is approached by the different elements in the trade-union leadership. Among the Right wing, some work openly for a policy of

discr
vice
or ev
lines
basic
gener
until
with
depar
and
Th
fund
the tr
can r
the b
pose
discr
ing c
tem
stand
tices
erful
desig
from
tions
sive
Negr
ern F
unde
action
(1)
again
crimi
(2)
temat
in wh
a wea
ping
of the
(3)

discrimination. Others pay lip service to equal rights and upgrading or even vote for motions along these lines; but the "hitch" is that in most basic industries there cannot be any general upgrading or advancement until discrimination is done away with in the large lily white skilled departments, in the trade schools, and in the apprenticeship programs.

The Marxist understanding of this fundamental question flows from the truth that labor in the white skin can never be free so long as labor in the black skin is branded. The purpose of the system of segregation and discrimination is to divide the working class in order to continue the system of exploitation. From the understanding that the ideology and practices of white chauvinism are powerful weapons of the capitalist class designed to perpetuate this system, from the understanding of the relationship of this chauvinistic offensive to the liberation battles of the Negro nation oppressed in the Southern Black Belt—from this theoretical understanding flows a program of action:

(1) To organize action at all times against every and all forms of discrimination.

(2) To maintain a continuous, systematic campaign exposing the way in which white chauvinism serves as a weapon of the ruling class in propping up its profit system by means of the strategy of divide-and-rule.

(3) To show the need for unity

of Negro and white workers in all struggles.

(4) To conduct the campaign with such content that all workers taking part in the struggle will see the need forcefully to reject the policies and practices of discrimination and to see the need for class unity and solidarity. The content must be such as to enable the workers to draw the conclusion that a system that must resort to lynchings, frame-ups, and other barbaric forms of terror, that resorts to such hideous, divisive measures to poison the minds of the people in order to perpetuate its rule, must be destroyed, and a new, more advanced system, socialism, built in its place.

As indicated in the foregoing examples, the unity of the working-class movement and socialist consciousness must be made the content and essence of every struggle. When workers take part in a fight, they become more receptive to learning what are the deeper issues, the "big politics" behind the conditions they face and fight against. And it is especially in the midst of such a struggle that the Communists have the opportunity to explain the basic policies of class struggle as they appear under the spotlight of Marxist-Leninist science.

The Marxist-Leninist thesis of the Party being the "union" of the working-class movement and socialism is a source of limitless fighting morale and enthusiasm. Without this understanding, one very easily slips

out of the ranks of the fighters for socialism and into the ranks of the "negotiators." To the extent that Party organizations strive to give a Marxist content to their every activity, to that extent are they active, vigorous, enthusiastic, growing organizations. To the extent that the content is reformist, mechanical, or non-Marxist in general, the organizations lack enthusiasm, perspective, and consistency in their activities. The content of our leadership must help *all* workers draw the general conclusions about classes and class struggle, of the need to fight for socialism.

CONCENTRATION: LENIN'S METHOD

So far I have dealt with manifestations of certain shortcomings in the political content of our activities. Now a few words on certain weaknesses in the forms and style of our work.

At the last State Convention of our Communist Party in Ohio, great stress was placed on industrial concentration. This was correct, and the Party is all the stronger as a result. But our work has convinced us that we have not yet fully understood the meaning of this question. We did not draw the full conclusions from Comrade Winston's report to the Fourteenth National Convention of our Party last August: "This cannot be done, unless we turn the face of the entire Party to the workers in the factory." We have viewed indus-

trial concentration as either the most important or one of the most important *tasks*. We understood this concentration as a task for a section of the Party. To us, industrial concentration was largely limited to the important task of leaflet distribution and *Worker* sales.

As a result of our experience, it is now clear that industrial concentration cannot be viewed as a task; it is not an assignment that you give to one section of the Party. Industrial concentration is a basic Leninist method of work for the whole Party. Industrial concentration means giving life to some basic Leninist concepts of a Marxist Party. It gives life to the Leninist concept of the Communist Party as the vanguard of the working class. It gives meaning to the whole idea that ours is a working-class Party. It gives life to the concept that we must take hold of the main link, the link that will move everything else at the given moment.

Industrial concentration gives content to the Leninist concept of the hegemony of the proletariat in all phases and stages of the struggle. If we agree with Lenin that "only a class like the proletariat could rally around itself all the forces discontented with capitalism," then we must show that agreement by applying the method of industrial concentration in leading and winning the proletariat.

Comrade Eugene Dennis showed the significance of this method for

our cu
"To h
and w
must
its mo

One
replac
less th
class r
mation
No
coaliti
ress c
workin
fact th
a mov

The
this d
must l
consci
with t
infuse
it mus
hidden
tation,
road
Marxi
compl
use th
tion to
section

Indu
metho
thing
chang
class i
in bas
consta
indust
jectiv

our current struggles when he stated: "To halt the drive toward fascism and war, the new people's coalition must be led by the working class and its most class conscious sector."

One cannot speak seriously about replacing capitalism by Socialism unless the decisive role the working class must perform in this transformation is fully grasped.

No movement, organization, or coalition dedicated to human progress can succeed today unless the working class is an integral part, in fact the most decisive part, of such a movement.

The working class will not play this decisive role automatically. It must be organized, it must be *made* conscious of being a class in struggle with the capitalist class, it must be infused with political consciousness, it must be taught how to unravel the hidden forms of slavery and exploitation, it must be guided along the road to victory over its class foe. Marxism-Leninism is the key to accomplishing all these tasks. We must use this key by a concentrated attention to this all-important and decisive section of the population.

Industrial concentration is the basic method and approach toward everything we do. Issues and tactics will change, but the role of the working class in general and of the workers in basic industry in particular is a constant, permanent element in all industrial concentration plans or objectives. Industrial concentration is

the *method* of work of the Party of a "new type."

At the core of the mass work of the Party is the objective of winning the majority of the working class to a class-struggle policy, and of isolating those leaders of the trade unions who are pursuing the policy of class collaboration, of supporting all the reactionary ways of Wall Street. Organically related to this central mass task, we have a number one *must*—building and rooting the Communist Party in the main industries and industrial centers.

How can the Party as a whole work on the central task; or, to put it another way, how can the central objective be at the very heart of the activity of every section of our Party?

To begin with, we must understand industrial concentration as a basic method of work. Then, the Party, and certainly all levels of the leadership, must know what the central tasks and objectives are. The Party must be acquainted with the issues, forces, background and the tactics to be pursued in reaching the objective.

The winning of the majority of the working class cannot be viewed within the narrow confines of the shop or local union. Besides working in shops, workers are a part of the community. They have families which are all very definitely influenced by the life in the shops. They are members of all types of community organizations. The workers influence, and in turn are influenced by, this

life that surrounds the industries. The Party can mold this reciprocal influence if it is acquainted with the problems and developments in the shops or industry. A neighborhood club of the Party cannot influence or lead the wives and families of steelworkers on any issue unless such a club is acquainted with the inner life and goings-on in the steel mill and the union local.

The Party must become the molder of a fighting alliance between the labor movement and the Negro people. This alliance, in which a leading part must be played by the Left-progressive unions, can become stable and effective only on the basis of a fight against all forms of discrimination in and out of the shops.

The working women and working-class housewives can be won to a class-struggle outlook only when Communists and other Left-progressive trade-union leaders recognize and fight for the special problems of women workers in the shops. These women workers will then become the element unifying the militant trade unionists and the working-class housewives and women's organizations in general. As an important feature of industrial concentration, Communist women should work for and help build such a unity. We must help organize chapters of women's organizations which include women workers and the wives and relatives of shop workers. The programs and policies of such organizations must meet the pressing eco-

nomie, social and political needs of working-class women.

There is an old saying that "he who has the youth has the future." This proverb has meaning because of the fact that he who leads the youth can lead the working class. To speak of winning the working class without special efforts to win the youth is unthinkable. These special efforts must start with a struggle in and by the trade unions on the special issues facing working-class youth in industry as well as for the interests of the youth in general. The unions must take seriously the organization of large, industry-wide sports movements. The unions must give serious consideration to the social and recreational needs of the youth.

The Party must become the force unifying Left-progressive, class-struggle trade unionism, and the foreign-born nationality organizations. An orientation of this kind must include special organizational forms of education and agitation.

To illustrate further the method of industrial concentration, let us see how the student sections of our Party must apply this method. The Communist student must feel a direct responsibility toward carrying out this central work of the Party. This should be viewed under three headings.

1. He must never allow the "classless" atmosphere of the schools to enter into the content of the thinking and political work of Communist students. There must be a very con-

scious
the e
class
the h
ple, i
avoid
demi
to it
a gui
part
indus
Party
the fr
a job
Su
dictio
On t
work
make
the b
of th

CON

Th
of th
Party
task
Fit

scious study and understanding of the emancipating role of the working class, which carries on its banners the hopes for the future of our people, including the students. He must avoid studying Marxism as an academic question, must apply himself to it as a science, a program of action, a guide for struggle. 2. He must take part in some direct activities in the industrial concentration plans of the Party. 3. Regardless of his plans for the future, he should endeavor to get a job in industry whenever possible.

Such a program is not in contradiction to the work among students. On the contrary, it can round out the work of the Communist students and make it more effective. It will build the best type of cadres for the work of the Party.

CONCLUSION

The foregoing is a sketchy outline of the tasks of every section of the Party which flow from our central task and objective.

Finally, industrial concentration is

not a seasonal occupation. It is not a method of work that we will use only for a period of time. It is a *permanent* method of work.

We have made great strides forward in our understanding of Marxism-Leninism. We must continue to do so, to master this science of the working class. We have relearned the art of leadership and struggle—but we must continue to improve it. We have re-established the methods and forms of the Leninist Party of a "new type"—but we must not become smug, we must constantly strive for better forms and methods.

A Party that relaxes or stops even for a moment in its struggles to improve constantly its activities and understanding of Marxism-Leninism is a Party that has taken the first step backward, toward defeat. Our Communist Party, U.S.A., has advanced because we have struggled against all manifestations of alien, non-working-class ideologies. We will continue to advance because we will continue to struggle against all such manifestations.

The Chinese People's Victories and The Warmakers' Dilemma

by George Phillips

THE SCOPE AND MAGNITUDE of the victories of the Chinese revolution are universally recognized as a turning point both in the fight for colonial freedom and in the international relationship of forces. Half of the human race lives in Asia which, in the past, has been the world center of colonial oppression. Under the impact of the people's victories in China, which demonstrate the growing world-wide strength of the anti-imperialist camp, Asia today stands out as a world center of resistance to imperialism and colonial oppression.

The victories of the Chinese Liberation Forces are transforming China from a semi-feudal and semi-colonial country into an independent country developing a new democratic revolution under Communist leadership.

By the end of February 1949, the People's Liberation Armies in China had freed 770 cities and towns, including a number of large cities with populations of two million inhabitants, and liberated more than 200,000,000 of China's population of 450,000,000. More decisive than any quantitative summary is the qualitative character of the people's victories

to date. As Mao Tse-tung, chairman of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China, pointed out in the statement, "On Peace in China," that he issued on January 14 of this year:

In the course of two and a half years, the Chinese People's Liberation Army wiped out the main military forces of the Kuomintang reactionary Government and all its crack divisions.

At the present time, the People's Liberation Army is superior to the remnant military forces of the Kuomintang reactionary Government in numbers, morale, and equipment. Now, at last, the people of China have begun to come into their own.

Now the situation is extremely clear: the People's Liberation Army need only further deal some heavy blows at the remaining Kuomintang troops, and the entire reactionary ruling machinery of the KMT will crumble into dust and extinction. (*China Digest* (Hong Kong) Vol. V, No. 7, Jan. 25, 1949.)

At this writing, these conclusive blows are yet to be dealt as the popular forces continue to march forward, regrouping and reorganizing their armies, consolidating their victories, building the new democracy and

daily i
lation
capital
has be
success
ries an
presse
the pa
impres
But th
not at
sory r
the M
[N.C.
Ameri
moppi
mies
for e
nounc
of the
Pengp
an are
with a
000,00
Rivers
cultur
March
thirtee
front
These
fronts
from m
proble
Liber
out in
contex
distor
patch
story
Areas
forcer

daily increasing the area and population of the Liberated Areas. The capitalist press in the United States has become "bored" with the steady succession of Communist-led victories and has so played down or suppressed even the military events of the past weeks as to create the false impression of a standstill in China. But the state of affairs in China is not at all static. Even the most cursory reading of the dispatches of the New China News Agency [N.C.N.A.]—largely ignored by the American press—reveals that the mopping up of the Nanking armies continues. On March 12, for example, the N.C.N.A. announced the victorious completion of the People's Army's Hsuehchow-Pengpu campaign, which liberated an area of 90,000 square kilometers, with a population of more than 10,000,000 people in the Huai-Yangtze Rivers area, famous for its rich agriculture and fishing stretches. On March 11, N.C.N.A. announced a thirteen-day advance on the Shensi front that liberated 1,200,000 people. These and similar victories on other fronts have virtually been concealed from the American people, while the problems still to be solved in the Liberated Areas have been singled out in such isolation from their true context that they represent a gross distortion. Other N.C.N.A. dispatches set forth the tremendous story of the rebirth of the Liberated Areas on new foundations, the enforcement of land reform, the ad-

vances in agricultural production and the people's living standards, the important developments in the industrial expansion in the Liberated Areas as fundamental expressions of the advancing Chinese revolution.

China has illuminated the new scope, intensity, and maturity of the national liberation movements of the East. The Chinese Communist Party, leading the Chinese nation to freedom, has demonstrated the road to freedom for all the nations and peoples now under colonial subjugation.

COLONIAL STRUGGLES IN ASIA

While the victories over foreign imperialist intervention and its native compradore and feudal stooges have reached their highest development in China, the same basic conflict is being waged in varying degrees in all of the countries of Asia.

In Indo-China, Indonesia, the Philippines, Malaya, Burma and Korea the most important new feature is the strength and militancy of the colonial liberation movements. In all of these countries organized anti-imperialist movements of unprecedented strength are vital and permanent factors, with deep roots in the peasantry, the rising labor movements, students and intellectuals, and those sections of the national bourgeoisie—small as they may be—that have refused to surrender and betray their national interests to the imperialists. In all of these countries Communist Parties are the leading

force in the national liberation struggles. That is the emerging new factor in Asia.

