

Gen

political affairs

AUGUST 1949 • 25 CENTS

V. J. JEROME
ALEXANDER BITTELMAN
SID STEIN
ELIZABETH G. FLYNN
LIU SHAO-CHI
HENRY NEWMAN
MICHAEL SALERNO

- [1] Homage to Dimitrov
[7] In the Spirit of Dimitrov
[22] The Beginnings of the Economic
Crisis in the United States
[35] As the C.I.O. Convention Nears
[50] Remembering Sacco and Vanzetti
[57] Internationalism and Nationalism
[77] Myths and Realities of
U.S. China Policy
[92] Communication

IN MEMORIAM

Georgi Mikhailovich Dimitrov

1882—1949

Ready Soon!

A NEW POPULAR DOLLAR EDITION OF

NEGRO LIBERATION

By HARRY HAYWOOD

Selected as the Marxist Book-of-the-Month for September, this important INTERNATIONAL book, which has sold out two editions since publication, has now been issued in a one-dollar edition because of the wide popular demand. Taking the plantation system of the South as the core of Negro oppression, the author has provided a new and fundamental study of the Negro question in the United States. Ready at the end of August.

OTHER NEW AND TIMELY PAMPHLETS

THE UNITED FRONT, by Georgi Dimitrov.....	\$.35
STOOLPIGEON, by Elizabeth Gurley Flynn.....	.05
A TALE OF TWO WORKERS, by David Englestin and Carl Hirsch .05	
INTELLECTUALS IN THE FIGHT FOR PEACE, by Howard Fast....	.15
FOR PEACE AND FREEDOM, by Paul Robeson.....	.05
WHERE IS THE C.I.O. GOING?, by George Morris.....	.10
LABOR'S OWN—WILLIAM Z. FOSTER, by Elizabeth Gurley Flynn .15	
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

A M

Editorial

NATIO

GEORGI
his de
peoples
dictmen
aries.

Dimi
voice h
out th
new cl
against

As i
Georgi
accuser
ers, th
world
and so

Sixte

* State

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

IN MEMORIAM

Georgi Mikhailovich Dimitrov

1882-1949

**NATIONAL COMMITTEE, C.P.U.S.A. HONORS THE MEMORY
OF DIMITROV***

GEORGI DIMITROV is dead. But with his death new life quickens the peoples' memory of his immortal indictment of the Nazi war incendiaries.

Dimitrov's powerful anti-fascist voice has been stilled. But throughout the world its echo sounds a new clarion call for united action against Hitler's would-be imitators.

As in his life, so even in death Georgi Dimitrov becomes again the accuser of the imperialist warmakers, the welder of the unity of the world forces of peace, democracy and socialism.

Sixteen years ago, this Communist

leader had a price on his head, and was persecuted by the traitorous rulers of his native Bulgaria. Today the whole Bulgarian people mourn him as a national hero. United under the leadership of the Bulgarian working class and its Communist Party, they are building Dimitrov a glorious monument of People's Democracy and Socialist achievement.

Sixteen years ago, a Nazi court and prosecution attempted to frame this Bulgarian Communist on the false charge of setting fire to the Reichstag, an act perpetrated by the Hitler gang itself. Dimitrov's magnificent defense of his Communist

* Statement issued July 8, 1949.

honor, and of Marxist-Leninist principle, aroused the world's anti-fascists to the menace of Hitlerism. He was saved from the Nazi murderers by the U.S.S.R. and the democratic forces of the world.

Even though the beacon for world reaction lit by the Nazis in the Reichstag fire trial was not extinguished in time and flamed into World War II, the struggle for the United Nations victory coalition was greatly advanced by Dimitrov in that Leipzig court.

The American people have learned much and profited greatly from the fight led by Dimitrov to forge the united world front for peace and against fascism. His example and leadership did much to build and strengthen the anti-Axis war coalition in which our country joined with the U.S.S.R. to beat back the Hitlerite threats to all civilization.

Dimitrov leaves a priceless legacy to the workers and common people of all capitalist countries. As one of the great Marxists of our time, he did much to advance an effective people's struggle against fascism and war, showing the way to build the united front in action—to unite the working class and people, Communists and non-Communists, in resistance to each and every reactionary move, each and every fascist advance, each and every preparation for imperialist war. These lessons are of particular significance to the American people today, as they face a growing assault on their liberties,

emphasized by the trial on Foley Square.

Dimitrov, symbol of international working class solidarity, is mourned from liberated China to war-torn Greece.

Dimitrov, ardent champion of friendship of all peoples with the Soviet Union, is mourned by his own people as the greatest of all Bulgarian patriots.

Dimitrov, world Communist leader, friend and comrade of the great Stalin, is mourned not only by Communists but also by millions of non-Communists the world over.

The National Committee of the Communist Party grieves with all who mourn the death of this giant among the men of our time. In his spirit we will work to strengthen the anti-fascist unity of the American working class and people, and build the friendship of the peace-loving peoples of our own country with the lands of socialism and people's democracy and with the toilers of all lands.

Long live the memory of Georgi Dimitrov!

Long live the united front struggle for peace, democracy and social progress!

National Committee,
Communist Party

William Z. Foster,
Chairman

Eugene Dennis,
General Secretary.

STAT
PA
D

On
trov, t
workin
ous or
has pa

Our
people
leader
pilot o
wise s
People
inspire
our co

The
Georg
heroic
munis
and h
and vi
trov g
munis
as an
ardent
prolet
shoul
class
Comm
gle of
ist an
count
there
which

* Re

STATEMENT OF THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE, COMMUNIST PARTY OF BULGARIA, ON THE DEMISE OF GEORGI DIMITROV, ADDRESSED TO THE PARTY MEMBERSHIP AND THE BULGARIAN PEOPLE*

On July 2 Comrade Georgi Dimitrov, the great son of the Bulgarian working class, its talented, tempestuous organizer, leader and inspirer, has passed away.

Our Party and the entire Bulgarian people have lost their outstanding leader and teacher, the founder and pilot of the Fatherland Front, the wise statesman and organizer of the People's Republic, the organizer and inspirer of socialist construction in our country.

The name and life of Comrade Georgi Dimitrov symbolize the heroic history of the Bulgarian Communist Party, its difficult struggle and heroic deeds, its achievements and victories. Comrade Georgi Dimitrov grew as an outstanding Communist activist hardened in struggle, as an organizer and leader, as an ardent, fearless and indefatigable proletarian tribune, shoulder to shoulder with our heroic working class and its glorious vanguard, the Communist Party. In the entire struggle of the working class in the Socialist and Communist movement of our country during the last 50 years, there is not a single important event which is not closely linked with the

great name and intense activity of Comrade Georgi Dimitrov as organizer and leader.

[After recalling the most important events in Dimitrov's life, the statement declares:]

Comrade Georgi Dimitrov has departed from us, but he left a granite-hardened Party, ideologically equipped with the sharp and invincible weapon of Marxism-Leninism, steeled in battles and endowed with an iron discipline, a party which will bring to a victorious culmination the great cause for which he fought. Comrade Georgi Dimitrov trained militant Bolshevik cadres unreservedly devoted to the Party and the people, uncompromising toward the enemy and capable of successfully completing the building of the grandiose structure of Socialism and Communism in our country, the foundations of which were laid by our great teacher and leader.

Let us continuously learn from the rich, splendid life of our teacher and leader Georgi Dimitrov, the true disciple and co-fighter of the great Lenin and the great Stalin.

[The statement further calls for uncompromising struggle against all enemies, to safeguard the national independence and to be loyal to the

* Reprinted from *Pravda*, Moscow, July 6, 1949.

end to the mighty Soviet Union, the glorious C.P.S.U. (B.) and the leader of the progressive forces of mankind, Stalin. In conclusion, the statement of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Bulgaria calls upon all members of the Party, all sympathizers and all toiling people of city and countryside to close ranks and to unite even more firmly under the victorious banner of the Fatherland Front and under the leadership

of the glorious Communist Party.]

Let us work, each one at his post, with still greater energy and devotion, with more discipline and self-sacrifice; let us work as the leader and teacher of our people, Comrade Georgi Dimitrov, has taught us. Let us fulfill and over-fulfill the economic plan, let us secure the welfare of our people, let us create an economically and culturally powerful Bulgaria.

C.P.S.U. CO-WORKERS OF GEORGI DIMITROV PAY TRIBUTE TO HIS MEMORY*

ON JULY 2, after a long and severe illness, Georgi Mikhailovich Dimitrov—Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the People's Republic of Bulgaria, General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Bulgarian Communist Party, eminent leader of the international working-class movement, leader of the Bulgarian people, and loyal friend of the Soviet Union—passed away.

Georgi Mikhailovich Dimitrov was born into a proletarian family on June 18, 1882, in the town of Radomir. When only 15 years old, Dimitrov, then working as a compositor in a printing shop, joined the revolutionary movement and took an active part in the work of the oldest Bulgarian trade-union of printers.

In 1902, Dimitrov joined the Bul-

garian Workers Social-Democratic Party. He actively combatted revisionism on the side of the Marxist wing of "Tesniaki" headed by Dimitri Blagoyev.

The self-sacrificing revolutionary struggle of Dimitrov earned him the ardent love of the revolutionary workers of Bulgaria who in 1905 elected him Secretary of the Alliance of Revolutionary Trade Associations of Bulgaria. He remained in this post without interruption until 1923, when the Alliance was disbanded by the fascists.

While heading the struggle of the Bulgarian proletariat, Dimitrov displayed courage and staunchness in revolutionary battles and was repeatedly arrested and persecuted. During the armed uprising of September 1923 Dimitrov stood at the head of the Central Revolutionary Committee and set an example of

* Statement published in *Pravda*, Moscow, July 3, 1949.

revolutionary fearlessness and unflinching loyalty and devotion to the cause of the working class.

Because of his leadership of the armed uprising in 1923, a fascist court sentenced Dimitrov to death in absentia. In 1926, after a provocative trial engineered by the fascists against the Communist Party leadership in Bulgaria, Dimitrov was again condemned to death in absentia.

Being compelled to emigrate from Bulgaria in 1923, Dimitrov led the life of a professional revolutionary. He worked actively in the Executive Committee of the Communist International.

In 1933 Dimitrov was arrested in Berlin for revolutionary activity. During the Leipzig trial, Georgi Dimitrov became the standard-bearer of the struggle against fascism and imperialist war. His heroic conduct at the trial, the wrathful words which he flung in the face of the fascists exposing their revolting provocation in connection with the Reichstag fire, unmasked the fascist provocators and brought new millions of working people throughout the world into the struggle against fascism.

In 1935, Georgi Dimitrov was elected General Secretary of the Executive Committee of the Communist International. He waged a persistent struggle for the establishment and consolidation of a united proletarian and people's front for rebuffing fascism and against the war which was being prepared by the

fascist chieftains of Germany, Japan, and Italy. He tirelessly urged the masses of working people of all countries to rally around the Communist Parties in order to block the way of the fascist aggressors.

Dimitrov did a good job within the ranks of the international Communist movement, strengthening the leadership of Communist Parties loyal to the great teachings of Marxism-Leninism, to the principles of proletarian internationalism and to the cause of defending the interests of the masses in their respective countries.

During the Second World War, Georgi Dimitrov urged Communists to give leadership in the national liberation, anti-fascist movement and tirelessly worked to organize all patriotic forces for routing the fascist invaders. He headed the struggle of the Bulgarian Workers' Party (Communist) and of all Bulgarian patriots who rose in arms against the German fascist invaders.

For his outstanding service in the struggle against fascism, Dimitrov was awarded the Order of Lenin in 1945 by the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R.

After the debacle of fascist Germany, Dimitrov led the building of the new People's Democratic Republic of Bulgaria and laid the foundation for eternal friendship between the Bulgarian people and the peoples of the U.S.S.R.

Tirelessly working for the consolidation of a united, anti-imperial-

ist camp and the rallying of all democratic forces, Dimitrov mercifully exposed the betrayal of the cause of socialism and the united anti-imperialist front by Tito's nationalist clique.

The working people of the whole world have lost a fiery fighter who devoted his entire heroic life to selfless services for the cause of the working class and for the cause of Communism. Dimitrov's death is a heavy loss for the entire international working class and the Communist movement, for all fighters for a lasting peace and people's democracy. His selfless struggle within the ranks of the working-class movement, his boundless devotion to the great teachings of Lenin and Stalin earned for Dimitrov the ardent love

of the working people of the whole world.

The life of Georgi Mikhailovich Dimitrov—loyal comrade-in-arms of Lenin and Stalin, staunch revolutionary and anti-fascist champion—will serve as an inspiring example for all fighters for the cause of peace and democracy, for Communism.

Farewell, our dear friend and comrade-in-arms.

Signed: A. Andreyev, L. Beria, N. Bulganin, K. Voroshilov, L. Kaganovich, A. Kosygin, G. Malenkov, A. Mikoyan, V. Molotov, P. Ponomarenko, G. Popov, P. Pospelov, J. Stalin, M. Suslov, N. Khrushchev, N. Shvernik, and M. Shkiriatov.

by V

GEOR
speco
thro
accu
tion-
mov-
tion,
the
as th
tedly
Dimit
nists
less
still

T
tory
ism
by e
ther
fuse
of
mor
tine
cise
cipl
Sov
from
mar
T
nisi
the
thio
ass

In the Spirit of Dimitrov

by V. J. Jerome

GEORGI DIMITROV ended his final speech in the Leipzig court by throwing into the faces of his Nazi accusers the words of the Inquisition-tortured Galileo, "And still it moves." "This scientific proposition," he continued, "later became the property of all mankind." And as the President of the court agitatedly moved to suspend the session, Dimitrov spoke on: "We Communists at the present time can say no less resolutely than old Galileo, 'And still it moves.'"

They who tried to turn back history by branding Marxism-Leninism as a crime and a conspiracy and by exterminating its adherents, have themselves been hurled into the refuse of history, while the movement of Communism has gained in momentum and sweep on all continents of the world. And it is precisely the state founded on the principles of Marxism-Leninism, the Soviet state, that wrested Dimitrov from the Nazis, that smashed the main armed forces of Hitler.

They who tried to brand Communism as a crime and a conspiracy, as the subversive thoughts and deeds of thieves in the night, incendiaries and assassins, were compelled by the logic

of their foul enterprise to bring forth the degenerate Van der Lubbe—monstrous symbol of their own conspiracy against humanity.

And the man whose life they sought to destroy, whose life-mission they prepared to crush on the anvil of their usurped power—he rose to be the hammerer of the People's Front and leader of the new Bulgaria. His name is today a battle-standard advancing.

One might imagine that the lesson of the Reichstag fire trial would be brought home to all subsequent aspirants to Hitler's role and imitators of his technique. But the outworn social system which begets fascism is incapable of rational behavior. Fascism itself is the most fiendish expression of that irrationality.

And so today Wall Street imperialism, successor to the ambitions of Hitler, desperately striving to turn our country into a police state, resorts to the familiar pattern of Nazi frame-up trials and thought-control.

It is but a difference in technique that no charge of setting fire to the Capitol figures in the trial of the Communist leaders in Foley Square.

Yet who will say that American reaction, past-master at colossal frame-ups—to mention but the Haymarket Martyrs, the Molly Maguires, Joe Hill, Tom Mooney, Sacco-Vanzetti, the Scottsboro boys—would shrink “in a pinch” from using a Guy Fawkes or a Van der Lubbe? In an American Federal court today, even more directly than in the court at Leipzig in 1933, the ideas of Marxism-Leninism are on trial, in a legal frame-up to disfigure and false-color Communism as a conspiracy to violence. And it is the Communists who stand up in court to challenge the frame-up. Eugene Dennis, General Secretary of the Communist Party, conducting his own defense, declared in his Opening Statement to the Jury:

We will demonstrate and prove that the American people are menaced by the force and violence of fascism and atomic war—and not by us Communists who advocate that the people use all constitutional and popular means to save themselves from catastrophe. . . .

We will show that the social conditions brought into being by the growth of the giant American trusts gave rise to our Communist Party, as well as to the modern American trade union movement and labor's independent political action. . . .

We will establish that what we American Communists have learned from our experience, and from the experience of Communists and workers in other countries, has enabled us better

to defend the best interests of our people and our nation. . . .

We will establish, from authentic documents adopted at our 1945 National Convention, that we Communist leaders and our Party pledged ourselves to do all in our power to save our people and our country from the consequences of an American Reichstag Fire Trial and an American version of the Japanese system of punishing those who were alleged to hold “dangerous thoughts.”

Today, Dimitrov's role in the Leipzig trial and in the after-years takes on rich meaning for the American working class and the people as a whole.

The world will forever remember his ringing rebuff to the Nazi Inquisitors:

I am defending myself as an accused Communist.

I am defending my own Communist revolutionary honor.

I am defending my ideas, my Communist convictions.

I am defending the meaning and content of my life.

That is why every sentence made by me before the court is, so to speak, *blood of my blood and flesh of my flesh.*

Each word is an expression of my deepest indignation against the unjust accusation, against the fact that such an anti-Communist crime is blamed on the Communists.

The stand of the Communist Dimitrov in the Leipzig court was a supreme refutation of the canard

that
Dimit
Marx
soci
grew
tion o
the v
affirm
nism
tion v
ing-cl
by de
utopia
“puts
and o
ploy
velop
has a
tional
ment.
(histo
still
pende
soon
sects
Dimit
Bolsh
not a
masse
loyalt
faith
the o
was
class.
ple o
it wa
from
freed
ance
den o

that Communism is a conspiracy. Dimitrov personified the truth that Marxism, differing from all earlier socialist theories and movements, grew out of, and was from its inception openly linked to the struggles of the working class. Dimitrov's stand affirmed anew that scientific Communism could develop only in conjunction with the emergence of the working-class movement; that Marxism, by definition, meant a break with all utopianism, sectism, adventurism, "putschism," secrecy of organization and conspiratorial activity. To employ Marx's own words: "The development of Socialist sectarianism has always been inversely proportional to that of the real labor movement. As long as sects are justified (historically), the working class is still not ripe enough for an independent historical movement. As soon as it reaches its maturity, all sects are essentially reactionary."

Dimitrov stood up in court with Bolshevik heroism because he was not a conspirator, but a man of the masses, linked to the masses, through loyalty to the working class and faith in its capacity as leader of all the oppressed. His strength in court was the strength of the working class. Through him the toiling people of all lands turned accuser. And it was from their devotion to him, from their ringing solidarity for his freedom, that he drew the sustenance for his courage in the juridical den of the Nazi beasts. Only a leader

linked to the people, could exclaim, as did he in the Leipzing courtroom, with the passion of truth: "Mass work, mass struggle, mass resistance, the United Front, no adventurist acts—such is the alpha and omega of Communist tactics."

This guiding idea is contained in William Z. Foster's statement issued on May 22, 1949, outlining the Communist Party's position on the Government's charges against the Party leaders on trial for "conspiracy to advocate and to teach Marxism-Leninism":

Historically, violence has always been the weapon of the capitalist exploiters. Ours is the method of the broad democratic economic and political struggle of the workers.

It is, therefore, a political frame-up, and contrary to our Party's whole life practice, when the Prosecution comes in here with the baseless charge that we Communists are conspiring to overthrow the American government by force and violence."

The Communist Party is linked to the struggles of the working class as an organic part of the social process. This objective fact is determined by the laws of capitalist development, although the maturing of class consciousness proceeds unevenly as between different countries. It holds true for the United States today, even though the subjective factor, working-class consciousness, has been retarded, chiefly, by the labor aides of

imperialism and has not yet risen to recognition of the Party's vanguard role.

Class consciousness does not mature automatically; it develops as a historical necessity in the process of the class struggle. The American working class, though still relatively backward, in its political development, has repeatedly responded to campaigns of the Party on specific issues. This was dramatically shown by the mass response in the early 'thirties to the Party's pioneering for unemployment and social insurance, in the face of the A.F.L. leaders' spurning of the "dole." The workers identified the Party with the initiation and leadership of the fight for that demand; however, they did not yet see how the Party's role in that successful struggle was connected with its fundamental, historic role as vanguard. This gap is traceable in large measure to the Party's inadequate promotion of the Socialist education of the masses in the course of those struggles. As a consequence, the workers failed to see their constant class interests bound up with the growth and strengthening of the Party. It is only as the Party, by its continuous vanguard participation, helps the workers to learn *fundamentally* from their own experiences and raises their consciousness to the level where they recognize and turn from the misleadership of reformism and Social-Democracy, that the broad masses of the working class learn to

accept the Marxist-Leninist Party as the vanguard.

None but the naive will assume that those who charge Communists with conspiracy believe their own accusation. They know the indivisible connection, actual and potential, of the Communist vanguard with the masses. This knowledge prompts their systematic policy of force and violence, their conspiracy against the Constitutional guarantees of the people, in order to isolate the Communists, to make them appear a secret sect, and then to suppress them, as the first step toward suppression of the whole labor and progressive movement.

But more and more they are confronted with the futility of such fascist methods. Reaction everywhere winced at Dimitrov's revelation in the Leipzig court that, despite the fact that the Bulgarian fascist government bands, bent on uprooting Communism, had during the two years 1923-25 savagely killed more than 20,000 workers, peasants, and intellectuals,—

. . . Communism in Bulgaria has incomparably deeper roots at the present time [1933] than in 1923. This should be a good warning to all rabid uprooters of Communism in other countries, for all kinds of present-day Don Quixotes.