The aggressive drive of the western imperialist powers, fortified and led by the United States, to reimpose their domination over the peoples and countries of Asia is the main factor that the colonial peoples have to contend with. To carry out this design, imperialism has resorted to armed aggression against the peoples of Southeast Asia and in turn has encountered the armed resistance of the postwar colonial liberation movements.

Imperialist intervention is not the dominant *new* factor in Asia. It is a continuation, under new conditions and in many new guises and forms, of a full century of Western domination in China and many centuries of Western rule in other parts of Asia. The decisive new factor, which is the key to the future of Asia, is the fact that a century of imperialist rule in China is being brought to an end and that the imperialist powers in all the other countries of Asia can no longer fashion events as they desire and are confronted with revolutionary freedom movements of unprecedented strength.

The changing face of Asia, the rising tide of the anti-imperialist forces, cannot be fully appreciated without some reference to the developments in Japan, which, before the war, played the Asian counterpart of Nazi Germany's role in Europe. With the war's end, U.S. policy was designed

to transform Japan into a colony of the United States, into a U.S. base of operations against the Soviet Union and the colonial liberation movements in the Far East. General MacArthur's occupation policy has violated the Allied agreements and the Far Eastern Commission, has pursued an anti-labor and anti-Communist policy and has concentrated on trying to reimpose the Japanese fascists as the puppets of American imperialist rule. But in Japan, too, which has the largest organized labor movement in the Far East (6,000,000 strong) the anti-imperialist movement is growing and winning victories. In the elections of January 1949, the Japanese Communist Party trebled its popular vote over that of April 1947 with three million votes and won 35 seats in the lower house of the Diet, an increase of 31 seats over the number in 1947.

Analyzing the results of the Japanese elections in *Far East Spotlight* of March 1949, Hugh Deane, Tokyo correspondent of *Allied Labor News*, points out:

The number of successful Communist candidates is not the whole story. The party elected 12 candidates in Japan's six largest cities—Tokyo, Osaka, Yokohama, Nagoya, Kyoto and Kobe—showing that it has succeeded the Socialists as the political representative of the majority of the workers.

The Socialist Party which won a plurality in the 1947 elections paid for its broken promises, vacillation and corruption by losing nearly 100 seats. . .

In
of me
ty bra
bers
tellect
electic
at wh
early

The
despit
tion o
despit
curtai
Comm
just p
to wit
hortat
nists,
Govern
tin bo

The
Kyuic
that
favora
Demo
Yoshic
Diet a
ized w

Both
and th
which
tion an
official
for un
Sociali
Leader
which
already
cessity

Sign
ican pu
that t
Comm

In November and December a series of mergers with Left-wing Socialist Party branches took place, and large numbers of workers, union leaders and intellectuals joined the party. Thus the elections registered Communist strength at what may well turn out to be an early phase of continuing expansion.

The Communist gains were won despite the indirect and direct opposition of the occupation authorities and despite an electoral law which sharply curtailed campaigning. Several likely Communist candidates were arrested just prior to the campaign and forced to withdraw. In Nagano Prefecture exhortations to vote against the Communists, signed by the American Military Government, appeared on official bulletin boards. . . .

The view of Communist leaders Kyuichi Tokuda and Sanzo Nozaka is that the elections created conditions favorable to the formation of a People's Democratic Front which can oppose Yoshida's Tory majority both in the Diet and through the action of organized workers and farmers.

Both the party's central committee and the Congress of Industrial Unions, which is Japan's largest union federation and which elected four of its own officials to the Diet, have issued calls for unity of action by the Communist, Socialist and Labor-Farmer parties. Leaders of the Labor-Farmer Party, which has seven seats in the Diet, have already agreed in principle to the necessity of such a people's front.

Significantly, the reactionary American press is now beginning to admit that the strength of the Japanese Communists can be expected to grow

still further in the coming months. Thus, the Far Eastern Editor of the Big Business-minded weekly *U.S. News & World Report* observes in the March 25, 1949, issue:

Of course the Communists want to make the situation appear: "the Americans against the workers and the Communists," and I am inclined to believe they have pretty well succeeded. That is demonstrated by the election results. I think the trend of U.S. policy now will start pinching the farmers, so that in the next year or two the farmers will feel that they have no one to turn to except the Communists.

The foundations of the entire colonial system in Asia are being shaken at a time when the capitalist powers are most dependent upon the colonies and when the expansionist drive of American monopoly capitalism for world domination is being pursued with particular intensity in the colonial countries.

WALL STREET STRATEGY DEFEATED

The Chinese Liberation Forces have scored their sweeping victories, not alone against the warlords and the corrupt Kuomintang regime in China, but against the most powerful force in the imperialist world: American imperialism. In China American imperialism fully exposed its new role in world affairs as the dominant and most aggressive imperialist power. It intervened openly and extensively, to a far greater ex-

tent than official government figures indicate, and took its stand as the decisive enemy of the Chinese revolution. In China, where U.S. intervention was more extensive in terms of military direction and supplies as well as dollar assistance to fascist and reactionary puppets than in any other part of the globe, the expansionist drive of the American monopolies suffered its greatest defeat.

Large-scale U.S. intervention in China was begun before the Truman Doctrine got its name and Congressional approval in conjunction with Greece and Turkey. American imperialism made China a kingpin of its postwar expansionism and a major concentration in its strategic plans for a third world war. And it is here that American imperialism suffered its greatest postwar reverse and collided with the harsh reality that aroused peoples stand between the Wall Street-Washington blueprints and their implementation. The Chinese revolution, basing itself on faith in the people as the prime makers of history, is on the path of nationwide victory because it did not fall into the trap of overestimating the strength of imperialism and its ability to fashion the world as it desires. In China the weaknesses and limitations of American imperialism have been exposed for all the world to see and the strength of the people's anti-imperialist national liberation movements have been demonstrated unmistakably.

In the geopolitics of the "cold war"

the strategists of U.S. monopoly world domination had assigned a very specific place to China. Just as Nazi aggression found expression in the Nazi school of geopolitics, so the aggressive U.S. postwar foreign policy has given rise to an American school of geopolitics which finds expression in a series of studies and volumes published for limited circulation.

In essence the American geopolitical doctrine is a blueprint for imperialist encirclement of the Soviet Union and the new democracies of Europe through Anglo-American control of all the "rimlands" of the Eurasian land mass, or, in other words, of all the countries bordering or approaching the Soviet Union and the new democracies by land. This overall strategic concept guided the U.S. intervention in Turkey, Greece and Italy, the transformation of the Mediterranean from a British to an American lake with dominant U.S. naval power, and the strategic concentration on the Middle Eastern countries (all to the south of the Soviet Union); the drive to consolidate a Western European alliance, now expanded into the North Atlantic Military Pact; as well as American intervention in China.

Of all these countries the U.S. military attached singular importance to American control of China, which is the largest and most important "rimland" of the Eurasian land mass. Although Japan has captured the imagination of many Americans as

the c
factor
have
lar i
in the
dustri
China
subju
Manc
is onl
of its
the m
ondar
a thir
expre
holds
ican
Claire
book,
word
Cong
1949,
Chen
rabid
decla

No
the in
than
ductio
Amer
Chen
west
dustri
open
bases
China
comm
weste
even
China
friend
only

the central military and strategic factor in Asia, the American military have never fallen victim to this popular illusion. Japan's military strength in the last war was based on the industrial power of Manchuria, North China, and Korea, which had been subjugated by Japan. Japan minus Manchuria, North China, and Korea, is only a minor power, and because of its insular position, detached from the mainland of Asia, is only of secondary importance in the plans for a third world war. No one has better expressed the special place that China holds in the thinking of the American military than Major General Claire Lee Chennault in his latest book, *Way of a Fighter*, the foreword to which was inserted in the *Congressional Record* of January 31, 1949, by Senator Styles Bridges. Chennault, a spokesman of the most rabid and extreme interventionists, declares baldly in this book:

North China and Manchuria were the industrial bases that furnished more than one-third of all Japanese war production. From air bases built for the Americans during the last war at Chengtu, Sian, and Lanchow in northwest China, all of the vast Russian industry back of the Ural Mountains is open to air attack. From these same bases and dozens of others in north China the slender thread of Russian communication between eastern and western Siberia could be snapped by even a small air force. With north China controlled by a government friendly to the United States, Russia's only access to these fields would be

across a thousand miles of Turkestan desert. As a result of the Communist sweep in China, many of these vital fields are already in the hands of Chinese Communists. From Okinawa, Japan and the Philippines, American air power can only peck away at the perimeter of Russia's vitals. From north and central China the same force could strike deeply into Russia's industrial heart. These, then, are the stakes for which we are playing in China.

General MacArthur has repeatedly and hysterically called attention to the significance of China in the planning of the U.S. military. He has frequently reported that the advances of the Chinese Liberation Forces to the Yangtze River would make the U.S. imperialist position in Japan untenable, and has described China as the "fundamental keystone to the Pacific arch."

U.S. WARMAKERS' DILEMMA

It is only against this background that we can understand the sense of panic, frustration, hysteria and dilemma that has gripped the newspapers and commentators committed to the cold war in discussing China today. For months the American reactionary press has been speaking of the developments in China in terms of "disaster" and "debacle." Even official Washington, firmly in the grip of the strategists of an anti-Soviet war, has not been able to conceal the state of shock into which it was driven by the people's victories in China. Paul G. Hoffman, Eco-

conomic Cooperation Administrator, delivered a report to the press at the Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York on January 6, 1949, on his return from an official survey trip to Europe and Asia. In this report Hoffman dramatized Washington's profound disturbance over the developments in Asia. He said, speaking of course for the imperialists, "If you have been out in Asia . . . it gives you the heeby-jeebies." (*New York Times*, January 7, 1949.) And what is it that gives Washington the "heebj-jeebies"? The realization that American imperialism cannot do what it wants to in Asia.

Walter Lippmann gave the clearest expression to this new realization in his column in the *New York Herald Tribune* of January 10, 1949, when he said in a realistic appraisal reflecting the impact of the victories of the Chinese revolution:

In trying to decide what we should do we must begin, I think, by recognizing that we cannot shape and direct the course of events in Asia. We may be able to exert a useful influence in maintaining friendly relations between the Western democracies and the emerging peoples of Asia. Even that will be difficult to do. But if we try to do more than that, or something quite different—as for example to support puppet governments against the rising tide of nationalism and social revolution—we shall almost certainly fail and lose what influence we might otherwise have.

Lippmann then goes on to ask:

"Where, then, shall we look for allies, now that Nationalist China, the Netherlands and France are so manifestly unable to play the role in Asia which we had supposed they would play?"

The dilemma of U.S. imperialist policy in China was most recently registered at an executive session of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on March 22, 1949. According to *The New York Times* of March 23:

The witness on China heard by the Senate committee was Maj.-Gen. David G. Barr, chief of the Joint United States Military Advisory Group to China. He was quoted by committee-men as saying that the Chinese Communist Army could push across the whole of China whenever it decided to drive southward. He testified, members said, that there was no real line of defense south of the Yangtze River and that the disorganized Nationalist Army could offer no effective resistance.

It is this estimate of the actual military situation and the prevailing relationship of forces in China that has dictated the cautious and secretive policy of official Washington. The old forms of direct U.S. military intervention have been rendered ineffective and unsuitable by the victories of the Liberation Armies. Officially Washington has pronounced a policy of "watchful waiting." But this should not deceive anyone into believing that because of the difficulties involved U.S. imperialist intervention has ceased or been written off the

books in Washington. The magnitude and complexity of the problem has inevitably given rise to very outspoken and discernible differences of tactics in American imperialist circles. But the divisions that do exist are only tactical, evolving round the question of what are the best, most efficient and most economical forms of intervention to be utilized. There is no division of opinion among the American imperialists as to the need for further intervention and further U.S. imperialist efforts to destroy the independence of China.

The predominant line in Washington appears to be based on three considerations: (1) Do everything possible to secure a military force in South China as strong as possible; (2) maneuver secretly and flexibly among the various Kuomintang and pro-imperialist groupings to develop as extensive a fifth column operation as possible in North China to disrupt and harass the Liberated Areas; (3) proceed with efforts to strengthen the U.S. military position in Western Europe—the North Atlantic Military Pact—the Middle East, Africa, and East Asia to compensate for the imperialist reverses in China itself.

The central thing to bear in mind is that this official policy, which appears at this stage of developments to disavow any immediate large-scale U.S. appropriations to the Kuomintang forces, is in no shape or form a non-interventionist position. It is intervention concentrating on fifth column operations in North China

and the assembling of instruments of intervention in South China.

The decisive thing to bear in mind is that while American reaction is licking its wounds, it has not surrendered and has not abandoned China. American intervention, in various guises and forms—including further military intervention—remains the chief enemy of the victorious culmination of the Chinese democratic revolution.

In tactical opposition to this line and policy is the Bullitt-MacArthur-Luce group that demands large-scale and immediate military and economic assistance to Chiang Kai-shek. The program of this group, as voiced by Bullitt's testimony to the Joint Committee on Foreign Economic Assistance on January 6, 1949, was accurately described by the *New York Herald Tribune* as a proposal for "a virtual declaration of war on the Chinese Communists by Washington." (January 7, 1949.) This *New York Herald Tribune* editorial went on to say:

Although his [Bullitt's] proposals are as extreme as anyone is likely to make they might be worth serious consideration if China had an effective government at Nanking, and if the Chinese people were in a mood to fight the Reds.

Here we see that there is no difference in principle between the Bullitt group, which is hysterically urging a full-scale U.S. war against the new China now, and those who support

the State Department policy of more cautious maneuvering and more disguised intervention. The only differences between the two groups are on grounds of expediency and what is practical.

The State Department can afford to conceal its real intentions behind a studied silence on China because loud interventionist demands are being raised both by articulate groupings in the House and the Senate, as well as by the Luce, Scripps-Howard, Hearst, and other publications. The clamor for an American war against the Chinese Liberation Forces is raised daily, from one source or another. This propaganda machine is sufficient for the State Department to build up support for any large-scale intervention it may decide upon when it sees fit. Meantime, the demands for appropriations to the Kuomintang forces are increasing both in the House and in the Senate. For a while the demands in Congress for immediate large-scale appropriations to Chiang Kai-shek were Republican in origin. By March 10, 1949, however, the demand in the Senate for an immediate appropriation of one and a half billion dollars to combat the Chinese Liberation Forces was openly bipartisan. 50 Senators, 25 Republicans and 25 Democrats, including the chairman of the Democratic National Committee and other colleagues of Truman in the Senate, jointly endorsed the demand for this appropriation. These 50 Senators constitute more than half of the Senate.