And wherever, *without exception*, fascist regimes outlawed the Communist Parties, they did not succeed in annihilating them or in reducing

then
with
tyrs,
degr
tive
unde
grou
was
offic
ing
doon
nist
senc
gani
work
Com
the
ing
heroi
lawe
ship
strug
cism.
the
the
near
toget
head
swee
from
to In
to F
rialis
fortif
ings,
preve
ocrat
Th
cist
Lenin

them to secret, impotent sects. Notwithstanding their numerous martyrs, Communist Parties driven underground were not cut off from active connections with the masses. The underground became the above-ground, the arterial way of all that was vital, struggling, aspiring; the official above-ground was the sinking habitat of the desperate and the doomed. The illegalized Communist Parties changed, not their essence, but only their forms of organization and their methods of work. The vanguard role of the Communist Party is constant, as is the historical movement of the working class itself. With inspiring heroism and self-sacrifice the outlawed Communists extended leadership to the people drawn together in struggle by common hatred of fascism. They forged their bonds with the people indestructibly. And as the debacle of the fascist regimes neared, the Communist Parties rose together with the people, and at the head of the people. This was the sweep from Italy to Manchuria, from Korea to Greece, from Poland to Indo-China, from the Philippines to France. Only where the imperialist Western powers succeeded in fortifying the tottering local Quislings, were the people temporarily prevented from asserting their democratic will.

The lesson of those ill-starred fascist attempts to outlaw Marxism-Leninism and destroy the Commu-

nist Parties was sounded by William Z. Foster in concluding his above-quoted statement:

We Communists stand before this Court in full confidence of the justice of our cause. We have frankly stated our policy and our perspectives. We are fighting in the best interests of the American people. We are confident as to the final result of our struggle.

Whatever may be the outcome of this particular trial, we will, in the end, be justified by the course of political events, by the American masses, and by the peoples of the world. We are fighting on the side of history. Big capitalist reactionaries can never save their doomed capitalist system and defeat Socialism by persecuting Communists, by outlawing the Communist Party, by robbing the people of their hard-won constitutional rights, by increasing the exploitation of the workers, by plunging the world into fascism and war.

* * *

Dimitrov was not merely an anti-fascist; he was a Communist. And because he was every inch a Marxist, a great disciple of Lenin and Stalin, a Bolshevik of the highest type, he was the superb anti-fascist fighter and leader. Communists are the most consistent and resolute fighters against fascism, as events have proved because theirs is the clearest and furthest vision of the historical course of class society. It was integral, therefore, that Dimitrov as General Secretary of the Communist International projected at its

1935 (Seventh) Congress, in his famous Report, the classic program for the People's Front against fascism and war.

The fascist counter-revolution was assaulting bourgeois democracy in one country after another. The independence of nations was threatened more and more by the aggressive course of Germany, Italy and Japan. At this time Dimitrov set forth the tactical policy of the proletarian United Front and the People's Front. Its central objective was to mobilize all the popular forces who desired peace, who cherished their democratic gains won in long and bitter struggles, and who would resist the fascists and war-makers.

Hitler's rise to power alerted the peoples of the world. While the fascist offensive was emboldened in every capitalist country, mass resistance was everywhere mobilized. The choice was enslavement for all or struggle by all. Dimitrov stated:

"Now the toiling masses in a number of capitalist countries are faced with the necessity of making a definite choice, and of making it today, not between proletarian dictatorship and bourgeois democracy, but between bourgeois democracy and fascism."

The struggle against war, Dimitrov taught, is inseparable from the struggle against fascism: fascism is war. He summed up broadly the peace forces realizable in that situation:

The people's hatred of war is constantly gaining in depth and intensity. In pushing the toilers into the abyss of imperialist wars, the bourgeoisie is staking its head. Today not only the working class, the peasantry and other working people champion the cause of the preservation of peace, but also the oppressed nations and the weak peoples whose independence is menaced by new wars. Even some of the big capitalist states, afraid of losing in a new redivision of the world, are at the present stage interested in avoiding war.

The People's Front policy brilliantly expressed the dynamics of Marxism-Leninism. Detractors from the "Left" loudly denounced it as "surrender to the petty bourgeoisie" and "abandonment of the struggle for Socialism"; but it represented the very opposite. The struggle against imperialist war is the struggle against the *way of life* of declining capitalism, particularly in the stage of its general crisis. It is basic to the entire struggle of the working class and its allies. The fight for peace and democracy in this epoch, the fight to curb the organized violence of the monopolists, the struggle for national and colonial liberation—this entire process strengthens the peoples' forces, advances the positions of the working class, and speeds onward the world-wide movement toward Socialism. The people's anti-fascist victory in the war, made possible by the decisive blows of the Soviet Army, opened the way

to So
nation

In
Unit
broad
expres
ciple
class
ciple
chang
ing it
worki
again
could
leader
Dimit

...
prolet
influe
worki
the ur
tellige
spire
in the

Suc
Dimit
postur
Demo
peace
expos
we m
masse
ers fo
nists
unity.
In
tions
for
again

to Socialism for an entire series of nations.

In the policy of the working-class United Front, backbone of the broader People's Front, Dimitrov expressed the Marxist-Leninist principle of proletarian hegemony in class alliances. He applied that principle in new forms corresponding to changed conditions. Only by achieving its own United Front could the working class be a rallying force against fascism and war; only thus could it enhance its strength and leadership in the People's Front. Dimitrov said:

... a powerful united front of the proletariat would exert a tremendous influence on all other strata of the working people, on the peasantry, on the urban petty bourgeoisie, on the intelligentsia. A united front would inspire the wavering groups with faith in the strength of the working class.

Such united working-class action, Dimitrov warned, demanded the exposure and defeat of those Social-Democratic leaders who talked peace but acted appeasement. While exposing such leaders, he stressed, we must constantly strive to win the masses of Social-Democratic workers for united action with Communists and eventually for organic unity.

In the United States, the conditions were present in the 'thirties for realizing the People's Front against fascism and war. Ultra-reac-

tion erupted through the notorious Liberty League, through Hearst, Coughlin, Talmadge, Huey Long—fascist and quasi-fascist forces operating in conspiracy with Morgan-Dupont interests. They concealed their fascist intent under the guise of "Americanism" and "defense of the Constitution," calculated to confuse and disarm the American masses. Dimitrov warned in his Report:

... the most reactionary circles of American finance capital, which are attacking Roosevelt, are above all the very force which is stimulating and organizing the fascist movement in the United States. Not to see the beginnings of real fascism in the United States behind the hypocritical outpourings of these circles "in defense of the democratic rights of the American citizen" is tantamount to misleading the working class in the struggle against its worst enemy.

With the protraction of the economic crisis, the growing militancy of the working class was expressed in the great strikes of the early 'thirties, the rise of the mass basic-industry unions of the C.I.O. and the wide united-front movement for unemployment and social insurance, initiated by the Communist Party. The country was tense with struggle involving all sections of the toiling population: the poor and impoverished farmers fought against evictions and foreclosures; the Negro people organized against Jim

Crow and white ruling-class terror; World War I veterans pressed for the bonus and other measures; the broad united-front American Youth Congress demanded jobs, education and peace. Through the mass conventions and constant activities of the American League against War and Fascism, the people's cry for peace and democracy was heard over the land.

Despite the substantial victories won on domestic issues by the loose coalition of the labor movement, the Negro people and sections of the urban middle strata, with the Roosevelt forces, a consolidated People's Front was not realized. The coalition checked the fascist forces and made possible significant economic and organizational gains for the trade-union movement and the Negro people. Nevertheless, the New Deal-labor coalition fell short of being that People's Front, based on a proletarian United Front, which the general offensive of fascism and threat of war made imperative.

The explanation lies mainly in the subjective factor, *viz.*, the anti-fascist forces, particularly the working class. Despite the emergence of the new industrial unions of the C.I.O., the trade-union movement failed to develop along lines of independent working-class political action and organization. Contributing to this failure was the distortion by our Party, under Browder's leadership, of Dimitrov's teaching on the Peo-

ple's Front through minimizing the role of the working class. In the amorphous "Democratic Front," the labor movement supporting the progressive policies of the New Deal was placed by its decisive leadership in a position of tail-ending Roosevelt. Thus, in the absence of a united labor's independent political movement, the very concessions won in mass struggle from the New Deal served to blunt the consciousness of the working class and to frustrate the potential People's Front.

Dimitrov did not for a moment lessen his fight for Marxism in favorable situations of united action. He struggled against all tendencies to submerge the proletarian component and dissolve the vanguard role of the Communist Party in the general united-front movement—the line which was later adopted by the Titoites on their road to complete betrayal of Marxism-Leninism. Thus Dimitrov taught:

Correctly to combine the operation of the policy of the People's Front with the propaganda of Marxism, with the raising of the theoretical level of the cadres of the working-class movement, with the mastery of the great teachings of Marx, Engels, Lenin, and Stalin, as a guide to action—all this we must learn and teach our cadres and the masses day after day. We must not allow a situation where "you cannot see the woods for the trees." We must not allow practice to become divorced from theory, a gap to develop between the fulfillment of the urgent tasks of today

and the
of the

Wh
capitu
revisio
under
Foster
self t
ism!

It i
sider
Comm
Party
ple's
vert"

recy."
Conv
ple's
der's
repu
orien
ist-L
prof
polic
ten y

The

From
today
fers
divis
war-
favo
the
"eco
maje
give
polic
to r
tion
pow

and the further perspectives and aims of the working-class struggle.

What a light this sheds on the capitulatory course of Browder-revisionism, from which our Party, under the leadership of Comrades Foster and Dennis, has redirected itself to the path of Marxism-Leninism!

It is in this light that we must consider the charge brought against the Communist leaders on trial that the Party, in 1945, broke with its People's Front policy in order to "revert" to "sectarianism" and "secrecy." The Party's Emergency (1945) Convention broke, not with the People's Front policy, but with Browder's revisionist distortion of it. By repudiating Browderism, the Party oriented itself along the true, Marxist-Leninist principles underlying the profoundly democratic People's Front policy, as formulated by Dimitrov ten years earlier.

The principles of the People's Front are basically applicable for us today, even though the situation differs from that of the 'thirties. The division of the imperialist camp into war-instigating states and peace-favoring states, and internally, in the U.S.A., into New Dealers and "economic royalists," has on all major issues, foreign and domestic, given way to a unified imperialist policy, despite certain differences as to methods and tactical considerations. Since the defeat of the Axis powers, American imperialism has

become the sustaining power of the world fascist forces and the main organizer of aggression against the Soviet Union and the People's Democracies in its drive to dominate the world.

It is clear that the chief task we face today is to help develop the people's anti-fascist and anti-war coalition to the broadest mass scope and on the basis of *all* issues that can weaken the forces making for fascism and war.

For such a people's coalition to be realized on a firm basis, as our Party has stressed these past four years, the working class must take the lead, forming its militant democratic alliance with the Negro people, working farmers, men and women of the professions, progressive church bodies, youth and women's organizations, and national groups. Exercise of its vital leadership role, our Party has consistently pointed out, demands of labor its class solidification, which can be achieved only through abandonment of the course of class collaboration in favor of a united class-struggle policy — a policy of united labor action, for the common class interests, in common defense, against the common class enemy and his labor-agents. The situation demands, as Comrade Dennis declared in his Report to the Party's Fourteenth Convention in August, 1948, "a bold and systematic application of the united front of struggle from below, combined with a resolute

effort to enlist in common action every leader, group and mass organization opposed to war and fascism, irrespective of all other differences."

In the new situation, we must promote the broadest understanding that the fight against fascism and war, to be consistently waged, must be an anti-monopoly and anti-imperialist fight, a fight directed against Wall Street imperialism as the main enemy. As Comrade Foster states when discussing in the above cited document the formation of the Communist Information Bureau in September 1947 by the leading Communist Parties of Europe:

For us, in this trial, the important thing to signalize is that the substance of the decisions of the nine big European Communist Parties was to counter the expansionist drive of American imperialism by essentially reaffirming and strengthening the basic anti-fascist, people's front tactical line that had been initiated by the Seventh Congress of the Comintern.

The policy, jointly, of the People's Front and the proletarian United Front was the further, concrete application of the principle set forth in the *Communist Manifesto* that the Communists "always and everywhere represent the interests of the movement as a whole." It was the historically necessary step of progress for the working class away from self-defeating isolation. The People's Front meant a great new strengthening of that open link,

which Dimitrov symbolized, between the Communists, the working class, and the masses of humanity. A far cry from the "conspiracy" charge at Leipzig and Foley Square!

* * *

Dimitrov, anti-fascist fighter who defied the whole Nazi power, international Communist leader who brought forward the People's Front policy, was all his life part of the struggles of the working class of his native land. He grew up in the Bulgarian revolutionary movement and emerged as the Bolshevik teacher and leader of the Bulgarian Communist Party, whose vanguard course he guided through the years of difficult class struggle. He was founder of the Fatherland Front, master statesman of the Bulgarian People's Democracy and organizer of its Socialist construction.

Dimitrov's contribution to the advance of his people stemmed from his profound Marxist-Leninist understanding of the relationship of the working-class struggle to the people's cause, to the nation's destiny.

As the driving force of the anti-fascist movement, the working class, Dimitrov taught, is the true defender of the nation.

The bourgeoisie, having long ago forfeited its early place as the nation's leader, has degenerated into the nation's betrayer. This degraded role was signalized when the bour-

geoisie
gates
armies
That
since
imper
with
maste
fascist
work
mono
with
trayal
Vichy
Vic
foreh
geois
on th
in Sp
reauc
China
head
Amer
days
day
that
the r
ers w
of th
To
is th
stine
emar
entir
force
Th
the
ploit
tradi
happ

geoisie of France in 1871 opened the gates of Paris for the Prussian enemy armies to assault the Communards. That course of national betrayal has since become the way of every imperialist bourgeoisie confronted with the will of the people to be masters of their fate. When German fascism attacked not only the French workers but the French nation, the monopolists of France collaborated with the aggressor in a national betrayal stamped with the name *Vichy*.

Vichy is the blood-mark on the forehead of every monopolist bourgeoisie in our times. It is the mark on the forehead of the ruling classes in Spain and in Greece, of the bureaucratic capitalists in Kuomintang China. It was the mark on the forehead of the British, French and American finance capitalists in the days of Munich. It is the mark today of the bourgeois ruling classes that are selling their nations down the river to the Wall Street marauders who have hoisted the pirate flag of the North Atlantic Pact.

Today the defender of the nation is the working class, which is destined to achieve, with its own emancipation, the freedom of the entire people. Of this emancipating force, Dimitrov said:

The interests of the class struggle of the proletariat against its native exploiters and oppressors are not in contradiction to the interests of a free and happy future of the nation. . . . By the

very fact of building at the present time its class organizations and consolidating its positions, by the very fact of defending democratic rights and liberties against fascism, by the very fact of fighting for the overthrow of capitalism, the working class is fighting for the future of the nation.

Dimitrov's stand in the Leipzig court symbolized the Marxist-Leninist rejection of national nihilism, of bourgeois cosmopolitanism. Answering the fascist slur of "uncivilized Bulgarian," he retorted: "It is not the Bulgarian people who are savage and barbarous. The only savages and barbarians in Bulgarian are the fascists." And he added: "I ask you, Mr. President—in what country are the fascists not barbarians and savages?" And is there a Hungarian, Chinese or American worker who did not grow in self-respect when Dimitrov answered the racist detractors: "I am proud of the fact that I am a son of the Bulgarian working class"?

Dimitrov fought national nihilism, not as a bourgeois nationalist, but as a proletarian internationalist who based himself firmly on the teachings of Lenin and Stalin. While warning against the danger of "Leftist" sectarianism, he combated relentlessly all Right opportunist deviators. Flexible in tactic, he was adamant in principle. Writing in 1937, he stressed:

When we carry on a resolute struggle for the defense of democratic rights.

and liberties against reaction and fascism, we do so as Marxists, as consistent proletarian revolutionaries, and not as bourgeois democrats and reformists. Where we come forward in defense of the national interests of our own people, in defense of their independence and liberty, we do not become nationalists or bourgeois patriots; we do so as proletarian revolutionaries and true sons of our people. When we come forward in defense of religious freedom against the fascist persecution of Catholics or Protestants, we do not retreat from our Marxist outlook, which is free of all religious superstitions.

Dedicated to the cause of the working class and the welfare of the nation, the Communist Party hurls back in the teeth of its accusers the charge of "foreign agent." This hoary slur has been the stock-in-trade of the capitalist class which knows no patriotism save the use of the American flag as a drape for profiteering at home and a stake for plunder abroad. In calling on the people to fight these national betrayers, the Communists are the real patriots, proved in a thousand battles for the people's welfare. For this reason, the Communists combat the rotten ideology of chauvinist nationalism, the cult of Anglo-Saxon "supremacy," the "American Century," and all such jingo arrogance whose unexpressed super-slogan is "Wall Street über Alles."

Today, when dollar imperialism seeks with its "cold war" Doctrines, Plans, and Pacts to turn the world

into one global Greece, the Communist Party and the entire labor movement face special responsibilities toward all peoples. In the true interests of the American nation, which are inter-related with the interests of all other nations, we work to build a powerful anti-war front and press for an American-Soviet friendship pact. As Marxists-Leninists, we work to rouse our people against the bipartisan policy of fomenting civil war in the People's Democracies and the New China, of bringing the colonial peoples under the sway of Wall Street.

It is as proletarian internationalists and as "true sons of our people" that we American Communists are waging an inexorable struggle against the chauvinist drive which the white imperialist ruling class is intensifying against the Negro people. The achievements of Negro rights and Negro national liberation is in the interest, not of the Negro people alone, but of the entire American people. History has abundantly confirmed the truth of Karl Marx's teaching, "A people which enslaves another people forges its own chains." In the spirit of Dimitroff's devotion to the true interests of all peoples, and in consonance with the Marxist-Leninist doctrines which are now on trial in the Federal court, Comrade Foster declares:

One of the proudest pages in our Party's history is its long and relentless

fight for full economic, political, and social equality of the Negro people. In the Scottsboro case, the Herndon case, the Camp Hill cases, the Trenton cases, and in scores of other struggles against the Jim-Crowers and the lynchers, the Communist Party has boldly taken the lead and blazed the trail to liberty for these most oppressed of all our people. The fight for Negro rights is a major front in the whole struggle for the defense and extension of democracy in this country.

Dimitrov, forced into exile by fascism in power, was nonetheless active abroad in the interests of the working class and Communist Party of his native land, in the face even of the heavy prices that were twice placed on his head by the fascist Bulgarian government. Thus it was that, in his first speech upon his return to Bulgaria, on the 6th of November, 1945, Dimitrov movingly spoke to his people:

Twenty-two years have already elapsed since I was last on Bulgarian soil. You will not doubt my words when I tell you that during that whole time, wherever I have been, whatever I have been doing, never for one moment have I ceased to think of, and to struggle for, the Bulgarian people, for their future, happiness and prosperity.

After Bulgaria was freed from the German incubus and the quisling regime, Dimitrov led in establishing the Bulgarian People's Democracy which has entered the path toward Socialism. He led in

building the free and sovereign Bulgaria which, in his words, "will leave no open doors for a return to the shameful past of monarchism, fascism and greater Bulgarian chauvinism," which "will not dance to the tune of different capitalist corporations and trusts," and which "will not grease the axle of any anti-Slav or anti-Soviet policy leading to enmity between the peoples."

Dimitrov constantly stressed the enormous role of the Soviet Union in liberating Bulgaria, in standing guard—as leader of the camp of peace and democracy—over the independence and security of the people's Bulgaria, and in providing moral and material assistance to the people in their transition to Socialism. Dimitrov's emphasis on this mighty role of the Soviet Union is a basic theme underlying every section of his report to the memorable Fifth Congress of the Bulgarian Communist Party, held in December 1948. Thus, in defining the character, role and perspectives of the people's democratic state, Dimitrov declared:

The People's Democracy stands for internationalism. Nationalism is incompatible with People's Democracy. Our Party sees in internationalism, in international cooperation headed by the great Stalin, a guarantee for the independent existence, prosperity and progress of our country toward Socialism. We think that nationalism, no matter behind what mask, is an enemy

of Communism. This was clearly manifested by the anti-Communist actions of Tito's nationalist group in Yugoslavia. Hence, combating nationalism is a primary duty of the Communists. . . .

The entire future of our people depends, on the one hand, on the might of the Soviet Union in whose friendship we are vitally interested, and, on the other, on the readiness and ability of our people, in case of capitalist aggression, to fulfill their duty honorably in the common fight.

Here we see, confirmed and extended, Dimitrov's long-held and profound conviction, which he brilliantly proclaimed in 1935:

The touchstone of the devotion and honesty of anyone active in the labor movement, of every workers' party and labor organization, of every democrat in the capitalist countries, is their attitude toward the great country of Socialism.

Today more than ever, when the Soviet Union, the greatest single force in the world for peace, is the object of the most vicious concentration of calumny by reactionaries of every stripe, this statement is a legacy for everyone who wants to fight fascism, war, and national oppression.

What a light this sheds on the bourgeois-nationalist policy of the Tito clique in Yugoslavia, whose treason to the cause of Socialism and the anti-imperialist front Dimitrov mercilessly laid bare!

What a warning this carries for the dominant "leaders" of labor in the United States, who, capitulating to the dictates of the monopolists, began their postwar course of betrayal by slandering the Soviet Union, only to end in selling out the day-to-day struggle of the American working class!

What a lesson this holds for those who, while declaring themselves for peace, nonetheless lend themselves, in one way or another, to the warmongers' anti-Soviet campaign!

The Communist Dimitrov, in loyalty to Marxism-Leninism, served his nation and his working class best. So, too, we American Communists affirm our devotion to the American people and the American working class, from which we spring, when we raise the alarm against the men of the trusts who are driving our country toward fascism and war. As formulated by our National Chairman, Comrade Foster:

The foundation principle of all Communist policy is to make ours a freer, happier and more prosperous nation. Whoever does not understand this high patriotic motive as the basis of our policy knows precisely nothing about the Communist Party in this country. . . .