The great danger today is accelerated U.S. intervention in China.

Both the Social-Democratic press and the Roman Catholic press in the United States fundamentally support the Bullitt-MacArthur position and the transformation of China into the first battleground of World War III.

The greatest mistake that the peace forces can make would be to fail to see the growing danger of American imperialist maneuvers and intervention in China. One of the most obvious reasons for the present cloak of secrecy that the State Department has pulled over its China policy is to disarm the American people and try to prevent them from seeing the price in American dollars and manpower that Wall Street is ready to pay in order to satisfy its lust for domination of China as a base for its world-domination war plans.

BROWDER'S SPECIAL SERVICE TO IMPERIALISM

Most of the bourgeois liberals have joined this imperialist game in their own way. They have scored the withdrawal of Chiang Kai-shek from the titular leadership of the Kuomintang as a great victory for liberalism and are now sharpening up their differences with, and attacks against, the Chinese Communists who are responsible for the defeats of the Kuomintang. These attacks against the Chinese Communists, who lead the Liberation Forces in China, constitute direct aid and assistance to American imperialism.

But it remained for Earl Browder, in his latest pamphleteering effort, pompously titled, *Chinese Lessons for American Marxists*, to make the boldest defense of the American imperialists in this period when the China policy of the United States is being re-examined and re-discussed on the highest levels in the light of the new developments.

Browder, parading as a Marxist and as the oracle of the Chinese Communists and the Liberation movement in China, has written the most dishonest and bald perversion of the role of American imperialism in China. Unlike the bourgeois liberals who are openly hostile to the Chinese Communists, Browder feigns friendship for the Chinese Communist Party the better to knife it in the back by apologizing for the crimes of American imperialism.

Browder pays lip service to the Roosevelt policy. But whom does he blame for the betrayal of the Roosevelt policy and the Civil War in China? Does he blame the Truman Administration and the American monopolies that it serves? No. Browder would have it believed that the Communist Party of the United States, which has consistently fought against the betrayal of the progressive features of the Roosevelt policy, is responsible for the Civil War in China! Thus, writes this trickster of the pen:

The Communists actually welcomed the abandonment of the Roosevelt poli-

cy, and the consequent development of civil war in China, as a good thing.

A statement of this sort doesn't even warrant a polemic. It is a palpable lie, exposed by the record, by the most cursory reading of the Communist press and the statements of the Communist Party on China. Browder himself is compelled to expose his own lie, even if this means contradicting himself so that he can manufacture two anti-Communist lies out of the same event. For, elsewhere in his pamphlet, Browder refers to the nation-wide series of Communist Party mass meetings in 1946 conducted under the central slogan of "Hands Off China!" Clearly, then, the Communist Party, far from welcoming the Civil War in China as a "good thing," was the most articulate force in the United States, warning against the dangers of the Civil War in China and fighting against the American imperialist intervention that was responsible for the Civil War. Actually this is what Browder is fighting—the Communist Party's opposition to American imperialist intervention in China, as his special contribution to the American imperialists. Thus, he complains, "The policy expounded in these meetings and in the press was not a fight for the Roosevelt policy, but instead was a negative demand to 'get out of China.' . . ."

Negative demand! Yes, negative in the great anti-imperialist tradition of the slogans: Hands Off the Soviet

Union! No Appeasement of the Fascist Aggressors! No Scrap Iron to Japan! No, to the Warmongers of Today!

What Browder is doing here is still peddling his reactionary concept of "progressive" American imperialism. His criticism of the position of the Communist Party of the United States is an attack on the elementary Marxist-Leninist proposition that the intervention conducted by Wall Street in China, as everywhere else, is inherent in the nature of imperialism.

Browder takes great pains to absolve American imperialism of its responsibility for the Civil War in China and tries to pin the direct blame for the Civil War on one American personality—General Marshall.

According to Browder's version of history, there is no class force in the United States that is consciously promoting an imperialist policy in China. What happened was that one man, General Marshall, went to China and "surrendered without a serious battle to Chiang Kai-shek and his cliques." Wall Street as such is not to blame! But to anyone without a pro-imperialist axe to grind it should be evident that the general with the greater armed strength was the imperialist General Marshall and not the puppet Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek. The capitalist *Far Eastern Survey* has reported the obvious fact that even the non-Marxist liberals in China charge United States policy

with responsibility for the Civil War in China. But for Browder to admit this elementary truth means to admit the hoax of his "progressive" American imperialism. For Browder to admit this means to admit the correctness of the Communist Party's position in singling out Wall Street as the chief foe of the Chinese people and of the American people. But since Browder consciously has embarked upon a course of serving Wall Street and imperialism, facts and events have to be twisted and distorted so as to vilify the Communist Party of the United States.

Browder equally distorts the overall position of the Chinese Communist Party by emphasizing that it is fighting for a prolonged period of "private" capitalism, rather than the new democracy, as a transition to socialism.

This does not correspond to the facts. The position of the Liberation Forces of China was unmistakably expressed in a New Year's editorial of the New China News Agency (*China Digest*, January 11, 1949), which pointed out:

The question now confronting the people of China, all democratic parties and groups and all people's organizations is: are they to carry the revolution through to the end or are they to abandon the revolution in mid-stream? If the revolution is to be carried through to the end, then this means using revolutionary methods to firmly, thoroughly and completely wipe out clean all reactionary forces. This means the unswerv-

ing ove
ism and
means
rule of
tire cou
of the p
through
the lea
an allia
as the r
nation
over fro
independ
people
can cas
capitalis
oppressi
unified
the pri
from a
country
advanci
ploitation
society.

Wha
realizat
ican in
torial r

The
ment h
the KM
to a st
the first
KMT
called
resistan
Army
in dista
is to or
revoluti
to put
the rev
coloring

ing overthrow of imperialism, feudalism and bureaucratic capitalism. This means overthrowing the reactionary rule of the KMT throughout the entire country and establishing a republic of the people's democratic dictatorship throughout the entire country under the leadership of the proletariat with an alliance of the workers and peasants as the main body so that the Chinese nation can win emancipation, change over from a semi-colony into a really independent state; so that the Chinese people can win liberation; so that they can cast off feudal and bureaucratic capitalist (China's monopoly capitalist) oppression, thus creating a situation of unified and democratic peace, creating the prerequisites for transformation from an agricultural to an industrial country and creating the possibility for advancing from a society with the exploitation of man by man to a socialist society.

What is the main danger to the realization of this perspective? American imperialism. As the same editorial reveals:

The policy of the American Government has turned from mere support of the KMT's counter-revolutionary war to a struggle in two different forms: the first is to organize the remnants of KMT military strength and the so-called provincial forces for continued resistance to the People's Liberation Army south of the Yangtze River and in distant border provinces. The second is to organize an opposition within the revolutionary camp and exert all efforts to put a halt to the revolution or force the revolution to take on a moderate coloring so as not to encroach too much

on the interests of imperialism and its stooges, if the revolution should continue to advance.

Browder's pamphlet consciously cultivates a dangerous myth, the myth that the fighting in China is over, that it's all over but the shouting, that the people have already won the victory, and that no further responsibilities confront the American people in relation to China. Above all, the pamphlet tries to disarm American anti-imperialists by concealing the dangers of American imperialist intervention, which not only remain acute, but which are growing, as we have demonstrated earlier in this article. Therefore, Browder singles out the "Hands Off China" slogan for special attack when the fight to keep American imperialism out of China has to be developed much further and much more extensively in the interests of the fight for peace.

CONCLUSION

The victories of the people in China have strengthened the worldwide anti-imperialist peace camp, as we have seen. Without in any way minimizing the historic significance of these victories, it would be a distortion of reality to leave the impression that these victories have eliminated the danger of war. The contradictions of imperialism are growing as a result of the victories of the Chinese Liberation Forces, and the position of the imperialist

camp has been weakened. But imperialism does not surrender and voluntarily abandon the arena of struggle because its contradictions multiply and the strength of the anti-imperialist camp grows. On the contrary, imperialism knows but one answer when it faces such dilemmas, and that is to intensify its preparations for war.

Therefore it must be understood that the fight for a reversal of the present China policy of the United States is not only an expression of friendship for China, but is vital to the interests of the American people. American imperialist policy in China is a significant expression of Wall Street's drive toward a third world war. The fight against an imperialist American policy in China is therefore a very vital aspect of the

fight for peace, of the fight to prevent a third world war, which is not inevitable and which can be averted by the united efforts of the democratic and anti-imperialist forces the world over.

The significant thing is that the American people have won a new and powerful ally in the world-wide fight against a new war—Liberated China. The fight for American recognition of, and friendship with, the new China, for an economic program based upon the mutual interests of the American and Chinese peoples and not upon U.S. monopoly domination of China, looms today as a central task of the American labor-movement, of all progressives—as a task organically linked to the fight for peace.

by Joseph

THE READ
understan
passionate
circles he
swerable
tion, and
ment, Pr
three pro
day imp

1. Tha
super-we
tegic mil
ssor. C
that we
button st
a future
stratosph
thousand

2. Tha
were nec
reasons t
conclusio

3. Tha
late ato
generous
nals of d
provides
trol of a
of peace

With
postulate

* Four,
Blacken, W

The Atom Bomb: Myth and Truth

by Joseph Clark

THE READER of this book* will readily understand why it has aroused such passionate resentment in reactionary circles here and abroad. With unanswerable logic, careful documentation, and typical British understatement, Professor Blackett demolishes three precious postulates of present-day imperialist mythology:

1. That the atomic bomb is such a super-weapon that it guarantees strategic military superiority to the possessor. Corollary to this is the idea that we have arrived at the push-button stage of military history—that a future war would be fought in the stratosphere, not in the muck of a thousand Stalingrads.

2. That Hiroshima and Nagasaki were necessarily bombed for military reasons to bring the war to a speedier conclusion.

3. That the Baruch Plan to regulate atomic production is the most generous offer ever made in the annals of diplomatic history and that it provides for a truly international control of atomic energy in the interests of peace.

* * *

With regard to the first of these postulates, Blackett would be the last

person to minimize the frightful destructiveness of the atom bomb. In his analysis, he deals with the strategic capabilities of the bomb. Describing the vast improvement in the techniques of mass murder from the air which the atomic bomb has made possible, the author shows that the bomb would have a no more decisive influence on the outcome of a war than did the systematic destruction of entire cities and civilian population in the defeat of Germany.

As proof, Blackett uses the statistics compiled by that very branch of the armed services which sponsored the notion that strategic bombing could win the war. The figures and quotations which he cites from the reports of the United States Strategic Bombing Survey reveal that German military production continued to increase well into 1944 in the face of saturation bombing. In a war involving such countries as the U.S.S.R. and the U.S.A., even the present, more deadly atom bomb could not destroy the contending armies or their total sources of military supply.

As a matter of fact, Blackett shows that a proper *tactical* use of the atomic bomb could have a more decisive effect than a strategy of victory through bombardment. The atomic

* *Four, War, and the Bomb*, by P. M. S. Blackett. Whittelsey House, New York. \$3.50.

bombing of advanced air bases which would have to be used by strategic bombing planes could bring tactical advantages which would, however, nullify the use of the bomb for strategic purposes.

In refuting the extravagant claims about the capabilities of strategic atom bombing, Blackett also shows that erroneous ideas about "victory through air power" delayed victory over the fascist Axis in the recent war. Even the ordinary American soldier realized by Christmas of 1944 that the German winter offensive could have been swiftly shattered, and the war brought to an end then and there, given an adequate infantry and armored force to drive against the Germans from the Seventh Army front in the South to Belgium in the North. And the same American soldier offered up many prayers and thanks during that awful winter because on the Soviet front there were the divisions needed to drive back three-fourths of the German Army.

The idea of victory through air power was the military reflection of the political outlook of the Western powers which delayed the opening of the Second Front in the vain hope that their imperialist rival, Germany, and the Soviet Union—our great and most powerful ally—would destroy each other. Today, the idea of victory via atomic bombs is the military reflection of Wall Street's imperialist drive for world domination. False military theory during the recent war unnecessarily prolonged the conflict

and increased the numbers of dead and maimed. In the world of today, false military notions based on imperialist politics can lead to even more disastrous consequences.

* * *

Probably no greater moral condemnation of imperialism can be adduced than the charge that the atom bomb was used at Hiroshima and Nagasaki as part of a diplomatic offensive against the Soviet Union rather than for military reasons. Blackett proves "that the dropping of the atomic bombs was not so much the last military act of the second World War, as the first major operation of the cold diplomatic war with Russia now in progress." (p. 139.)

He shows that official apologists for our military strategy after V.E. day neglect to mention a vital part of the overall plan to defeat Japan which was agreed upon at Potsdam. This was the pledge by the Soviet Union to enter the war against Japan three months after the European victory. The European war ended on May 8, and so the Soviet offensive was due to start August 8. It did start on August 8. But on August 6 the first atomic bomb was dropped.

Secretary of War Henry L. Stimson, writing in *Harper's Magazine* in February 1947, revealed that the two bombs dropped on Hiroshima and Nagasaki "were the only ones we had ready." Blackett quotes the Stimson article to show that the Truman Administration was extremely desirous that the bombs be dropped

exactly
a matte
proach
before
mediary
Blacket

If the
been th
bombs v
til (a) i
peace p
were no
sian off
been pa
and wh
demand

Again
Strategi
ett quo
prior to
would
atomic
..." (p

Black
lemma
and mi
summer
had not
would l
the Jap
taken N
a millic
fact. Al
would
than are
this dile

... the s
atomic b
16, must
One can

exactly when they were dropped. As a matter of record, Japan had approached the Soviet Union shortly before asking her to act as intermediary in a Japanese surrender. Blackett writes:

If the saving of American lives had been the main objective, surely the bombs would have been held back until (a) it was certain that the Japanese peace proposals made through Russia were not acceptable, and (b) the Russian offensive, which had for months been part of the Allied strategic plan, and which Americans had previously demanded, had run its course (p. 132).

Again, it is from the United States Strategic Bombing Survey that Blackett quotes the fact "that certainly prior to December 31, 1945, Japan would have surrendered even if the atomic bombs had not been dropped ..." (p. 134).