The Party's three present-day central issues are also obviously in the very best interest of our whole people. These are, first, to protect the workers, by social insurance and other measures, against the ravages of the developing

economic crisis, signs of whose coming are daily multiplying on the horizon; second, to defeat growing fascism in the United States, with all its insidious and complex manifestations; and, third, to prevent the outbreak of a new world war, the danger of which becomes more and more threatening as Wall Street imperialism develops its policies of imperialist expansion and world conquest.

As we go forward with this policy in the true interests of the American nation, we hold before us the great example of Dimitrov and remember his words which apply, under the

new, perilous conditions, to the situation today:

[The policy of the People's Front] has opened up the perspective of developing a wide anti-war front, not only for the Communist vanguard, but for the working class of the whole world, and for the peoples of every land. The extent to which this worldwide front is realized and comes into operation will determine whether the fascist and other imperialist instigators of war will be able in the near future to kindle a new imperialist war, or whether their fiendish hands will be hacked off by the ax of a powerful anti-war front.

The Beginnings of the Economic Crisis in the United States

by Alexander Bittelman

[With the following section we conclude publication of the article begun in the July issue.—Ed.]

III. AMERICAN CAPITALISM STILL HOPES TO AVERT CRISIS

American capitalists still hope to be able to avert the economic crisis, although there are differences—also among bourgeois economists—on the exact meaning of the declining trends and on what should be done to “escape” the crisis.

Yet there is agreement that there are “dangers” in the economic situation, that the imperialist drive for markets and world domination must be intensified, that the Marshall Plan must be carried through, that the armament program must be speeded up, *that the working class and its allies (small and middle farmers, the Negro people, lower middle classes, masses of national groups, etc.) must be forced to carry the main burden of the developing crisis* (though there are differences as to methods). There is also general agreement among capitalists that the war preparations must be hastened politically and militarily (the North Atlantic Alliance

and rearmament of the West European agents of Wall Street), even though there are important differences on tactics and forms.

The official position is more “optimistic” as to economic outlook (“disinflation” to be followed by rising trends). The Truman Administration seeks more government controls and favors putting the main burden of the crisis mostly on the Negro people, the unskilled and semi-skilled workers making certain exceptions for the top layers of skilled labor and the extensive reformist bureaucracy and for certain farm and middle-class groups. The policies of the Truman Administration to meet the crisis continue to be developed in a maze of reckless demagoguery and deceit, including big promises to the masses which the Administration never intends to fulfill nor can fulfill. The Truman policies as formulated by his economic advisers, are theoretically based upon a number of economic assumptions of Keynes, especially the much discredited “theory” that capitalism by manipulating its credit and fiscal structure and investment policies through government intervention

can "escape" economic crises. These are the "theories" of "managed" currencies grown over into "theories" of "managed" capitalist economies, which theories are assiduously spread among the masses by the reformist agents of American imperialism.* As decided by the 14th Convention of our Party and re-emphasized by Comrade Foster in his letter on the economic situation,** we must prepare ourselves for a more thorough mass propaganda campaign against these dangerous Keynesian illusions and for developing mass understanding of the true nature of capitalism and capitalist crises.

The Republican opposition is influenced mainly by a more "pessimistic" outlook, is unwilling to give

* Bourgeois economists of the Keynesian school are showing themselves the most helpless in their analyses of the crisis. With them, the crisis is here and it is not here, it is coming and it is not coming, all depending upon the ability of the Keynesian economists to persuade Wall Street to adopt the Keynesian program for "preventing" the crisis. Here is George Soule, writing in the *New Republic* (April 25), and maintaining stoutly that "we are not in a depression." But then he begins to retreat. He admits that "there is some chance that the economic tide has started to recede" and that we have in fact "a recession," a fancy name for the beginning of the crisis. But he goes further than that. His only hope that this so-called "recession" may be "moderate" is "if business allows prices to fall so as to maintain and increase consumer demand, instead of keeping prices up, cutting production and laying off men." But the monopolies are already doing the opposite of what Soule wants them to do: they maintain monopoly prices, they force down wholesale farm and non-monopoly prices, they cut wages and production and are laying off men. But even if they followed Soule's advice to the letter, that could not check the developing crisis. It would mitigate somewhat the course of the crisis for the masses but that will be achieved not by the writings of Keynesian economists, but by the hard and militant struggles of the masses against the war-making and reactionary course of the monopolies and their government.

** Comrade Foster's letter, addressed to the National Committee, was the basis of National Committee discussions on the economic situation.

Truman more economic powers, is not inclined to placate the top layers of the skilled workers or to make any concessions to the reformist trade-union bureaucracy and is more inclined to concentrate on arming the United States rather than Marshallized countries, whose internal situation is unstable and where Communist influence is growing.

These differences in the camp of the capitalists reflect in part different attitudes and interests—conflicting interests—of different monopoly groups; and with the development of mass struggles led by the workers, these differences can be exploited usefully. But the main thing is the fact that the monopolies and their servants of both parties are seeking to make the masses carry the main burden of the crisis and are agreed to intensify the imperialist drive for world conquest and the preparations for war in the hope of escaping a serious economic crash.

To achieve this aim, the monopolies are banking primarily on three things: continued expenditures under the Marshall Plan to subsidize American exports to Western Europe and the expansion of Wall Street's economic domination in those countries plus the "new" plan for colonial conquest; the armament program for the United States, and for Western Europe as called for by the North Atlantic war alliance; and further attacks upon the living standards of the working class (especially its most exploited sections),

the working farmers, the Negro people, lower middle classes, etc., in order to make them carry the main burden of the developing crisis, and in the expectation that this may help to avert a catastrophic economic crash.

It is already well established that Marshall Plan subsidies of United States exports to Western Europe, far from assisting in that area's economic recovery, have actually retarded the recovery of the Western European economies. This means that while the Marshall Plan helps the monopolies of the U.S. to secure a stranglehold upon the economic life of the Western European countries and, above all, promotes the cold war and war preparations, it does not and cannot help create normal markets for peacetime American industries. Thus is demonstrated the utter falsity and fraud of the assertions of the Marshall-Plan agents in the American labor movement—Murray, Reuther, Green, Dubinsky—that the Marshall Plan improves the economic situation and the conditions of American labor.

Here is a brief but telling description of the economic situation in the Marshall Plan countries:

The situation is even worse [than in the U.S.—A.B.] in the Marshall countries: there are close to 3 million unemployed in Italy, over 300,000 in little Belgium, more than 200,000 in Holland. Britain is experiencing severe economic difficulties. Her trade deficit

has reached a level unprecedented in peacetime.*

The International Labor Office survey shows the following: "Denmark reported an unemployment rise from 4.2 percent to 11.6 percent between November and December. . . . In France joblessness increased by two-thirds."**

It is important to note that a committee of United Nations economic experts has submitted a report which proposes a world-wide economic conference "to map international action against recession," warning that only international action can "stem economic disaster."*** Of course, this sort of international action will not check the developing crisis—which is *taking on the nature of an economic crisis in the whole capitalist world*—but will help the Wall Street monopolies to place the burden of the crisis, not only on the American people, but also on the peoples of the other capitalist countries. Therefore, such action must be opposed.

The important point of analysis here is that the developing economic crisis in the United States is turning into an economic crisis in all capitalist countries, in all economies under Marshall-Plan domination.

The capitalist economies in Western Europe are in a crisis condition which the Marshall Plan is aggra-

* *For a Lasting Peace, For a People's Democracy!* February 15, 1949.

** *The New York Times*, February 27, 1949.

*** *The New York Times*, April 20, 1949.

vating and prolonging. This, in its turn, makes it certain that the further subsidizing of U.S. exports to Western Europe with Marshall-Plan funds cannot prevent or check the further development of the economic crisis in the United States. What it may accomplish is to relieve American business of some of the commodity surpluses at the expense of the mass of American taxpayers and to the primary benefit of the monopolies. This may or may not have certain effects upon the rapidity with which the economic crisis develops and on how soon it results in a crash, depending upon many other factors; but it cannot check the further unfolding of the crisis itself.

In this connection, we must also note two more crucial facts. The drive of the American monopolies to prevent the industrialization and economic independence of Latin America is keeping the economies of those countries in conditions of semi-crisis. Hence, Latin-American markets cannot be looked upon as something that can seriously retard, let alone check, the further development of the economic crisis in the United States.

And the second fact is that the American imperialist drive in China to secure economic domination over and strangulation of the Chinese economy, as well as political and military domination, has suffered a disastrous defeat. Consequently, the monopolies of the U.S. cannot count on being able to make the mass of

the Chinese people bear the cost of the U.S. economic crisis. Normal trade relations with the new China are possible, but only on the basis of full equality and absolute non-interference by U.S. imperialism in Chinese affairs. But this is not the present policy of the U.S. monopolies.

In this connection, we must comment on Truman's "bold, new plan" to Marshallize the colonial and dependent countries. It is well known that American imperialism has already made serious inroads—economic, political, and military—into the colonial possessions of the Marshall Plan countries: Africa, Indonesia, India, the Middle East, etc. This matter requires extended treatment. At this point, suffice it to say that this new "bold" plan of American imperialism to take their colonies away from the European capitalist countries, besides robbing those countries of their economic independence, can have no appreciable effect upon the further development of the economic crisis in the U.S. What this "plan" has already begun to accomplish is to sharpen imperialist rivalries and contradictions and, especially, to put the colonial and dependent peoples on guard against the new dangers facing them and to stimulate their struggles for national freedom and independence—freedom from Wall Street's beneficence as well.

As to the probable economic effect of the armaments program on the economy of the U.S., it is clear that

this is undoubtedly already having, and will continue to have, serious economic effects. The question is what kind of effects. Will this program check or seriously retard the further development of the economic crisis?

The first effect of the armaments program is to strengthen the tendencies toward the development of a *war economy*. This means to strengthen the tendencies of development toward a one-sided economy in which the industries producing war equipment are overloaded while all the other industries, especially consumption-goods industries, are in a crisis. Hence, the armament and war budget for 1949-50, if it becomes law and is put into effect, will tend to keep certain heavy industries—steel, motor vehicles, chemical, atom bomb plants—busy, thus affecting to a certain extent *the rate of development* of the economic crisis. That is, it may slow up the unfolding of the crisis and retard somewhat its approach to a crash. But then a point must inevitably be reached when—if war is not actually unleashed to continue to feed the war economy—a catastrophic economic crash must take place.

Regarding the armament plans for Western Europe, as provided by the North Atlantic war alliance, we must orientate on the rise of a sharp people's peace opposition in the U.S. which will fight against the war alliance and, especially, the militarization of Western Europe, which the

monopolies are trying to push through at the expense of the American people, and in order to let loose a war against the Soviet Union and to crush the labor and socialist movements in Western Europe. We must also orientate on the development of serious differences among the imperialist ruling circles in the U.S., especially on the armament provisions of the war alliance—differences which may assume considerable importance if mass movements of the people assume impressive proportions. If the peace movement succeeds in defeating the war alliance and its armament plans, this may be followed by changes in the general political situation in which the establishment of normal and peaceful trade relations between the U.S. and the rest of the world, especially with the Soviet Union, the new democracies and the new China, will become a practical possibility. In that case, the rate of development of the economic crisis in the U.S. would be retarded. But if the war alliance goes through, and attempts are made by U.S. imperialism and its West European clients to start an armament program for war, this will seriously aggravate the general political situation, worsen the economic conditions in Western Europe and *intensify the further development of the crisis in the United States*.