Blackett described the political dilemma facing the U.S. government and military high command in the summer of 1945. If the atomic bombs had not been dropped, Soviet armies would have engaged a major part of the Japanese land forces, swiftly taken Manchuria, and captured half a million prisoners—as they did in fact. All this while our land forces would have been no nearer Japan than are Iwo Jima and Okinawa. "In this dilemma," Blackett notes,

...the successful explosion of the first atomic bomb in New Mexico, on July 16, must have come as a welcome aid. One can imagine the hurry with which

the two bombs—the only two existing—were whisked across the Pacific to be dropped on Hiroshima and Nagasaki just in time, but only just, to insure that the Japanese Government surrendered to American forces alone. The long-demanded Soviet offensive took its planned victorious course, almost unheralded in the world sensation caused by the dropping of the bombs (p. 135).

Reactionaries may well be angered by Professor Blackett's calm marshalling of data, because it is the reactionaries themselves who are quoted with deadly effect. For example, it is Soviet-hating, Red-baiting General Chennault who is cited in a *New York Times* account from Rome of August 15, 1945, as follows:

Russia's entry into the Japanese war was the decisive factor in speeding its end and would have been so, even if no atomic bombs had been dropped, is the opinion of Major General Claire Chennault, who arrived en route home via Germany. The founder of the American Volunteer group (Flying Tigers) and former Air Force Commander in China said that the Soviet armies had been alert [for the invasion of Manchuria] as far back as V.E. day. He added that their swift stroke completed the circle around Japan that brought the nation to its knees (p. 136).

That view does not find its way into Chennault's new book, which he has flung against Roosevelt, General Stilwell and the Soviet Union.

Even the choice of targets was based on the use of the bomb primarily for the mass murder of civil-

ians. President Truman stated on August 9 that Hiroshima was chosen because it was a "military base." But the official Bombing Survey Report notes: "Hiroshima and Nagasaki were chosen as targets because of their concentration of activities and population" (p. 139).

* * *

With regard to the most widespread shibboleth, that about the much-vaunted "generosity" of the Baruch Plan, Blackett demonstrates that this scheme was a forerunner of the Truman Doctrine of "containing Communism" all over the world. Perhaps no one pursues this myth of "generosity" more vehemently than the science editor of *The New York Times*, Waldemar Kaempffert. In his review of the Blackett book (*The New York Times* Book Review Section, February 13, 1949), Kaempffert charges:

All through his book Blackett makes an extraordinary error of omission . . . that the problem of the veto and sanctions has been solved [by the Baruch Plan]. Furthermore, the U.N. plan strips the International Agency of the power to interfere with the industrial progress of any country, and so disposes of Blackett's fear that Soviet Russia will be economically shackled.

The extraordinary thing is that Kaempffert can make such statements despite the evidence of the U.N. plan itself and the report of the reasons for the failure to achieve agreement with the Soviet Union on

the control of atomic energy as reported in *The New York Times*. On May 8, 1948, that paper reported from Lake Success:

Seven countries, led by the United States, France and Britain, told the eleven-member Atomic Energy Commission that there was no use talking about atomic control any more until the Soviet Union changed its mind and accepted the essential of the majority plan for an international agency to manage and operate all atomic facilities from mine to plant (my emphasis—J.C.).

The same issue of *The New York Times* contains the official statement by the U.S., France, and Britain which insists "that atomic energy must not be developed on the basis of national interests and needs, means and resources; but that its planning and operation be made a common enterprise in all its phases."

"Common enterprise" means that atomic installations all over the world will be managed by the proposed International Agency. The U.N. report provides that this Agency shall not be subordinated to the U.N. Security Council as proposed by the U.S.S.R., but shall be controlled by a "majority vote" of the U.N. This sweet-sounding "majority vote" is but another way of saying that the Agency will be controlled by the U.S. and the majority vote which it secures in the U.N. and of rejecting the principle of Big Five unanimity which President Roosevelt envisioned as the cornerstone of the United Nations.

Yet Kaempffert argues that "the

problem has been

Black Baruch national proceed uranium the elim unanim a "voti this me energy Street posits nents o do-anti "surren The or kind w the sov people imperi renders States. any d agency Council ciples As E . . . wou in a si been st domina would late st control Union that, v which some raised

problem of the veto and sanctions has been solved"!

Blackett stresses the aspect of the Baruch Plan under which the International Agency would immediately proceed to assert its control over the uranium resources of all lands. Given the elimination of the principle of unanimity and the establishment of a "voting majority" in the Agency, this means that the sources of atomic energy would be as securely in Wall Street hands as are the uranium deposits of the Belgian Congo. Proponents of the Baruch Plan make pseudo-anti-imperialist speeches about the "surrender" of national sovereignty. The only "surrender" involved is the kind we witness in the Congo, where the sovereign rights of the African people are surrendered to Belgian imperialism. In turn, Belgium "surrenders" those rights to the United States. Why would the situation be any different in an international agency which eliminates Security Council control and violates the principles of Big Five unanimity?

As Blackett shows, the Baruch Plan ... would have put the Soviet Union in a situation where she would have been subservient to a group of nations dominated by America. Since America would keep her atomic bombs till a late state in the process of setting the control scheme in operation, the Soviet Union would have no firm guarantee that, when the stage was reached at which the bombs should be disposed of, some technical point would not be raised to justify retaining them. In the

meantime, she would have thrown her land and economy open to inspection and so inevitably to military espionage (pp. 158-159).

One reason why the proponents of the Baruch Plan have been able to make considerable headway with their demagoguery in the U.S. is that many scientists have pointed out, and correctly, that atomic energy plants for peacetime uses and those for bomb production are practically identical. They therefore argue that control must mean ownership of all the plants.

This conclusion signifies that in a world divided into capitalist and socialist nations, a "voting majority" of capitalist nations and their satellites will move in on the economy of the socialist nations. The argument about a general "surrender" of "sovereignty" becomes nothing but a specious plea for capitalist intervention into the socialist world. This is the hard fact even where the argument is offered by a starry-eyed idealist who sees in "world government" the present-day road to peace.

Baruch and the other men who devised the U.S. plan on atomic energy control are no starry-eyed idealists. On the contrary, they are men who have themselves invested millions of "sovereign" dollars in General Electric, duPont, Monsanto Chemical and the other giant corporations which have been given the sovereign right to produce atomic bombs.

Despite all the talk about surrendering sovereignty, nine out of ten

workers employed in the atomic industry in this country are working for private monopolies. The \$632,000,000 we pay in taxes this year directly for atomic bomb production goes mainly to the private capitalists who run the show for the government. Their aspirations go far beyond their present investments. They envisage a world to win, a Wall Street Century. They plan atomic war toward that end. They use the atomic bomb as an instrument of diplomacy.

They took that road when they dropped the bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki. They can be driven off that road by the people's struggle for peace. In that struggle, Blackett's book is an invaluable weapon; in the

war of ideas it has the power of an atomic explosion.

Professor Blackett is not a Marxist. As a result his book lacks a full analysis of the main forces in the world today: the camp of the monopolists who are plotting atomic war and the world-wide peoples' camp of peace in which the Socialist Soviet Union plays the leading role. Thus, his splendid book does not deal with the role that the working class and all other peace forces throughout the world can play in defeating the aims of Wall Street.

Nevertheless, Blackett's book can and will serve as a powerful weapon in the struggle to defeat Wall Street's drive to war.

"The second world war brought humanity concrete proof of the tremendous importance of science and technology in our times. The development of science has put into the hands of the human race weapons and natural forces equivalent in power to elemental upheavals. And it is a matter of the most vital moment into whose hands these mighty weapons fall. Science and technology in the hands of insane fascism threatened the fate of humanity. Science and technology in the hands of imperialists who dream of world domination becomes a means of enslaving the peoples. Science and technology in the hands of progressive Soviet democracy promote universal prosperity and facilitate the advance to Communism."

Sergei Vavilov, President of the Academy of Sciences of the U.S.S.R.

LEADING
the ma
the Com
have w
struggle
Numer
have be
Comm
ously
demag
reaction
cialists-
monger
The
time to
revolut
broken
declare
tionary
The
to the
themsel
flagging
Anglo-
day giv
they an
aggress
ican ble
the peo
at unle

* Repr
People's

Right Socialists: Enemies of Peace and Democracy*

LEADING THE POWERFUL MOVEMENT OF the masses for peace and democracy, the Communist and Workers' Parties have won not a few successes in the struggle against the warmongers. Numerous plans of the warmongers have been foiled precisely because the Communist Parties daily and vigorously exposed the pseudo-Socialist demagoguery, the treacherous policy and reactionary ideology of the Right Socialists—the henchmen of the warmongers.

The Right Socialists, who at one time toyed with Marxism and with revolutionary phrases, have openly broken with Marxism, have become declared enemies of all that is revolutionary in the working class.

The Right Socialists, servilely loyal to the bourgeoisie, do not confine themselves to justifying or camouflaging the predatory actions of the Anglo-American imperialists. Each day gives new proofs of how directly they are working to carry out the aggressive policy of the Anglo-American bloc, a policy aimed at enslaving the peoples of Europe and the world, at unleashing a new war. Approving

wholeheartedly Truman's rejection of a Peace Pact, cringing before the imperialists, the Right Socialists are doing everything to besmirch the Soviet Union's proposals to strengthen peace and world security. The Alpha and Omega of their policy is again the old Munich line of isolating the Soviet Union.

These gentlemen are particularly zealous in carrying out the functions assigned them by their imperialist masters; they are hastily forming military political blocs and unions against the Soviet Union and the new democracies.

On orders from Washington, Bevin puts pressure on Lange, Right Socialist Minister of Foreign Affairs in Norway, and instructs him how to draw the Scandinavian countries "adroitly" into the orbit of the North Atlantic Pact. Saragat, at the recent congress of his party, championed the immediate, wholesale inclusion of Italy in the European branch of this Pact—the so-called Western Union. Reuter, Schumacher's associate and former agent of von Papen in Turkey now touring Britain for the Labor Government, is calling on the people to intensify the "cold war" in

* Reprinted from *For a Lasting Peace, for a People's Democracy!* Bucharest, March 1, 1949.

Berlin, to support the division of Germany and complete the creation of a militarist West German state which would include the western sectors of Berlin. Blum and his accomplices are slandering the Communist Party of France for its patriotic and solemn declaration that the French people would never fight against the Soviet Union.

At the same time, the representatives of the British Labor Government in the Security Council, loyally following the baton of their American conductor, are sabotaging the new proposals of the Soviet Union to cut down armaments and outlaw the atomic bomb, and are continuing to undermine the United Nations.

The traitors to the working class are doing their utmost to justify the "high" appraisal of their obsequiousness given by Harriman, Wall Street's gauleiter for the Marshallization of Western Europe. In Harriman's own words, the Social-Democrats are the greatest potential ally of the United States in Europe, sharing a common cause. For the good of this shady "common cause" the Right Socialists united in the "International Conference of Socialist Parties"—Comisco—are assiduously helping to put the "Marshall Plan" into effect. They are zealously adjusting the policy and economy of the West European countries to fit the monopolist plans for Europe's military, political and economic enslavement.

The disastrous results of this Marshallization carried out by the Right

Socialists are already apparent. The national economy of each of the West European countries comes up against difficulty after difficulty; entire branches of industry are being closed down in the interests of the American monopolists and in some of these countries people are being thrown out of work by the thousand.

* * *

Wherever the Right Socialists head the government or are members of it, the conditions of the working people deteriorate. The profits of the big capitalists go up sharply while the working people are forced to shoulder the burden of heavy armament expenditure.

In the powerful and mounting wave of popular resistance to the Marshallization of Western Europe and in the steady growth of the forces of the democratic, anti-imperialist camp, the Right Socialists can see an immediate menace to the aggressive plans of the Wall Street and City of London magnates with whom they have thrown in their lot. That is why these traitors are bringing into play their extensive experience of disruption and treachery in an effort to break the ranks and poison the conscience of the working class. They are propagating class co-operation with the bourgeoisie, are rejecting national sovereignty, scorning the idea of international working-class solidarity. They are loud in their praises of the Tito clique which has degenerated into a gang of imperialist reaction, and they uphold and

circula
trines"

East

Union,

everyth

the four

with i

and B

Truma

a fran

the spy

posed f

This la

ried on

ing the

security

place

Anglo-

In t

Right

despica

blackm

Having

soul in

are dire

the Co

behead

In this

of the

mittee.

Comm

Socialis

deman

policy

and m

Comm

eral Co

gress, v

nances

partme

Carey

circulate the utterly reactionary "doctrines" of the "American Century."

Eaten up with hatred of the Soviet Union, the new democracies and everything progressive, they stoop to the foulest slanders and lies in unison with inveterate warmongers. Bevin and Blum, making a quartet with Truman and the Pope, have started a frantic uproar around the case of the spy and plotter, Mindszenty, exposed from under his cardinal's cloak.

This latest slander campaign is carried on with the object of heightening the atmosphere of alarm and insecurity which holds an important place in the calculations of the Anglo-American aggressive bloc.

In their treacherous policy the Right Socialists resort to the most despicable methods — deceit and blackmail, corruption and forgery. Having thrown themselves heart and soul into the war preparations, they are directing their main blow against the Communists in an attempt to behead the working-class movement. In this they follow in the footsteps of the notorious Un-American Committee.

Comisco is blackmailing the Italian Socialist Party with ultimatums, with demands to support the aggressive policy of the Anglo-American bloc and make a clean break with the Communists. The Rights in the General Council of Trades Union Congress, with the instructions and finances of the American State Department's direct agents, [James] Carey and Irving Brown, are now

forming their international center of Marshall trade unions, following the failure of their joint attempt to break up the World Federation of Trade Unions. The associates of Blum and Saragat are trying to undermine the big militant trade-union organizations—the General Confederations of Labor in France and Italy, from whose leadership they were dislodged by the workers themselves.

* * *

The Right Socialists are no longer able to prevent militant mass actions of the working people, especially in France and Italy, by their "ordinary" strikebreaking methods. The army and the police are now brought out against the working class who are taking up the struggle with growing determination and closed ranks, under the leadership of the Communist Parties. The Right Socialists are trampling underfoot and curtailing the rights of the people, conspiring with de Gaullists and clerical reaction, and extending protection to the fascist regimes in Greece and Spain. In the past they paved the way for the coming to power of fascism in Germany and other countries. This earned for them in the working-class movement the contemptible epithet "social-fascists." Now, they are again bent on playing their despicable role of clearing the way for fascism.

Imperialism's colonial policy has found its most consistent and zealous champions in the persons of Bevin, Blum and Spaak. The Right Socialists are directly responsible for the

continuation of the war in Viet Nam, for the mass murder of the fighters for freedom in Iraq, Malaya and Burma, for the terrible reprisals against the people of Indonesia who are battling for their independence.

The steady growth of the power and prestige of the Soviet Union, the great success achieved by the new democracies, the growth in numbers and influence of the Communist Parties, the upsurge of the working-class and democratic movement in the capitalist countries and the victories of the national-liberation struggle in the colonial and dependent countries—all this has broken the former influence of the Right Socialists among the masses. Their increasingly obvious servility to the Anglo-American imperialists is inevitably leading to a further sharpening of the crisis among the Right Social-Democrats. In the new democracies and the Soviet zone of Germany the fusion of the Communists and Left Socialists into Marxist-Leninist parties has irrevocably thrown the Right Socialists overboard so far as the working-class movement is concerned, has struck a blow at the whole of Right-wing Social-Democracy. In the countries of Western Europe, the social basis of the Right Socialists—this main bulwark of the imperialist bourgeoisie—is shrinking.

* * *

The party of Blum and Moch is suffering defeat after defeat. The overwhelming majority of the working class of France is following the

Communist Party and the General Confederation of Labor. The splinter "Force Ouvriere" is leading a sorry existence. The recent municipal elections in a number of French cities showed that the electorate is more and more turning away from Blum's American party which has lost two-thirds of its membership during the past two years.

In Italy, under the leadership of the Communist Party, the working people are displaying their militant spirit; the strike movement is growing. The Saragats are unable to split the General Confederation of Labor and to divert honest Socialist workers from uniting with the Communists. In Britain, rank-and-file trade-union members are electing Communists to leading posts, despite Morgan Phillips' "black circular." The movement of trade unionists protesting against Deakin's machinations is spreading.

In the recent elections in Japan, the Communists scored a brilliant victory, while the Right Socialists suffered a heavy defeat, losing more than half of their Parliamentary seats.

The Communist and Workers' Parties, staunchly defending the cause of peace, drawing democratic and patriotic elements into the struggle against the warmongers, have already inflicted a number of telling defeats on the Right Socialist henchmen of Anglo-American imperialism. Influenced by the courageous struggle of the Communists, the reactionary policy of the Right leaders in the Socialist Parties is being countered

by the
Socialis
gle of t
sion of
and in
ence an
Socialis
ing mo
nists. T
come o
decision
gress. I
bor Pa
protest
of Attle
The
dressed
ple thi
phetical
German
Socialis
the bo

by the growing desire of the Left Socialists to join the common struggle of the people against the aggression of Anglo-American imperialism and in defense of national independence and peace. In France, the Left-Socialist Party for Unity is co-operating more closely with the Communists. The Italian Socialist Party has come out against the pro-American decisions of the recent Saragat congress. Left-wing members of the Labor Party are raising their voice in protest against the aggressive policy of Attlee and Bevin.

The immortal words of Lenin, addressed to the German working people thirty years ago, ring out prophetically today: "As long as the German workers allow traitors to Socialism, scoundrels and lackeys of the bourgeoisie, the Scheidemanns

and their whole party to be in power, there can be no talk of saving the German people."

It is appropriate today to recall these words of Lenin to the workers of the countries where, with the help of the state machine and the support of the imperialist bourgeoisie, the present-day Scheidemanns are causing enormous damage to the cause of peace and democracy.

Uniting all honest Socialists and democrats in the name of their countries' salvation from Anglo-American imperialist enslavement and for prevention of the war they are preparing, the Communists will head the struggle with still greater confidence, energy and determination against the Right Socialists whom Lenin branded as the accomplices of the brutality and crimes of the bourgeoisie.

Twenty-five Years of the "Daily Worker"

by Joseph Roberts

THE BIG MAJORITY of the immense public opinion-molding apparatus of the bourgeoisie—the 1,750-odd daily newspapers, the thousands of weekly and bi-weekly papers, the flood of magazines, pamphlets and books, and the round-the-clock radio broadcasts—are today engaged in whipping up a wild hysteria. This assault on the minds and emotions of the American people is designed to divide and terrorize, to drive the people into support of an aggressive war to save Wall Street.

The right of a free press in our country was fought for and won as part of the victorious revolt of our colonist ancestors against royal England. The record of struggle to achieve this fundamental right to report and comment freely in the printed word numbers among its brightest pages the successful battle waged by John Peter Zenger. In 1733, Zenger printed in the *New York Weekly Journal* an exposure of Royal Governor Crosby's act of preventing thirty-eight Quakers from voting for a candidate of their own choice. The governor ordered the burning of copies of the *Journal* carrying the exposure, and caused Zenger to be thrown into jail. Zen-

ger's trial, which created a sensation, resulted in his acquittal.

It was as a result of struggles such as these, in which the young American working-class movement played an active role, that freedom of the press was written into the American constitution as part of the Bill of Rights and became one of the most cherished of all our democratic rights.

But when monopoly capitalism replaced "free," competitive capitalism, the constitutional right to a free press—even within the limits permitted by bourgeois democracy—was strangled by the monopoly press. Today, according to a recent report of the Commission on Freedom of the Press: "The owners and managers of the press determine which persons, which facts, which versions of fact, and which ideas shall reach the public."*

The function of the press under monopoly capitalism has always been to lay down a smokescreen behind which the men of the trusts intensify their vicious exploitation and prepare for war. Today, the owners of the big press are the men of Wall Street. Hundreds of smaller, so-called

* Commission on Freedom of the Press, *A Free and Responsible Press* (Supplement to *Freedom of the Press*, April 1947), p. 4.

independent newspapers have been squeezed out by the monopoly press and have ceased publication. (A prime example is the *New York Star*, which recently folded in spite of an increase in circulation.) Differences among the bourgeois newspapers along political lines, never fundamental, are fast disappearing. In many American cities with only two newspapers, the morning paper may be Republican and the afternoon, Democratic, and both are likely to be owned by the same publisher!

THE 25TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE DAILY WORKER

In the light of this, the twenty-fifth anniversary of the *Daily Worker* and the *Sunday Worker*, which was celebrated throughout the country during the last few months, is of enormous significance. For twenty-five years, the *Daily Worker* and *The Worker*, in spite of onerous financial difficulties and constant attacks by the Wall Street press, did not miss a single day's publication.

What has been the main factor contributing toward this magnificent record? What is the driving power behind the tens of thousands of Communists and other friends of our press who, for twenty-five years, have been selling these papers and collecting subscriptions and funds so that the *Daily Worker* and *The Worker* have survived and grown in the face of terrific odds?

The answers lie in the understanding that, in order to do battle with

Wall Street monopoly, the working class must forge its own weapons. Just as Peter Zenger used his *Journal* as a weapon against the royalists, so today the American Communists are building the *Daily Worker* and *The Worker* as weapons in the struggle against the economic royalists.

For one hundred years prior to the birth of the *Daily Worker*, the men and women of labor tried to launch their own socialist daily newspaper. Their efforts were not without success. According to the *American Labor Yearbook* of 1916, there were in 1912, at the height of the Socialist Party's publication activities, five English and eight foreign-language dailies, 262 English and 36 foreign-language weeklies, and ten English and two foreign-language monthlies. Their combined circulation ran into hundreds of thousands of copies. The weekly *Appeal to Reason* alone circulated in half a million copies. This was when the Socialist Party was at its height, when among its leaders were Charles Ruthenberg, Louis Engdahl, and many others who later, as the Left Wing, helped found the American Communist Party and subsequently the *Daily Worker*. The reformist and pro-imperialist policies of the dominant leaders of the Socialist Party doomed its one-time flourishing socialist press to oblivion.

The Daily Worker and *The Worker* have weathered twenty-five years of stormy struggle and are today growing stronger because these organs are based on the working class

and are fighting, day in and day out, the battles of the working class and of its allies, the Negro people, the farming masses, the oppressed city middle classes. The proudest achievements of our press are the part it played in the epic struggles of the unemployed; in the campaigns to organize the unorganized; in the struggles for progressive unionism, trade-union unity, and trade-union democracy; in championing the fight against Negro oppression, symbolized by the Scottsboro case; and in the consistent, untiring fight for democracy and peace, against fascist-imperialist aggression and its accessory, Munichism, and for winning the war against the fascist Axis powers. For twenty-five years, the *Daily Worker* and *The Worker* have been clarions promoting amicable and co-operative relations between the United States and the Soviet Union, in the common interest of both countries and as the basis for world peace.

As part of its struggle to win the American working class for a policy of class struggle as against the policy of class collaboration which chained labor to Wall Street, the *Daily Worker* and *The Worker* have fought against reformism and opportunism in the labor movement.

These two organs have striven to imbue the working class with consciousness of the need to take its place as the leading force in the nation in a common alliance with all the oppressed against the monopolists and their two-party system, to

achieve independent political expression and action in an anti-monopoly, anti-fascist, and anti-war coalition and party.

The unique quality of our Party press is to be found in its service as an organ of working-class struggle, not only for the immediate, but also for the future interests of the toiling majority in our country. Ours have been the only newspapers teaching the masses Marxism-Leninism, the science for achieving a socialist society, that society which is based upon the communal ownership of the means of production, and the planned production of plenty for society as a whole instead of exploitative production of profit for a handful—that system which, by its socialist essence, will eliminate crises and the drive to expansionism and war, and will usher in true democracy and banish all oppression and discrimination.

In building the *Daily Worker* and *The Worker*, the American Communists are aided by the generalized experiences of other Communist parties and by the Leninist teachings on the role of a Communist press. In his historic fight to create a Marxist Party in Czarist Russia, Lenin placed the greatest emphasis on creating a newspaper which would unite and link together the then-existing separate Marxist organizations into a single Party. Lenin put forward and carried out a plan for the founding of *Iskra* (The Spark)—the first newspaper of the Revolutionary Marxists

on an al
its appo
Lenin
through
the "Eco
to the o
centraliz
working
they fals
and arti
In his
Done? I

In our
all our a
towards
desire, th
unswervi
and expa
establish
newspape
above all
matically
theoretica
agitation
constant
[read: C
the essen
ment in
politics a
has been
tions of f

The te
of the Co
most ur
today, h
increase
Commun
The W
tributed
scently co
scription

on an all-Russian scale—which made its appearance in 1900. Later on, Lenin conducted a political struggle through the pages of *Iskra* against the “Economists,” who were opposed to the organization of a united and centralized political party of the working class, an organization which, they falsely claimed, was unnecessary and artificial.

In his famous work *What Is To Be Done?* Lenin wrote:

In our opinion, the starting point of all our activities, the first practical step towards creating the organization we desire, the thread that will guide us in unswervingly developing, deepening and expanding that organization, is the establishment of an all-Russian political newspaper. A paper is what we need above all; without it we cannot systematically carry on that extensive and theoretically sound propaganda and agitation which is the principal and constant duty of the Social-Democrats [read: Communists] in general, and the essential task of the present moment in particular, when interest in politics and in questions of socialism has been aroused among the widest sections of the population.

The teachings of Lenin on the role of the Communist press, which apply most urgently to the problems of today, have helped to stimulate and increase the activities of thousands of Communists and other friends of *The Worker*. These activities contributed toward carrying out the recently concluded most successful subscription campaign in our history—

a campaign which netted 36,517 subscriptions, the highest number gathered in any single campaign in the past.

The Communists the world over have learned from Lenin to defend and circulate the working-class press. Thus, in 1935, Comrade Marcel Cachin, an outstanding leader of the French Communist Party, considered it important to relate “one example of the remarkable devotion of the proletarians to the French Communist Party”:

We have set up very many committees for the defense of *L'Humanité*. Every Sunday, and whenever great events take place in France, we mobilize our comrades to distribute the paper. At the present time, we have 15,000 men and women in Paris and the Paris region who defy the fascists and the police every Sunday, in all kinds of weather, working without pay, selling the paper in front of the subway entrances, in the markets, and in the streets.

A more recent experience demonstrating the importance of the Communist press was the participation of the top leaders of the Italian Communist Party in selling *L'Unita*. As reported in a Rome dispatch, dated February 13, which was prominently displayed in the New York press, these Party leaders, who sold the paper on the streets of Rome as part of a campaign to increase its circulation, were surrounded by crowds of purchasers as soon as they appeared. *L'Unita* reported advance orders of 240,000 copies of that day's issue.

THE PARTY CAMPAIGN TO INCREASE CIRCULATION

During the past year, our Party was engaged in a campaign to increase the circulation of our press. The basis of this campaign was the Open Letter addressed to all members of the Communist Party in March 1948 by the National Committee. The Letter called the attention of all Party members to the fact that, despite a qualitative improvement in the content and attractiveness of the *Daily Worker* and *The Worker*, the circulation of our press remained at a low point of 19,060 for the *Daily Worker*, and 57,128 for the *Sunday Worker*. The Open Letter touched the heart of the problem when it declared:

The Communist press, no matter how good, doesn't sell itself. We are competing with a daily press that has millions of dollars behind it—that has an established circulation of millions of readers, and that bars no hold in its efforts to keep these and win more readers by resorting to sensationalism, warmongering and . . . intimidation.

A Communist press must be sold by COMMUNIST and other militant workers—by individual human beings who understand that press building is a very high kind of POLITICAL work. It must be sold by men and women comrades who take personal responsibility for getting our Communist papers to their neighbors and shopmates, their co-workers in the broad mass movements.

The goals set were to increase the

circulation of *The Worker* to 100,000 and of the *Daily Worker* to 35,000. The National Committee put forward the following slogans as a guide for press building:

Every Communist a reader of *The Worker* and *Daily Worker*!

Every Party member sell at least one subscription to a friend!

Every Communist club a press building club!

Every Communist in a mass organization a promoter of our press!

THE CAMPAIGN METHODS AND RESULTS

What are some of the results of the year's campaign to build the circulation of *The Worker* and the *Daily Worker*? As a result of the successful subscription campaign of *The Worker*, its circulation reached 90,000. The highest circulation of the *Daily Worker* during the year was 24,553, but in the past few months it has dropped to about 22,000. During the trial of the Communist leaders, the *Daily Worker* is publishing every Wednesday a four-page penny extra which is circulated in 250,000 copies in and outside of New York.

What are the main factors which contributed to the increased circulation of *The Worker*?

1. *Political and organizational leadership.* In accordance with the National Committee's decision to give top priority to the problem of building the circulation of *The Worker* and *Daily Worker*, Comrade Eugene Dennis accepted the chairmanship

of a N
partici
most o
and St
on the
of con
that p
the cer
district
organi
for the
distrib
2. T
Work
ing pa
The W
increas
produc
their a
still, th
quality
in the
Work
publish
mail,
newsst
Penny
land, S
New
land-W
met,
Rocky
Thes
the str
states,
against
and fo
vital in
The
Edition
additio

of a National Press Committee and participated directly in its work. In most of the districts, the State Boards and State Committees gave first place on the agenda to the educational task of convincing the Party membership that press circulation should be at the center of their activities. In many districts, counties, and sections, an organizational apparatus was created for the day-to-day handling of press distribution.