This leaves the monopoly campaign of new sharp attacks upon the living standards of the masses as

means of making the people pay for the crisis and in the hope of checking its development. This campaign takes the form of mass lay-offs, wage cuts, maintenance of monopoly prices and "deflation" of wholesale farm prices and non-monopoly industrial prices and so on. This campaign, if allowed to develop, will undoubtedly save the major portion of the profits of the monopolies despite the crisis, will eliminate many of their rivals and thus strengthen the position of the monopolies in the economy of the country and in the government. But this campaign will also make the course of the crisis infinitely more painful for the masses, deepening the crisis and driving the U.S. to an economic catastrophe, instead of retarding the development of the crisis or checking it.

We should add here that there is absolutely no economic basis for the assumption in certain Wall Street circles that the present declining trends will not go very far and will even be reversed because the steel, auto, airplane and certain other industries are in a sound position due to continuing favorable market possibilities. The real facts are that the steel, auto and airplane industries *are approaching the condition of saturated markets at home and growing sharp competition abroad.* None of these industries can or will retard the course of the crisis by production of peace-time goods. On the contrary, to the extent that these industries are not turned more com-

pletely to the production of war equipment, they will themselves soon begin to show the effects of the developing crisis of overproduction, thus deepening the entire course of the crisis.

To sum up on what the U.S. monopolies can accomplish with their policies to meet the economic crisis, we must say: nothing the monopolies can do, short of precipitating a new world war, can check the further development of the economic crisis. What the monopolies may succeed in doing, if the mass struggles do not seriously intervene, is to place the main burden of the crisis on the masses, intensify the development of a war economy in the U.S., and possibly retard somewhat the rapidity with which the crisis develops; *but they can only do this in such a way as to lay the basis for the coming of an economic crash of catastrophic proportions.*

The continued deepening of the *general crisis* of the world capitalist system (which the notorious revisionist Browder has "abolished," substituting for it Wall Street's "progressive" imperialism) is making certain that the developing economic crisis in the U.S. will not be checked, but will spread and deepen in the American economy and will involve the rest of the capitalist world. Expressing the further deepening of the general crisis of capitalism is the growth and consolidation of the world of socialism and of the countries in transition to socialism. The

this is undoubtedly already having, and will continue to have, serious economic effects. The question is what kind of effects. Will this program check or seriously retard the further development of the economic crisis?

The first effect of the armaments program is to strengthen the tendencies toward the development of a *war economy*. This means to strengthen the tendencies of development toward a one-sided economy in which the industries producing war equipment are overloaded while all the other industries, especially consumption-goods industries, are in a crisis. Hence, the armament and war budget for 1949-50, if it becomes law and is put into effect, will tend to keep certain heavy industries—steel, motor vehicles, chemical, atom bomb plants—busy, thus affecting to a certain extent *the rate of development* of the economic crisis. That is, it may slow up the unfolding of the crisis and retard somewhat its approach to a crash. But then a point must inevitably be reached when—if war is not actually unleashed to continue to feed the war economy—a catastrophic economic crash must take place.

Regarding the armament plans for Western Europe, as provided by the North Atlantic war alliance, we must orientate on the rise of a sharp people's peace opposition in the U.S. which will fight against the war alliance and, especially, the militarization of Western Europe, which the

monopolies are trying to push through at the expense of the American people, and in order to let loose a war against the Soviet Union and to crush the labor and socialist movements in Western Europe. We must also orientate on the development of serious differences among the imperialist ruling circles in the U.S., especially on the armament provisions of the war alliance—differences which may assume considerable importance if mass movements of the people assume impressive proportions. If the peace movement succeeds in defeating the war alliance and its armament plans, this may be followed by changes in the general political situation in which the establishment of normal and peaceful trade relations between the U.S. and the rest of the world, especially with the Soviet Union, the new democracies and the new China, will become a practical possibility. In that case, the rate of development of the economic crisis in the U.S. would be retarded. But if the war alliance goes through, and attempts are made by U.S. imperialism and its West European clients to start an armament program for war, this will seriously aggravate the general political situation, worsen the economic conditions in Western Europe and *intensify the further development of the crisis in the United States*.

This leaves the monopoly campaign of new sharp attacks upon the living standards of the masses as a

means of making the people pay for the crisis and in the hope of checking its development. This campaign takes the form of mass lay-offs, wage cuts, maintenance of monopoly prices and "deflation" of wholesale farm prices and non-monopoly industrial prices and so on. This campaign, if allowed to develop, will undoubtedly save the major portion of the profits of the monopolies despite the crisis, will eliminate many of their rivals and thus strengthen the position of the monopolies in the economy of the country and in the government. But this campaign will also make the course of the crisis infinitely more painful for the masses, deepening the crisis and driving the U.S. to an economic catastrophe, instead of retarding the development of the crisis or checking it.

We should add here that there is absolutely no economic basis for the assumption in certain Wall Street circles that the present declining trends will not go very far and will even be reversed because the steel, auto, airplane and certain other industries are in a sound position due to continuing favorable market possibilities. The real facts are that the steel, auto and airplane industries are *approaching the condition of saturated markets at home and growing sharp competition abroad.* None of these industries can or will retard the course of the crisis by production of peace-time goods. On the contrary, to the extent that these industries are not turned more com-

pletely to the production of war equipment, they will themselves soon begin to show the effects of the developing crisis of overproduction, thus deepening the entire course of the crisis.

To sum up on what the U.S. monopolies can accomplish with their policies to meet the economic crisis, we must say: nothing the monopolies can do, short of precipitating a new world war, can check the further development of the economic crisis. What the monopolies may succeed in doing, if the mass struggles do not seriously intervene, is to place the main burden of the crisis on the masses, intensify the development of a war economy in the U.S., and possibly retard somewhat the rapidity with which the crisis develops; *but they can only do this in such a way as to lay the basis for the coming of an economic crash of catastrophic proportions.*

The continued deepening of the *general crisis* of the world capitalist system (which the notorious revisionist Browder has "abolished," substituting for it Wall Street's "progressive" imperialism) is making certain that the developing economic crisis in the U.S. will not be checked, but will spread and deepen in the American economy and will involve the rest of the capitalist world. Expressing the further deepening of the general crisis of capitalism is the growth and consolidation of the world of socialism and of the countries in transition to socialism. The

successful completion of the post-war Five-Year Plan in the Soviet Union in four years is of world-shaking importance. And the new democracies "are now emerging from the phase of restoring their economies on the basis of short-term plans, to the reorganization and development of the economy in keeping with long-term planning."*

This growth and consolidation is promoted by a democratic policy of economic cooperation between the Soviet Union and the new democracies, a policy which stands in marked contrast to the Marshall-Plan policy of domination and violence.

Economic cooperation between the new democracies and the Soviet Union is a striking expression of genuine democratic cooperation, based upon the recognized principle of equality and mutual assistance, aimed at promoting the national economy and securing the well-being of the peoples.**

Further expressing the deepening of the general crisis of the world system of capitalism is the process of colonial liberation, especially in the Far East—China, Indonesia, etc.—but also in the Middle East, in Africa and in Latin America. World capitalism can no longer expect to be able to repair the fortunes of its economy by means of the super-profits extracted from the colonial and dependent peoples. Truman's "bold, new plan" for Wall Street domina-

tion in the colonies is introduced into a world where the colonial peoples themselves, in alliance with the world of Socialism and People's Democracies will speak the decisive word on this question—and it will not be Truman's word.

Consequently, while the developing economic crisis in the U.S. will undoubtedly produce certain special features and characteristics under the impact of the deepening general crisis of the world system of capitalism, the economic crisis itself will continue to develop and will, in its turn, further deepen the general crisis.

BROWDER'S CRISIS "PROGRAM" AIDS IMPERIALIST DRIVE

We have already had occasion to note that Browder-revisionism is continuing its efforts to propagate the program of Wall Street imperialism—the program of world conquest and war—in an effort, first, to "prevent" the crisis, and then, to check its development. And all this under the guise of offering a democratic program to "aid" the people of America and the peoples abroad.

Browder has hastened to present his stuff dealing with the economic crisis in a new pamphlet in which he significantly makes his main attack upon Comrade Kuzminov's article on "The Crisis Character of the Economic Development of the U.S. in the Postwar Period."*

As we have seen in Section II of

* *For a Lasting Peace, For a People's Democracy!* February 1, 1949.

** *Ibid.*

* Reprinted in *Political Affairs*, May 1949.—*Ed.*

this article,* Kuzminov has demonstrated that the crisis character of American postwar economic development derives from the extraordinary further sharpening of the contradiction between production and consumption, between the reduced buying power of the masses and the productive capacities expanded by the war orders. In other words, Kuzminov demonstrated that the very expansion of U.S. industry during the war has laid the basis for the further sharpening of the fundamental contradictions of capitalism, expressed in the developing crisis.

Further, Comrade Kuzminov has shown that these contradictions between production and consumption and the crisis character of American postwar economic development are the motive power behind the drive of Wall Street for world conquest. American imperialism seeks to overcome these contradictions by conquering and dominating other peoples and countries and by preparing war to achieve these aims.

But this fundamental analysis is veritable poison to Browderism. For Browder peddles the discredited idea that the drive of American imperialism for world domination is a "progressive" development, that this drive aims to provide prosperity for the American people and to "help" the economic development of other peoples. Naturally, Kuzminov's analysis became a target for Browderite slander and attack.

Browderism has to be energetically and systematically combated. And in connection with the developing crisis, we must combat it especially on these points:

1. The extreme further sharpening of the contradiction between production and consumption cannot be overcome under capitalism, by capitalist governments and policies. Only a people's government headed by the working class and planfully directing economic development toward socialism, can overcome the sharpening of this contradiction and eventually abolish the contradiction itself, thus abolishing economic crises. Browder's contention that labor and the democratic forces generally must help American imperialism to secure markets for American industry, "to help industrialize backward peoples," and thus to overcome the sharpening contradiction between production and consumption, is sheer fraud. In essence, its purpose is to tie the American people to Wall Street's drive to world domination and to a new world war.

2. We do not propose that the American people demand of U.S. imperialism and its government that it "industrialize backward peoples," "help other peoples economically," or "bring prosperity to the American people." To make such proposals is to deceive the masses, to cultivate in them dangerous illusions that Wall Street imperialism and monopoly capitalism are capable of doing all these things. To make such

* *Political Affairs*, July 1949, pp. 29-30—Ed.

proposals is to adopt Browderism.