2. *The strengthening of the Daily Worker and The Worker as a fighting paper.* The *Daily Worker* and *The Worker*, by changing their form, increasing their page-lengths, and introducing new features, increased their attractiveness. More important still, they strengthened the fighting quality. This is particularly expressed in the various state editions of *The Worker*, of which the following are published today: Weekly: National mail, New York mail, New York newsstand, Michigan, Ohio, Illinois, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, New England, Southern, Harlem, and Upstate New York. Semi-monthly: Maryland-Washington. Monthly: Calumet, Wisconsin, Minnesota, and Rocky Mountain.

These editions give top priority to the struggles of the workers in their states, shops, and communities against speed-up and unemployment, and for housing and other issues of vital interest to the workers.

The latest of these, the Harlem Edition, will play a unique role. In addition to highlighting such issues

as jobs, housing, etc., it is already emerging as the champion and organizer of the struggles against police brutality, Jim-Crow discrimination, and other aspects of the national oppression of the Negro people. It is this recognition by the people in Harlem of the role of *The Worker* that resulted in a truly mass sale of the first issue. The goal has now been set for a 10-000-copy weekly circulation of this edition.

3. *Industrial concentration.* At the Fourteenth National Convention of our Party, Comrade Henry Winston stressed as the central task before the Party the shifting of the main base of our Party to the working class. He showed that this cannot be done unless we turn the face of the entire Party to the workers in the factories. Since the Convention (August 1948), considerable headway has been made in a number of districts where, as a result of the industrial concentration policy, our Party has made important contributions to the winning of victories by the workers, as well as to the strengthening of our Party organization in the shops.

In a number of districts, our Party has learned to use *The Worker* and *Daily Worker* as the main instrument in the campaigns and struggles of the workers. This has increased the number of readers of our press many-fold and has created a solid basis for further advances. While there are numerous examples, the most shining is that of the Ford section in Detroit.

The Ford section of the Party did not wait for the national subscription drive. It initiated its own drive, combining it with the campaign against speedup—which was also initiated by the Communists and progressives in Ford, and in which the Michigan edition of *The Worker* became the major organ. The *Michigan Worker* was used to publicize the struggle against the brutal speedup system; stories were carried each week and important victories were played up. Comrades were convinced of the need to get subscriptions in order to stimulate rank-and-file struggle against speedup; in order to secure Communists the right to work openly as Communists and be elected to offices in the union local; and in order to surround the Party with thousands of non-Party readers who could be counted upon to support the campaigns undertaken by the Party and who would, in addition, be a source for recruits. Result: Whereas formerly the leadership of the Ford local had pooh-pooed the campaign against speedup as "Communist propaganda," the pressure of the workers developed to the point of forcing the leadership to act on this issue; and the Ford section secured 1,000 subscriptions (of which 400 were obtained by three individuals).

Similar experiences, on a smaller scale, were reported from Illinois and Ohio, where the two leading sections in the subscription drive were in the packing and steel industries, from Lehigh Valley, New Jersey, Con-

necticut and elsewhere in New England, and upstate New York.

The important lesson is that by properly utilizing the *Daily Worker* and *The Worker*, we can help stimulate and lead struggles, build our Party, and create a mass circulation for our press.

THE TASK AHEAD

We must also learn that the highly important political content of the *Daily Worker* and *The Worker* must be geared to circulation, if it is to reach the masses in order to educate, stimulate, and lead them to action. In this way, those for whom our press speaks and fights, day in and day out, will be reached with our paper and in turn will reach others.

A major weakness, the solution of which must receive the attention of the whole Party, is the still-low circulation of the *Daily Worker*. Even more serious is the fact that during the trial of our Party leaders the circulation of the *Daily Worker* by the Party has remained static, even though newsstand circulation went up, reflecting a heightened interest in the *Daily Worker* by the public. Reports from various districts indicate the great interest with which the weekly Trial Penny Extra is received.

The detailed reportage of the trial by the *Daily Worker*, and the increased coverage of shop and industrial news, should make it possible to increase the paper's present circulation by many thousands in a short period. This can be done, however,

only i
the da
Work
their
every
and a
will b
of the
shopm

In a
our P
Comm
special
adopti
lem o
our pr
been
counti
sults h
there
by the
ing th
often
activis
rades,
the clu
put his
in his
Party's
tion, h

Ano
Conver
the D
The D
cannot
be tak
our pr
portan

only if our clubs gear themselves to the daily use and sale of the *Daily Worker* in the communities and in their concentration shops — when every Communist working in a shop and active in a mass organization will bring in from one to five copies of the *Daily Worker* for his or her shopmates every day.

In addressing the Open Letter to our Party last year, the National Committee stated that it is placing special emphasis on the need for adopting a new approach to the problem of building the circulation of our press. To the extent that this has been followed up by the districts, counties, sections and clubs, the results have reflected it. However, that there are still weaknesses is revealed by the fact that the problem of building the circulation of our press is often relegated by the clubs to press activists and other individual comrades, with infrequent discussions by the club as a whole. Comrade Foster put his finger on this weakness when, in his concluding remarks at the Party's Fourteenth National Convention, he stated:

Another thing that struck me in our Convention was the unsatisfactory way the *Daily Worker* was handled. . . . The *Daily Worker* and *The Worker* cannot live by themselves. They cannot be taken for granted. The building of our press now is of overwhelming importance, and this question should have

run through the whole Convention and been part of its very fiber. . . ."

The struggle of the American people against the Wall Street warmongers is sharpening. The frame-up trial of the Party leaders, the outcome of which will affect every worker—indeed, every peace-desiring, democratic American—is an indication of this. The role of the *Daily Worker* and of *The Worker* in mobilizing the American workers and their allies on the side of world peace and progress looms more important by the hour.

Our Party will multiply its effectiveness in the crucial days ahead by building a mass circulation of our press. This can and must be accomplished. The successful *Worker* subscription campaign proves this can be done, and constitutes a fitting answer to the Wall Street publications, which, seeking to revile us and demoralize the masses, fill their pages with canards to the effect that the circulation of our press is declining. The success of the subscription campaign also speaks for the healthy state of our Party. How else can one explain why we have so many Communists working so hard and with such spirit to bring in the highest number of subscriptions of any *Worker* campaign?

Forward to a 35,000-copy *Daily Worker* circulation!

Forward to a 140,000-copy *Worker* circulation!

To the Working Men and Women of the World*

The Executive Bureau of the W.F.T.U.

WORKING MEN AND WOMEN,

International labor unity is in danger. The representatives of the British Trades Union Congress and the American Congress of Industrial Organizations have confronted the Executive Bureau of the World Federation of Trade Unions with the alternative: either temporarily to suspend the activities of the W.F.T.U. or to dissolve it, as proposed by the leaders of the C.I.O. Failing that, they would resign from its ranks. They thus endeavored to impose the will of the British trade unions and the C.I.O. upon 67 national trade union centers, embracing the organized workers of the world. The majority of the members of the Executive Bureau proposed that the points of difference regarding the activities of the W.F.T.U. be elucidated, but the representatives of the T.U.C. and the C.I.O. were implacable; they would not agree with any argument, and insisted that the other members of the Executive Bureau accept their demand to dissolve the W.F.T.U.

The majority of the Executive Bureau members could not agree to such an ultimatum. They vigorously protest against the intention to com-

pel the Executive Bureau to pass a decision on a question affecting the existence of the W.F.T.U. and international trade union unity, since such a decision could be taken only by the Congress. The Executive Bureau majority suggested that the British proposal be submitted to the Executive Committee, the General Council, and Congress. The representatives of the T.U.C. and the C.I.O. declared that they did not intend to reckon with the opinion of the majority, after which members of the Executive Bureau Deakin (T.U.C.), Carey (C.I.O.) and Kupers (Dutch trade unions) withdrew from the meeting of the Executive Bureau, thereby indicating that they were breaking with the W.F.T.U. and categorically refuse to examine any acceptable decision for the preservation of trade union unity.

But the Executive Bureau is continuing its functions, and Comrade Di Vittorio (Italy), Vice-President of the W.F.T.U., will preside at the sittings of the Executive Bureau until the end of the session.

Working Men and Women, the World Federation of Trade Unions is the common possession of all working people. It is the spokesman of

* Declaration issued in Paris, January 22, 1949.

their a
of their
At t
W.F.I.
fined i
commo
all cou
ments
rights
cratic
ployme
hours
tions;
worker
the ha
ness, a
adopti
ing th
being
with t
nation
cism v
tigably
of war
enduri
terests
intern
For
W.F.T.
achiev
to its
people
fighter
The W
plishe
had n
those
posed
that it
lution.
In r

their aspirations and the instrument of their hopes.

At the time of its formation, the W.F.T.U., in its Constitution, defined its objects to be to organize the common struggle of trade unions of all countries: against all encroachments on the economic and social rights of the workers and on democratic liberties; for security of employment; for improvement of wages, hours and working and living conditions; for social security to protect workers and their families against the hazards of unemployment, sickness, accident and old age; for the adoption of other measures furthering the social and economic well-being of the workers, and parallel with this to struggle for the extermination of every manifestation of fascism under whatever form; indefatigably to combat war and the causes of war and to work for stable and enduring peace; to represent the interests of the working people in all international agencies.

For more than three years the W.F.T.U. has been working for the achievement of these aims. Thanks to its activities, the lives of many people in many countries—our fellow fighters in the struggle—were saved. The W.F.T.U. might have accomplished much more, if its activity had not been hampered precisely by those who have now officially proposed that it cease all activity, and that it commit the act of self-dissolution.

In making this proposal, the lead-

ers of the General Council of the T.U.C. fail to understand the profound changes which have taken place in the development of the trade union movement and the struggle for the independence of nations, as well as in the world alignment of trade union forces.

The termination of the second world war saw the end of the period when any national trade union center, thanks to the size of its membership and its past achievements, could undividedly rule and direct the destinies of the international trade union movement. Since the first world war, and especially since the second world war, the trade unions in many countries have attained a high level of organization. They have become mass organizations, embracing all trades. These organizations unite many thousands of workers.

It is under the influence of an incorrect assessment of the present situation of the trade unions in the various countries that the leaders of the British T.U.C. continue to believe that they can impose their own conceptions on others, instead of striving for fraternal co-operation with their colleagues on a footing of equality and on mutually acceptable conditions.

The attempt to split or destroy the W.F.T.U. also implies an absolute denial of the elementary principles of democracy, as reflected in a proposal which in practice amounts to depriving the International Trade Union Congress of its powers and transfer-

ring these powers only to two or three of the trade union organizations affiliated to the W.F.T.U.

The international unity of the workers within the W.F.T.U. is based upon voluntary co-operation of trade unions. These trade unions are not political organizations. Their basic object is to raise the living standards of the working class, irrespective of the political, religious or philosophical convictions or race of their members. The trade unions can take no part in a political game.

The Executive Bureau declares that the World Federation of Trade Unions continues to exist. It does not expel from or hinder admission to its ranks of any national trade union organization. It continues to exist, because all over the world working men and women need protection and union. To weaken the working class, to attempt to destroy its international and national unity at this juncture is a criminal act, whose initiators will be sternly condemned by the workers and by history.

The Executive Bureau has decided to summon a meeting of the Executive Committee of the W.F.T.U. in Paris on January 28. The Executive Bureau will recommend the Executive Committee to convene the Second World Congress in the latter half of June 1949. Messages are coming in from all countries confirming the necessity of preserving and

strengthening the World Federation of Trade Unions.

Working Men and Women, the aims of the World Federation of Trade Unions are great and noble ones. They reflect the general interests of all workers by hand and brain. For the achievement of these aims it is necessary to consolidate the unity of the workers of the world, to consolidate and develop the W.F.T.U.

Despite all the covert political machinations against the W.F.T.U., it will continue to live and to grow.

The working class of the world learned a profound lesson from the second world war. It realized that division of its forces opens the way to fascism, to new war and impoverishment of the workers.

If you do not want to witness the resurgence of fascism in a new form, if you do not want another world war, strengthen your ranks and work for world-wide working class unity! This is the chief source of hope for peace, democracy and progress.

Don't believe the lying attacks on the W.F.T.U.

Workers of the world, maintain your ties with the World Federation of Trade Unions! Proclaim and uphold the demands formulated by the World Federation of Trade Unions!

Long live the international solidarity of the workers! Long live the World Federation of Trade Unions!

A P
WAL

HUMA
by C
brary
\$3-75

In hi
Philoso
guished
Columb
myths
levelled
and its
"trial"
The de
ing the
ism, v
claims
Govern
Against
Leninis
violence
of Mar
servatio
hundre
istic hu
all that
He poi
the trea
Marxism
of scien
attempt
philosop
posed f
to destr
violence

Book Review

A PHILOSOPHER EXPOSES WALL STREET'S MYTHS ABOUT THE MARXISTS

by Harry K. Wells

HUMANISM AS A PHILOSOPHY,
by Corliss Lamont, Philosophical Li-
brary, New York, 1949. 368 pages.
\$3.75.

In his latest book, *Humanism As A Philosophy*, Corliss Lamont, distinguished Lecturer in Philosophy at Columbia University, exposes the myths which are used in the charges levelled against the Communist Party and its twelve leaders in the so-called "trial" now in progress in New York. The defendants are charged with teaching the philosophy of Marxism-Leninism, which the Attorney General claims advocates the overthrow of the Government by force and violence. Against this false equation of Marxist-Leninist philosophy with force and violence, Lamont places the philosophy of Marxism-Leninism, without any reservations, squarely in the twenty-five-hundred-year-old tradition of "naturalistic humanism," by which he means all that is best in the history of man. He points out, in passage after passage, the tremendous contributions made by Marxism-Leninism to the development of science and a better life for all. The attempt in the trial to brand such a philosophy as a conspiracy is exposed for what it in fact is, an attempt to destroy, by the organized force and violence of a decayed and degenerate

system, man's historic struggle for a better world.

LAMONT'S NATURALISTIC HUMANISM

Lamont's philosophy, which he variously calls "naturalistic," "scientific," or "democratic" humanism, is based on "the simple proposition that the chief end of human life is to work for the happiness of man upon this earth and within the confines of the Nature that is his home." (p. 7.) Its aim is "to change the world in the direction of those ends and values that it sets up as supremely worth-while and desirable." (p. 13.) Lamont's "naturalistic humanism" is materialism under a more "polite" name, as he, himself, points out on page 50. As a matter of fact, his world-view is not only materialist, but contains markedly dialectical elements. At the same time, as we shall see later, his philosophy is neither thoroughly materialist nor thoroughly dialectical.

In a series of eight propositions, Lamont establishes a philosophic position with which, as far as it goes, I think no dialectical materialist would take important exception. The first asserts that humanism "rules out all forms of the supernatural" and that it regards nature "as a constantly changing

system of events which exists independently of any kind of consciousness." This is the central materialist position. The second notes that "man is an evolutionary product of this great Nature of which he is a part," and eliminates unequivocally "individual survival beyond death." The third holds that "thinking is as natural as walking or breathing" and is "a function of the brain." The fourth maintains that man can know the truth about the world and can "solve his own problems successfully." The fifth repudiates all forms of determinism and fatalism and asserts that human beings are "within reasonable limits, the masters of their own destiny." The sixth states that all ethical and moral values grow out of "this-earthly experiences and relationships" and are directed toward "the this-worldly happiness, freedom and progress—economic, cultural and ethical—of all mankind, irrespective of nation, race or religion." The seventh concerns art, which should be given "the widest possible development" so that "the aesthetic experience may become a pervasive reality in the life of men." The eighth states that "Humanism believes in a far-reaching social program that stands for the establishment throughout the world of democracy and peace on the foundations of a flourishing and cooperative economic order, both national and international."

Such are the main points in the philosophy Lamont calls "naturalistic humanism." In this country, and at this time, when the ideologists of monopoly capitalism are so busy fabricating obscurantist doctrines in an effort to sell "the American Century," it is especially important to have such a forth-

right statement of a materialist philosophy from a non-Marxist. It is doubly important when this non-Marxist accepts Marxism-Leninism as one of the major sources of his thought and holds that the philosophy of the working class has great contributions to make to human thought and development.

MATERIALISM VERSUS MYTH

Lamont lists groups of philosophers, scientists, educators and statesmen whom he considers to be today within the humanist movement. Among others he mentions the "religious humanists," the Ethical Culture Society, and the "rationalist humanists." "Finally," he says, "we find in the category of naturalistic Humanists the followers of Karl Marx, who call themselves variously Marxists, Communists or Socialists and who are active in every country of the earth." He goes on to say:

On economic, political and social issues the Marxist Humanists are of course much to the left of the other types of Humanist I have described. And they ordinarily use the formidable phrase *Dialectical Materialism* to designate their philosophy, though they often talk in a general way about the *Humanist* civilization of Soviet Russia and socialism. While the Marxist materialists disagree sharply on certain issues with me and with others who classify themselves as Humanists, they are unquestionably humanistic in their major tenets of rejecting the supernatural and all religious authority, of setting up the welfare of mankind in this life as the supreme goal, and of relying on science and its techniques. (pp. 36-37.)

He s
ism in
ing th
general
Natural
code of
Turn
tradition
sophy
bulwark
to the
from
Lucretiu
Feuerba
recognit
material
tative le
is a diff
its fore
Dialectic
Engels o
of the c
gave fu
ever-cha
and to
phenom
Here L
contribu
one whi
and pra
and soci
this fact
to out
whether
and Fed
latures,
States, a
form of
continue
Wh
consider
a fun
it belie
passive

He sums up his inclusion of Marxism in the humanist tradition by saying that "Materialism denotes the same general attitude toward the universe as Naturalism and includes an estimable code of moral values." (p. 38.)

Turning to the historic "Humanist tradition," Lamont cites the "philosophy of Materialism" as "a strong bulwark for Humanism." He refers to the great materialists of the past, from Heraclitus, Democritus, and Lucretius to Hobbes, Diderot and Feuerbach. But most significant is his recognition that with Marx and Engels materialist philosophy takes a qualitative leap, that dialectical materialism is a different kind of materialism from its forerunners. Thus, he says, "The Dialectical Materialism of Marx and Engels corrected the mechanistic errors of the earlier materialist tradition and gave full recognition to the dynamic, ever-changing, character of existence and to the infinite interrelatedness of phenomena in both nature and society." Here Lamont is citing a tremendous contribution of Marxist philosophy, one which revolutionized man's theory and practice in relation to the world and society. Think what an indictment this fact is of the shameless attempt to outlaw dialectical materialism, whether in the universities, in the state and Federal courts, in the state legislatures, in the Congress of the United States, or by Presidential fiat in the form of "loyalty" inquisitions. Lamont continues:

While Dialectical Materialism considers that human thought is a function of the bodily organism, it believes that the mind is no mere passive reflector of the outside world,

but that it possesses a fundamental initiative and creativity, a power of working upon and remolding the environment through the force of new ideas. (p. 56)

In this passage, Lamont puts his finger on the real reason why the bourgeois universities, the legislatures, the courts and the President are so intent on outlawing the philosophy of Marxism-Leninism: it embodies "the force of new ideas" which is "a power of working upon and remolding the environment"; as such it threatens the privileged position of the minority class. Such a body of ideas is dangerous to those who stand in the way of further development of the great majority. Lamont's passage also points to the fact that all people are on trial with the Communist Party, for to outlaw dialectical materialism, is to outlaw that "force of new ideas" and that "power of working upon and remolding the environment" which alone is the hope of American men and women, as of men and women the world over, for an environment, a society, adapted to their own needs and interests. Lamont goes on to say that:

Today there can be little question that Dialectical Materialism, while having its own shortcomings, is the most influential variety of Materialism, both because of its consistency and inclusiveness and also because it is the official philosophy of the Soviet Union and the Communist Parties throughout the world. (pp. 56-57.)

It is important that Lamont views dialectical materialism as the most influential variety of materialism; but

this is an understatement. Dialectical materialism is in fact the only thoroughly materialist philosophy. Also Lamont speaks of its "shortcomings," though he nowhere in the book explains what he means. From the general context one might assume that he has reference to the Marxist position on freedom as related to necessity, while he insists on retaining a metaphysical "free will."

Lamont is fully aware of the fact that the anti-democratic campaign, following the Second World War "has made headway under the guise of fighting Communism and Communists." He refers to the "Un-American" Committee, the President's "loyalty order," the case of the "Hollywood Ten," etc., and says, "The fact is that many of America's most powerful figures in politics and business, when it come to their attitude to groups with whom they disagree, continually act as if they had never read the American Constitution or did not care about it." (p. 316.)

In discussing democracy as part of the humanist tradition, Lamont lists twelve aspects: "political democracy"; "civil liberties"; "democracy under the law"; "economic democracy"; "organizational democracy"; "social democracy"; "cultural and educational democracy"; "religious and philosophical democracy"; "democracy between the sexes"; "the democracy of age"; "racial or ethnic democracy"; and, finally, "international democracy." After pointing out that the Soviet Union "has forged ahead of any other power in regard to racial democracy"; and has "made rapid strides in respect to economic democracy, cultural democracy, and equality between the sexes," he says:

I believe that the Marxists, whether inside or outside of the Communist Party, are sincere in their intention of ultimately bringing about an enduring democracy embodying the principle of "all for each and each for all" and extending to all twelve aspects of democracy I have outlined. Their allegiance to this ultimate end properly places them within the ranks of democratic Humanists. (pp. 331-332.)

Although Lamont does not fully understand the nature of bourgeois democracy and therefore cannot see that the Soviet Union is leading the world in all aspects of people's democracy, it is still important, today, that a non-Marxist recognizes the fact that Communists are within the general camp of what he calls "democratic Humanism." Such a position exposes the degenerate lies about "totalitarianism," "subversion," "treason," "agents of a foreign power," etc., etc. It brands the "trial" of the Communist leaders and the witch hunt generally as anti-democratic, and thus demonstrates that all anti-Communism is anti-democracy, in the broad, human meaning of "democracy," and is therefore itself subversive of the interest of the people.

LAMONT'S PHILOSOPHY AND MARXISM

The importance of *Humanism as a Philosophy* stems from the non-Marxist position of its author. It is the testimony of an advanced non-Marxist philosopher and educator bearing witness to the fact that the science of Marxism-Leninism, far from being a conspiracy to overthrow any govern-

ment by
the great
the advan
rually,
ply, and
implicat
possible
deprive
prized
stitute a
the hun
But,
tions of
the non
There a
of contr
of what
In the
philosoph
falls in
philosoph
follow M
to its lo
apply re
thus a
tween
nature
history.
has no
that ph
non-exis
tius to
of this
philosoph
that is
the pa
somehi
Platonis
of, and
"Huma
eclectic
disparat
whateve
value."
rejecting

ment by force and violence, is one of the greatest "forces of new ideas" for the advancement of mankind, intellectually, economically, politically, socially, and culturally. The unmistakable implication is that to outlaw—were it possible!—such a science would be to deprive man of one of his most highly prized possessions, and would constitute an unpardonable crime against the human race.

But, on the other hand, the limitations of the book likewise stem from the non-Marxist position of its author. There are two limitations, in the form of contradictions, which lie at the root of whatever others there may be.

In the first place, it is philosophy as philosophizing, not as science. Lamont falls into the traditional pattern of philosophizing because he does not follow his materialist position through to its logical conclusion; he does not apply materialism to society. There is thus a fundamental contradiction between his materialist philosophy of nature and his idealist philosophy of history. An example of this is that he has no way of accounting for the fact that philosophic materialism is almost non-existent from the time of Lucretius to the time of Hobbes. One result of this contradiction is that he reduces philosophy to an eclectic rehash of all that is "good" in all the systems of the past—and he manages to find something "good" in all of them, from Platonism to Pragmatism. He is aware of, and approves, such eclecticism: "Humanism finds it profitable to be eclectic and to select from the most disparate philosophies and religions whatever ideas or insights seem of value." (p. 42.) Marxism-Leninism, in rejecting eclecticism, does not itself

simply repudiate everything in past philosophies. Its founders have emphatically paid tribute to forerunners in the spheres of materialism and of dialectics. But what Marxism-Leninism takes from past philosophies it transforms *qualitatively*, in the light of the historic world-view of the working class. Thus it marks a revolutionary leap in the history of philosophy: philosophy becomes a science.

The most glaring result of the contradiction above noted is Lamont's tendency to regard history in terms of a struggle between "good" and "bad" men. Thus speaking of science he says, "Wielded by cold and cruel men in search of personal gain or by autocratic groups disdainful of the common good, science can lead to a veritable hell on earth." (p. 272.) In general it leads him to treat the advance toward "social democracy" as a matter of winning over the majority of individuals to naturalistic humanism—transform individuals and you will change society. Speaking of humanism as "an ideal philosophy for the world," he says, "It is quite conceivable that a majority of this planet's population could come to see the truth of its underlying principles." (p. 347.) Thus, the contradiction between his natural materialism and his social idealism forces him into a utopian-socialist position. The resolution of this contradiction is, of course, historical materialism, which relates the development of society, in all its aspects including philosophy, to the development of its material basis, the forces and relations of production. In short, *Humanism As A Philosophy* is philosophy without the living concreteness of the class struggle.

Secondly, while Lamont accepts

something closely resembling a dialectical materialist view of the natural world—the world is independent of any mind, is forever changing, is interconnected and develops ever more complex levels—he retains the traditional method of formal logic. In short, there is a fundamental contradiction between his dynamic world-view and his static method. Lamont accepts Aristotelian logic as “definitive”: “The fundamental laws of deduction were enunciated by Aristotle 2300 years ago, and since then there has been little improvement on his formulations.” (p. 250.) Hegel’s retort to a similar remark made by Kant was to the effect that the long reign of formal logic was a sign, not of its perfection, but of the urgency of the task of transforming it. This second contradiction leads Lamont into many difficulties. For example, it prevents him from solving the problem of the relation between freedom and necessity. Viewing the two as absolute opposites, rather than as dialectical opposites, he is forced to fall back on a doctrine of

metaphysical “free will” in order to avoid complete determinism or fatalism (cf. pp. 195-209). Thus, the contradiction between his dynamic philosophy and his static method forces him to resort to idealist mechanisms, and is a major factor in preventing him from working out a thoroughly dialectical materialist philosophy, either of nature or of society. The solution of his difficulties lies ready at hand, as that what Lenin said of a 20th century physicist can be said of Lamont: “Well, he is trying to force his way through an open door.” (V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. XIII, p. 266.)

Entirely apart from these very real limitations, Lamont’s *Humanism As A Philosophy* is, at this time in this country, an act of courage which can only be welcomed and appreciated, and can be employed by the working class and its allies in the fight against all forms of idealist obscurantism. It is a voice of sanity which is a potent weapon against those who would impose fascism on our country and war on the world.

A FA

by

THIS H
English
the last
vice in
unions
famous
it did s
of the
when th
at the h
class. B
a good
sirable
thirty y
and w
place. I
watchw

A fai
work?
and wh
are the
der wh
develop
this we
of mor
to any
manity,
is mora
law, m
fair. So
decided
science

From the Treasury of Marxism

A FAIR DAY'S WAGE FOR A FAIR DAY'S WORK

by Frederick Engels

THIS HAS NOW BEEN the motto of the English working-class movement for the last fifty years. It did good service in the time of the rising trades unions after the repeal of the infamous Combination Laws in 1824; it did still better service in the time of the glorious Chartist movement, when the English workmen marched at the head of the European working class. But times are moving on, and a good many things which were desirable and necessary fifty, and even thirty years ago, are now antiquated and would be completely out of place. Does the old, time-honoured watchword too belong to them?

A fair day's wage for a fair day's work? But what is a fair day's wage, and what is a fair day's work? How are they determined by the laws under which modern society exists and develops itself? For an answer to this we must not apply to the science of morals or of law and equity, nor to any sentimental feeling of humanity, justice, or even charity. What is morally fair, what is even fair in law, may be far from being socially fair. Social fairness or unfairness is decided by one science alone—the science which deals with the mate-

rial facts of production and exchange, the science of political economy.

Now what does political economy call a fair day's wage and a fair day's work? Simply the rate of wages and the length and intensity of a day's work which are determined by competition of employer and employed in the open market. And what are they, when thus determined?

A fair day's wage, under normal conditions, is the sum required to procure to the labourer the means of existence necessary, according to the standard of life of his station and country, to keep himself in working order and to propagate his race. The actual rate of wages, with the fluctuations of trade, may be sometimes above, sometimes below this rate; but, under fair conditions, that rate ought to be the average of all oscillations.