3. We expose and combat Truman's "bold, new scheme to help backward peoples" as a reactionary, imperialist scheme to Marshallize the colonial and dependent countries, which Browder is in reality propagating.

4. We seek to rally the masses in struggle *to make the monopolies pay for the crisis, to resist Wall Street's drive to war and to combat the war preparations, to defend the living standards of the masses and their democratic rights.* And we point out in our agitation and propaganda that the fight for peace demands, among other things, that the United States establish normal trade relations with the Soviet Union, the People's Democracies, the new China and all other countries; that this country abandon the Marshall Plan for conquering the economies of Western Europe and choking their development; and that these measures (normal trade relations on the basis of equality) will contribute toward moderating and mitigating the course of the developing crisis for the masses *if at the same time the American working class and its allies fight effectively against Wall Street's policies of placing the burden of the crisis upon the masses of the people.*

In other words, to protect the interests of the American people, their living standards and rights, in the course of the developing economic crisis, means to rally the masses for

struggle simultaneously for the economic demands of the masses, for peace and for democracy; it means that, whatever category of demands is the immediate practical objective of a particular struggle, it must be linked up with the other categories of demands in whatever form is most appropriate in the given situation.

It will be found that this policy has not been followed in our mass work with any degree of consistency, a grave weakness which has to be rapidly corrected.

5. We must expose and combat the new Browderite job on the question of the economic crisis in which the general crisis of the world system of capitalism is "abolished" by identifying imperialism with the general crisis. By identifying imperialism with the general crisis, Browder leaves out the rise of the socialist world as the most basic factor in the general crisis of capitalism, he leaves out the growth and consolidation of the socialist world as the main factor in the deepening of the general crisis of capitalism, and is thus negating the socialist perspective as the only and final solution to crises and wars. Moreover, in identifying imperialism with the general crisis of capitalism, Browder seeks to open for world capitalism a new lease on life, since, in the Browderite conceptions, imperialism in this period means almost exclusively United States imperialism and U.S. imperialism is "progressive" because it has a "progressive mission" to per-

form
that
tribu
more
the
ques
tack
the
and
is a
drive
and
Unit

IV.

I.
the
since
as th
crisis
clude
stabil
and
ward

2.
worl
nopo
opme
Plan
may
opme
ing
econo
diti
crash

3.
valrie
aggra

4.
to wh
readj

form. We must demonstrate, finally, that these so-called "theoretical" contributions of Browder are nothing more nor less than contributions to the Wall Street drive to world conquest and war, just as Browder's attack on the Party's main line since the Emergency Convention of 1945 and the reconstitution of the Party is a contribution to Wall Street's drive to outlaw the Communist Party and to promote fascism in the United States.

IV. CONCLUSIONS

1. The sharply declining trends in the American capitalist economy since last November must be viewed as the beginning of the economic crisis of overproduction. This excludes the possibility of the so-called stabilization of the U.S. economy and the resumption of a sharp upward trend.

2. Barring the outbreak of a new world war, no policies of the monopolies can check the further development of the crisis. The Marshall Plan and the armament program may tend to retard the rate of development of the crisis, but strengthening the tendencies toward a war economy can only establish the conditions for an inevitable economic crash of catastrophic proportions.

3. The sharpening imperialist rivalries and struggle for markets will aggravate the course of the crisis.

4. The monopolies are not averse to what they call a "slight downward readjustment" in prices of farm and

other non-monopoly products, but they are in mortal fear of the developing crisis. At the same time, the monopolies are already making full use of the first signs of the crisis to halt and defeat the wage movements (helped in this by Murray, Green, Reuther, Dubinsky), to stampede popular support for larger armament expenditures and for intensifying the "cold war" generally and to squeeze out weaker rivals.

5. The Truman program for meeting the present economic situation is in substance the class program of the monopolies. Whether it is called a policy of "managed" economy or of "planned" economy, its objective is to promote the program of the monopolies, to make the masses pay for the developing crisis, but to do it in such a way—by demagoguery, deceit and collaboration with the reformist trade-union bureaucracy and reactionary Social-Democrats—as to placate the upper layer of the farmers and skilled workers and to confuse and demoralize the struggles of the working-class masses and their allies. It is from these special Truman tactics and methods, as well as from certain economic frictions within the monopolies, that the "Right" opposition to Truman's "managed" economy arises.

6. To meet the attempts of the monopolies to place the burden of the developing crisis upon the masses of the people and to make them pay the rising cost of war preparations,

labor and its allies (working farmers, the Negro people, lower middle classes, the masses in the national groups) must launch a counter-offensive *to make the monopolies pay the cost of the crisis.*

7. Realizing that the developing economic crisis is strengthening all aggressive and warmaking forces in American imperialism, labor and its allies must intensify the fight against the "cold war," against the war preparations, against the North Atlantic war alliance, and the rearmament of Western Europe, against the war budget—and must wage a struggle for friendship and collaboration with the Soviet Union, for a pact of peace between the United States and the Soviet Union, for normal and peaceful trade relations with other countries on the basis of equality.

8. Realizing further that the developing economic crisis is intensifying the reactionary drive of the monopolies at home, stimulating the further growth of attacks on labor, upon the peace and progressive movements of the American people in general, upon the Communist vanguard of the American people, stimulating the further growth of persecutions and oppression of the Negro people, of anti-Semitism and of attacks upon the foreign-born, labor and its allies must redouble their efforts against this reactionary and pro-fascist drive of the monopolies promoted by the two major parties and the Truman Administration.

9. In view of the developing economic crisis and the intensifying attacks of the monopolies upon the living standards and democratic liberties of the masses which are taking place in a situation of heightened war preparations and growing war danger; in view of the emergence of the bi-partisan Senate coalition which gives Truman all the excuses he wants for betraying the election promises for civil rights and progressive economic measures—in view of all this, new possibilities have arisen for the building of broad united-front movements of struggle in the industries, among the unemployed, in the unions and in the communities, also in all fields of political struggle for peace and democracy; also in the relations between the Progressive Party and other progressive political tendencies and currents; *but especially in the relations between the Communist Party and the working class and its allies—under the slogans:*

a. *Protect the living standards of the masses of the people; make the monopolies pay the cost of the economic crisis.*

For wage increases, shorter hours without reduction in pay, adequate unemployment insurance and relief, extension of the scope and benefits of unemployment insurance.

For the protection of the income of the small and medium farmers and of the small businessmen.

For a people's tax program as formulated by the 14th National Con-

venti
b.
pac
the J
Fo
tic w
plans
mal
the
Chin
of ec
c.
of th
Bill
mon
Fo
For
the C
nist
legis
dem
Aga
mun
Sem
ganc
d.
unit
with
For
10
pen
chal
the
the
bins
abili
to t
rog
labo
11
step

vention of the Communist Party.

b. *End the "cold war." For a peace pact between the United States and the Soviet Union.*

For the defeat of the North Atlantic war alliance and the armament plans for Western Europe. For normal trade relations with the U.S.S.R., the New Democracies, the new China and all countries on the basis of equality.

c. *Defend the democratic liberties of the American people. Defend the Bill of Rights against the attacks of monopoly reaction.*

For the repeal of Taft-Hartley. For the defense of the civil rights of the Communists and of the Communist Party. Against all reactionary legislation seeking to curtail the democratic rights of the people. Against the outlawing of the Communist Party. For outlawing anti-Semitism and anti-Negro propaganda.

d. *For the unity of labor. For the unity of the American working class with the workers of all countries. For the unity of W.F.T.U.*

10. The success of this fight depends entirely upon our ability to challenge more effectively among the masses the treacherous policies of the Murrays, Greens, Reuthers, Dubinskys, etc. It depends upon the ability of the working-class vanguard to unmask and combat the demagoguery of Truman and of Wall Street's labor lieutenants.

11. The Communist Party must step forward as the vanguard of this

fight, and the building of the Party among the masses must be placed on a basis of utmost concentration. We must find more effective ways for the leaders of the Party now on trial to head and lead this struggle of the masses.

SOME SPECIAL PROBLEMS

1. On the Wallace "Budget for Abundance." We support this program as the program of the Progressive Party, not of the Communist Party. We must urge the Progressive Party to make this program the basis of daily political struggle, the means of building the party among the masses, the program of forthcoming election struggles and the instrument for new united-front approaches to other progressive political currents in the light of the emergence of the new bi-partisan coalition in the Senate and Truman's virtual acceptance of it and collaboration with it.

2. We must carry on an ideological campaign to combat all illusions concerning the possibility of doing away with economic crisis under capitalism, the possibility of planning or managing the economy so long as the government is dominated by the capitalist monopolies and the ability of the U.S. monopolies and of the Truman Administration to check the development of the present economic crisis by Keynesian or other measures.

3. We oppose in principle all ap-

propriations, even one cent, for armaments and war preparations, for the imperialist Truman government. We urge all progressives to vote against all military and war-preparation budgetary appropriations. Here we must take issue with the Wallace program, which seeks only to reduce the war budget.

4. We must rally mass opposition to Truman's demands for stand-by powers to control wages and prices. We fight for the rollback of prices and against monopoly prices in general. We support effective measures for rent control under people's supervision.

In this connection, we must draw attention to the analysis of the growing elements of state monopoly capitalism in the U.S. made by the 14th Convention of the Communist Party. This analysis in the draft resolution laid down important ideological and political tasks which now assume even greater meaning because the more advanced stage of war preparations and the developing crisis are intensifying the further growth of the elements of state monopoly capitalism.

As established by the Convention resolution, the growing domination of the monopolies in the economy and government of the U.S., made more vicious and dangerous by the growth of state monopoly capitalism, has the immediate political effect of stimulating fascist developments and the fascization of the state and of infinitely increasing the war preparations and the aggressiveness of American imperialism.

Further, inasmuch as measures for the further stimulation of the elements of state monopoly capitalism will be represented to the people as desirable economic intervention of the government in the interests of the masses, we must consistently oppose every extension of monopoly power in the government under whatever guise. We must rally mass struggles against the monopolies in all fields and steer the daily fight in the direction of the major demand *for curbing the power of the monopolies and for a people's government, and we must strengthen our ideological and mass propaganda fight for Marxism-Leninism, for Socialism.*

by S

EIGH
last F
been
the e
right
trade

We
of A
6 wh
Trum

Mi
the e
tain
tory
gains
mont
ship
was
with
new
conti
—Tr
sert t
and

Th
proce
is ab
ceed
cent
dollar
you v
all of
gethe

As the C. I. O. Convention Nears

by Sid Stein

EIGHT MONTHS have elapsed since the last Presidential election. These have been months of severe attacks upon the economic standards, the political rights and the very existence of the trade-union movement.

We recall the reaction of millions of American workers on November 6 when the news was flashed that Truman had defeated Dewey.

Millions of workers influenced by the election campaign oratory of certain labor leaders felt that the victory was real and that substantial gains were to be expected in the months that lay ahead. The leadership of the A. F. of L. and C.I.O. was quick to herald the "victory" with lavish statements, promises of a new New Deal if only the workers continued to rely on the lesser evil—Truman—and did nothing to assert their own independent political and economic strength.