A fair day's work is that length of working day and that intensity of actual work which expends one day's full working power of the workman without encroaching upon his capacity for the same amount of work for the next and following days.

The transaction, then, may be thus described—the workman gives to the

capitalist his full day's working power; that is, so much of it as he can give without rendering impossible the continuous repetition of the transaction. In exchange he receives just as much, and no more, of the necessities of life as is required to keep up the repetition of the same bargain every day. The workman gives as much, the capitalist gives as little, as the nature of the bargain will admit. This is a very peculiar sort of fairness.

But let us look a little deeper into the matter. As according to political economists, wages and working days are fixed by competition, fairness seems to require that both sides should have the same fair start on equal terms. But that is not the case. The capitalist, if he cannot agree with the labourer, can afford to wait, and live upon his capital. The workman cannot. He has but wages to live upon, and must therefore take work when, where, and at what terms he can get it. The workman has no fair start. He is fearfully handicapped by hunger. Yet, according to the political economy of the capitalist class, that is the very pink of fairness.

But this is a mere trifle. The application of mechanical power and machinery to new trades, and the extension and improvements of machinery in trades already subjected to it, keep turning out of work more and more "hands"; and they do so at a far quicker rate than that at which these superseded "hands" can be absorbed by, and find employment in,

the manufacturers of the country. These superseded "hands" form a real industrial army of reserve for the use of capital. If trade is bad they may starve, beg, steal, or go to the workhouse; if trade is good they are ready at hand to expand production; and until the very last man, woman, or child of this army of reserve shall have found work—which happens in times of frantic over-production alone—until then will its competition keep down wages, and by its existence alone strengthen the power of capital in its struggle with labour. In the race with capital, labour is not only handicapped, it has to drag a cannon-ball riveted to its foot. Yet this is fair according to capitalist political economy.

But let us inquire out of what fund does capital pay these very fair wages? Out of capital, of course. But capital produces no value. Labour is, besides the earth, the only source of wealth; capital itself is nothing but the stored-up produce of labour. So that the wages of labour are paid out of labour, and the working man is paid out of his own produce. According to what we may call common fairness, the wages of the labourer ought to consist in the produce of his labour. But that would not be fair according to political economy. On the contrary, the produce of the workman's labour goes to the capitalist, and the workman gets out of it no more than the bare necessities of life. And thus the end of this uncommonly "fair" race of competi-

tion is th
of those
ably a
those wh
in their
means to
produce

A fair
work! A
about th
fairness
with tha
must le
From w

THE V

by

In a p
the tim
day's wa
and cam
fairest d
cial con
amount t
of the w
er portio
the capit
man hav
much as
self in w
gate his
This is
er, in c
present
society,

tion is that the produce of the labour of those who do work gets unavoidably accumulated in the hands of those who do not work, and becomes in their hands the most powerful means to enslave the very men who produced it.

A fair day's wage for a fair day's work! A good deal might be said about the fair day's work too, the fairness of which is perfectly on a par with that of the wages. But that we must leave for another occasion. From what has been stated it is pretty

clear that the old watchword has lived its day, and will hardly hold water nowadays. The fairness of political economy, such as it truly lays down the laws which rule actual society, that fairness is all on one side—on that of capital. Let, then, the old motto be buried for ever and replaced by another:

Possession of the means of work—raw material, factories, machinery—by the working people themselves.

The Labour Standard, London. May 7, 1881.

THE WAGES SYSTEM

by Frederick Engels

In a previous article we examined the time-honoured motto, "A fair day's wage for a fair day's work," and came to the conclusion that the fairest day's wages under present social conditions is necessarily tantamount to the very unfairest division of the workman's produce, the greater portion of that produce going into the capitalist's pocket, and the workman having to put up with just as much as will enable him to keep himself in working order and to propagate his race.

This is a law of political economy, or, in other words, a law of the present economical organisation of society, which is more powerful than

all the Common and Statute of Law of England put together, the Court of Chancery included. While society is divided into two opposing classes—on the one hand the capitalists, monopolisers of the whole of the means of production, land, raw materials, machinery; on the other hand, labourers, working people deprived of all property in the means of production, owners of nothing but their own working power; while this social organisation exists the law of wages will remain all-powerful and will every day afresh rivet the chains by which the working man is made the slave of his own produce monopolised by the capitalist.

The trades unions of this country have now for nearly sixty years fought against this law—with what result? Have they succeeded in freeing the working class from the bondage in which capital—the produce of its own hands—holds it? Have they enabled a single section of the working class to rise above the situation of wage-slaves, to become owners of their own means of production, of the raw materials, tools, machinery required in their trade, and thus to become the owners of the produce of their own labour? It is well known that not only they have not done so, but that they never tried.

Far be it from us to say that trades unions are of no use because they have not done that. On the contrary, trades unions in England, as well as in every other manufacturing country, are a necessity for the working classes in their struggle against capital. The average rate of wages is equal to the sum of necessities sufficient to keep up the race of workmen in a certain country according to the standard of life habitual in that country. That standard of life may be very different for different classes of workmen. The great merit of trades unions, in their struggle to keep up the rate of wages and to reduce working hours, is that they tend to keep up and to raise the standard of life. There are many trades in the East End of London whose labour is not more skilled and quite as hard as that of bricklayers and bricklayers' labourers, yet they hardly earn half the

wages of these. Why? Simply because a powerful organisation enables the one set to maintain a comparatively high standard of life as the rule by which their wages are measured; while the other set, disorganised and powerless, have to submit not only to unavoidable but also to arbitrary encroachments of their employers: their standard of life is gradually reduced, they learn how to live on less and less wages, and their wages naturally fall to that level which they themselves have learnt to accept as sufficient.

The law of wages, then, is not one which draws a hard and fast line. It is not inexorable with certain limits. There is at every time (great depression excepted) for every trade a certain latitude within which the rate of wages may be modified by the results of the struggle between the two contending parties. Wages in every case are fixed by a bargain, and in a bargain he who resists longest and best has the greatest chance of getting more than his due. If the isolated workman tries to drive his bargain with the capitalist he is easily beaten and has to surrender at discretion; but if a whole trade of workmen form a powerful organisation, collect among themselves a fund to enable them to defy their employers if need be, and thus become enabled to treat with these employers as a power, then, and then only, have they a chance to get even that persistence which, according to the economical constitution of present so-

ciety,
for a
The
the st
the co
Witho
the tra
not rec
ordin
system
the tra
the ca
with t
labour
proof?
the me
ions, a
numbe
of stag
London
Thu
attack
not the
which

Po
fre
ad

ciety, may be called a fair day's wages for a fair day's work.

The law of wages is not upset by the struggles of trades unions. On the contrary, it is enforced by them. Without the means of resistance of the trade unions the labourer does not receive even what is his due according to the rules of the wages system. It is only with the fear of the trades unions before his eyes that the capitalist can be made to part with the full market value of his labourer's power. Do you want a proof? Look at the wages paid to the members of the large trades unions, and at the wages paid to the numberless small trades in that pool of stagnant misery, the East End of London.

Thus the trades unions do not attack the wages system. But it is not the highness or lowness of wages which constitutes the economical

degradation of the working class: this degradation is comprised in the fact that, instead of receiving for its labour the full produce of this labour, the working class has to be satisfied with a portion of its own produce called wages. The capitalist pockets the whole produce (paying the labourer out of it) because he is the owner of the means of labour. And, therefore, there is no real redemption for the working class until it becomes owner of all the means of work—land, raw material, machinery, etc.—and thereby also the owner of *the whole of the produce of its own labour*.

The Labour Standard, London, May 21, 1881.

[Both these articles appear in the compilation *The British Labour Movement*, by Frederick Engels, International Publishers, New York, 1940.]

NOTICE TO SUBSCRIBERS

A limited quantity of the Subject Index to Volume XXVII (1948) of *POLITICAL AFFAIRS* is now available. We shall be pleased to send copies free of charge to subscribers who request them. Requests should be addressed to the publishers, New Century Publishers, New York 3, N. Y.

Editor.

BOOKS AND PAMPHLETS RECEIVED

- Soviet Economy During the Second World War.* N. A. Voznesensky (International Publishers), New York, 1949. 160 pp. \$1.00.
- Documents on the Mindszenty Case.* Yellow Book published by the Hungarian Government, Budapest, 1949. 96 pp.
- Labor's Own William Z Foster: A Communist's Fifty Years of Working-Class Leadership and Struggle.* Elizabeth Gurley Flynn (New Century Publishers), New York, 1949. 48 pp. 15¢.
- Where Is the C.I.O. Going? A Program for Militant Trade Unionism.* George Morris (New Century Publishers), New York, 1949. 32 pp. 10¢.
- The Federal Jury Is Stacked Against You.* Marion Bachrach (Communist Party Defense Committee), New York, 1949. 24 pp. 5¢.
- Fighting Words: Selections From 25 Years of the Daily Worker.* (New Century Publishers), New York, 1949. 240 pp. \$1.50.
- Anti-Semitism and Reaction. 1795-1800.* Morris U. Schappes (Reprinted from Publications of the American Jewish Historical Society, No. XXXVIII, Part 2, December, 1948).
- Yankee Imperialism in Spain.* Vicente Uribe (New Century Publishers), New York, 1949. 32 pp. 15¢.
- Georgi Dimitrov—A Short Biographical Sketch.* Published by the Press Department of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Sofia, Bulgaria, 1948. 87 pp.
- International Conference of Working Youth, Warsaw 1948.* Published by the World Federation of Democratic Youth, Paris. 52 pp.
- Un Plan Cubano contra los Planes Imperialistas.* Blas Roca (Ediciones del Partido Socialista Popular), 1948. 97 pp. 20 centavos.
- Union pour Sauver la Paix.* Maurice Thorez (Communist Party of France), Paris, 1949. 30 pp. 8 francs.
- Linguistique et Materialisme Dialectique.* Marcel Cohen (Ophrys), Gap, 1948. 19 pp.
- Agrarian Reform and People's Victory in China.* Mao Tse-tung (People's Publishing House, Ltd.), Bombay, 1948. 15 pp. As 3.
- The Truth About MTA.* Daniel B. Schirmer (Communist Party of New England), Boston, 1949. 20 pp. 1¢.

Contro la Politica Interna del Governo Democristiano. Palmiro Togliatti (Centro Diffusione Stampa), Rome, 1948. 33 pp. 30 lire.

I Comunisti per la Pace e per una Politica Nazionale. Palmiro Togliatti (Centro Diffusione Stampa), Rome, 1948. 45 pp. 30 lire.

Per il Rafforzamento del Partito. Luigi Longo (Centro Diffusione Stampa), Rome, 1948. 78 pp. 60 lire.

I Comunisti e i Contadini Contivatori Diretti. Ruggero Grieco (Centro Diffusione Stampa), Rome, 1948. 31 pp. 45 lire.

The Polish Miner. The Role and Achievements of the Miners' Union. Published by the Central Board of Polish Trade Unions, Warsaw, 1949. 50 pp.

Ruch Zawodowy W Swietle Kongresu Zjednoczenia. Published by the Komisja Centralna Zwiolkow Zawodowych w Polsce, Warsaw, 1949. 62 pp.

Why You Should Subscribe to— **Political Affairs**

The battle for Marxism is not restricted to the economic or political problems of American working people; capitalism bombards us hourly with its ideas on *every* front; American capitalism in particular has made mighty institutions of the press, the radio, the entertainment industry, the movies, the mass publication of books. And through these institutions it attempts to maintain its hold on the minds of the people, and thereby undermine resistance to its drive toward fascism and a new atomic war.

In the great classic of Marxian science, *The German Ideology*, which is the first systematic exposition of the relationship between man's political, economic and intellectual activities, Karl Marx wrote: "The ideas of the ruling class are in every epoch the ruling ideas: *i.e.*, the class which is the ruling material force of society is at the same time its ruling intellectual force. The class which has the means of material production at its disposal, has control at the same time over the means of mental production."

Communists, above all, have a continuing obligation to meet the ideas of the capitalist class and defeat them. And *Political Affairs*, as the leading magazine of Communist thought and opinion in the United States, provides the most powerful ideological weapon against the reactionary anti-social ideas with which monopoly capital seeks to poison the minds of the masses.

To understand—and help change!—the world, you owe it to yourself to subscribe today to *Political Affairs*.

Subscribe Through Your Club or Local Bookshop

SINGLE COPIES 25¢ SUBSCRIPTION \$2.50

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

RECENT INTERNATIONAL BOOKS

SOVIET ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT SINCE 1917

By MAURICE DOBB

\$4.00

DOCUMENTS RELATING TO THE EVE OF THE SECOND WORLD WAR (two volumes)

Vol. I \$2.75; Vol. II \$2.50

TRENDS IN AMERICAN CAPITALISM

Prepared by LABOR RESEARCH ASSOCIATION

Cloth \$1.50; Paper \$.75

THE SCIENCE OF BIOLOGY TODAY

By TROFIM LYSENKO

Cloth \$1.25; Paper \$.25

PEOPLE COME FIRST

By JESSICA SMITH

2.50

GIANT AT THE CROSSROADS:

THE STORY OF ANCIENT CIVILIZATION

By M. Ilin and E. Segal

\$2.50

THE STORY OF YOUR BREAD

By CLARA HOLLOS, *with illustrations by* LAZLO ROTH

\$1.50

NEW CENTURY PUBLISHERS

832 Broadway, New York 3, N. Y.

TIMELY PAMPHLETS ON VITAL EVENTS

LABOR'S OWN WILLIAM Z. FOSTER by Elizabeth Gurley Flynn	\$.05
WHERE IS THE C.I.O. GOING? by George Morris	.10
YANKEE IMPERIALISM IN SPAIN by Vicente Uribe	.15
FIGHTING WORDS—TWENTY-FIVE YEARS OF THE "DAILY WORKER"	paper: \$1.50 cloth: 2.50
THE FEDERAL JURY IS STACKED AGAINST YOU by Marion Bachrach	.05
THIRTY-ONE YEARS OF THE U.S.S.R. by V. M. Molotov	.10
WHAT NEXT IN FRANCE? by Maurice Thorez	.05
SPOTLIGHT ON GERMANY by Paul Richards	.15
THE "SAVE OUR COUNTRY" RACKET by John L. Spivak	.25

NEW CENTURY PUBLISHERS

832 Broadway, New York 3, N. Y.

TS

.05

.10

.15

1.50

2.50

.05

.10

.05

.15

.25

V. Y.