Thus, Philip Murray said: "We proceeded upon a theory—and that is about the theory that we did proceed upon, in the course of the recent election—that if you put two dollars on a horse in a horse race you want that horse to win. We put all of our might and our effort, together with the expenditure of legi-

timate monies, toward the election of President Truman and a liberal Congress; and we won. The people won. Thank God for that." And he continued: "Now that victory has attended the efforts of the people in securing the election of President Truman, the Congress of Industrial Organizations like other right-thinking groups in this country, has a challenge before it. The election victory itself constituted a challenge. . . . It is our bounden duty and obligation, not only to the great constituency we are privileged to represent, but to all the people, to exercise these influences which we possess in promoting the constructive program of the President of the United States of America."

It is worth recalling the statement of our Party on the day after that election:

Many people believe they are going to get what they want from the Truman Administration and the Democratic majority in the bipartisan Congress. But these illusions will be—or, at least, can be—relatively short-lived. We are not entering another New Deal "era." The Administration and the bipartisan Congress are committed to an anti-Communist drive at home and

abroad, and to an aggressive imperialist war policy and a war economy. This cannot but determine the character of, and set definite limits upon, the scope of Truman's promised social and labor reforms. Moreover, there is already talk of making "peace" with most of the Dixiecrats (Eugene Dennis, *Political Affairs*, December 1948).

DETERIORATION OF WORKERS' CONDITIONS SINCE THE ELECTIONS

Even a brief review of the events of the past eight months will suffice to establish the correctness of the election analysis made by our Party and the validity of its program of action.

The past eight months have witnessed the development of mass unemployment, 5 million workers being totally unemployed, close to 10 million working part time, with the fear of unemployment extending to the vast majority of those workers still employed. It can well be seen that the election of Truman was in no way a check to the growing unemployment. On the contrary, it is precisely the period since the election that has been marked by the speedy development of the crisis and the growth of unemployment. It is therefore clear that millions of workers entirely jobless and millions of others, either working part-time or in constant fear of losing their jobs, find the victory of the "lesser evil" no less a curse than a Dewey-Hoover victory.

Within the shops and industries, the last eight months have been marked by an intensified speed-up, worsening of working conditions and great arrogance on the part of the "free enterprisers" in the front office and on a shop level. This has not been an isolated phenomenon in one or another shop or industry. It is a general development of which the recent Ford strike is but the dramatic example. This increased speed-up and general attack upon the working conditions of labor is part of a concerted drive by the capitalists to maintain and even increase their profits and to force the burden of the growing economic crisis upon the workers.

The intensified plunder of the working people by the monopolies is made clear by the continuation of high prices, despite growing overproduction and unemployment. The development of the crisis is further speeded by the growing decline of the purchasing power of the workers. Thus, in 1945, six million families (12 percent of all U.S. families) each earned less than 1,000 dollars. About one-third of the nation's families had incomes of less than 2,000 dollars in 1948. Eleven and a half million families (23 percent of the total) had incomes of between 2,000 and 3,000 dollars. The extent of the impoverishment of the working class is pointed up by the Federal Reserve Board report that 3 out of every 10 families spent more than they earned

in 1948, either by using up dwindling reserves or by getting into debt.

The millions of workers affected by this brutal campaign of the capitalists cannot but fail to question in what way they are better off now, eight months after the Truman victory. On the contrary, the record now clearly shows that the Truman Administration has done nothing, and intends to do nothing, to curb the monopolies or to protect the working conditions of labor. Just witness the high-handed steal of hard-earned East-coast longshoremen's overtime pay by an act of Congress quietly signed by Truman.

The millions of Negro workers who were likewise told that a Truman victory would be in their interest have in the past eight months experienced the most severe effects of the growing economic crisis, being the first to lose their jobs, and in many instances, being completely eliminated from some industries where they found employment in the past ten years. It is therefore obvious that so far as the Negro workers are concerned, the Truman "victory" did not in any way pay off in terms of jobs and economic security. On the contrary, the economic conditions of the Negro masses has become intolerably worse; while the Truman talk and promises of civil rights has proved a cruel hoax in the face of mounting police terror and lynching.

Now that the labor movement is

faced with the 1949 wage and contractual negotiations, it becomes clearer than ever that the victory of the "lesser evil" was no victory for labor. The employers have been most arrogant in their refusal to grant any of the demands of organized labor. On the contrary, they have been proposing wage cuts and company "security clauses," and have indicated in numerous instances not only that they have no intention of meeting the just demands of the workers but that they are preparing all-out attacks upon the very existence of the trade-union organization. From this it is clear that the so-called Truman victory did not bolster labor or weaken the monopolies. On the contrary, the corporations feel safe and confident that they can rely upon the strike-breaking zeal of the Truman Administration, just as they relied on it during the railroad workers' and miners' strikes of last year.

Labor has fared no better on the legislative front. Its outstanding demand, as well as the most loudly proclaimed promise of Truman during the election campaign, was to repeal the Taft-Hartley Act. But eight months after the elections, the Taft-Hartley Act remains in force as a result of outright betrayal of commitments and pledges by the Truman Administration, assisted heavily by certain "leaders" of labor. While the betrayal of his promise to annul the Taft-Hartley Act

most dramatically underscores the fact that labor has gained nothing by the so-called Truman victory, the same holds true with respect to other proposed labor and social legislation that made up the program on which Truman campaigned and was elected. This is true of the promises on civil rights, minimum wage, housing and social security laws. It is equally true of Truman's demagogic peace promises in the last lap of the election campaign. The ardent promises of peace which brought him many Wallace votes are being honored by "the lesser evil" with cynical war pacts and brutal war incitement.

It is high time for trade unionists to draw conclusions from the events of the past eight months. An answer must be given to the very simple and yet all important question: If it is true, as Murray and Green have stated, that the last election was an outstanding victory for labor, how is it that labor has reaped no fruits from that victory? Why has labor made no gains in the past eight months? Why has labor actually suffered reverses on the economic as well as legislative front?

Furthermore, how did the "lesser evil" theory fare in actual life? Were we not told before the election that the organization of a third party and the emergence of a third ticket, even if justified from a long-range point of view, was wrong and im-

practical because it could not possibly win in '48; while on the other hand a victory for Truman would be the only practical way to advance the immediate interests of the workers economically and politically?

The hard facts of life have refuted these contentions and arguments. It can now be shown that the most practical victory in the 1948 election could have been scored only under the banner of the Third Party and the support of the candidacy of Wallace. It can now be seen that millions of votes for the Progressive Party, expressing the political independence of labor from the twin parties of reactionary monopoly capital, was and remains the only practical road, not only to fulfill the long-range aspirations of the American working class and people, but also to achieve their most partial and immediate demands.

LABOR CAN BEAT BACK ATTACKS

Can it be said that defeats for labor on the economic and political fronts were and continue to be inevitable after the election of Truman? No, these defeats were not and are not inevitable.

The organized labor movement has great numerical strength; its rank and file has the fighting spirit, the experience and the willingness to fight effectively and victoriously against the attacks of the corpora-

tions. The labor movement has a powerful potential ally in the millions of Negro people who have repeatedly shown a desire to fight shoulder to shoulder with the white working class against their common enemy. Labor could rally the support of the widest sections of the people in its battle against the attempts of the monopolists to throw the burden of the developing crisis upon the shoulders of the working class, the Negro people and masses of the lower middle class.

Labor could rally the widest and most decisive support in its struggles against unemployment, for wage increases, for the rights of the Negro people, for repeal of the Taft-Hartley Law and for the enactment of other social and labor legislation. But this potential strength of labor and its allies can be realized only if the labor movement breaks with the political orientation which proved so disastrous for it in the 1948 elections.

Labor can make no gains, and will only continue to suffer defeat, so long as it is tied to the war program of the Administration and the bi-partisan reactionary coalition. The atmosphere of cold-war hysteria and war preparations which inevitably engenders political reaction at home is precisely the atmosphere in which the employers find it easiest to attack and undermine the economic conditions of the working class. As long as the Murrays, Dubinskys,

Careys, Greens and Reuthers are successful in committing large sections of the trade-union movement to the war program foreign policy of the Administration, exemplified by the Marshall Plan and North Atlantic Pact, and serve as the agents of the State Department in promoting the "cold war" with its disastrous consequences economically and politically, so long will the labor movement remain on the defensive, reaping the blows engendered by this policy.

For the war program is not a policy in the national interest. It is not an American program. It is a reactionary class program. It serves the interests of one class—the big capitalists. It is contrary to the interests of the working class, of the toiling farmers, of the overwhelming majority of the people.

Having committed themselves to the support of Truman in the last election, the Murrays and Greens are attempting to drag the whole labor movement into a position of going along with every betrayal of the Truman Administration and finding justification for it. This was amply demonstrated by the events in Congress that led up to the retention of the Taft-Hartley Act. The Murrays and Greens refused to mobilize the millions of workers and their allies to fight for outright repeal and restoration of the Wagner Act. On the contrary, they were quick to abandon the fight and to line up

behind Truman's so-called compromise, called the Sims Amendment. Instead of mobilizing mass support for the original promise of outright repeal and restoration of the Wagner Act, they proceeded to find justification for the Truman betrayal. In fact, they became a party to that betrayal, weakened the fight and subsequently opened the door for a series of amendments which in essence reconstituted the Taft-Hartley Act under a new name. They demobilized the working class and its allies, thereby aiding and encouraging the worst enemies of labor inside and outside of Congress to take the initiative and in collusion with Truman deal labor a severe blow with the retention of the Taft-Hartley Law. Here again the labor reformists and Social-Democrats trotted out the argument which proved so disastrous in the 1948 election, namely, that the "practical" approach to defeat the Taft-Hartley Act requires going along with the "lesser evil" propositions of the Administration. Whereas the facts proved once again that the "lesser evil" theory is precisely the most practical way to insure the retention of the Taft-Hartley Act, and that the only road leading to its defeat was and remains an uncompromising struggle based upon the mass action of millions of workers and their allies against both the Republican-Dixiecrat reactionaries and the Truman Administration.

It is clear that the Murrays and Greens are determined to continue this disastrous course even now. They already speak of 1950, which in effect means reconciling labor to live with the Taft-Hartley Law at least until 1951, when the Congress elected in 1950 will go into session. But that is not all. Labor would have a repetition of 1949 in 1951 if it followed once again the advice of the Murrays and Greens.

LABOR'S INDEPENDENT POLITICAL ACTION FOR VICTORY

The millions of workers who have experienced the effects of this "lesser evil" theory and the effects of labor leaders running interference for Truman and finding all sorts of excuses for these betrayals must now speak out. Taft-Hartley can still be defeated. But to do that it is imperative that the rank and file take the initiative for the development of an independent political force of labor, centered in the Progressive Party, which will be capable of giving expression to the demands of labor and the people through mass actions including demonstrations, demonstrative stoppages, as well as through the election of such real champions of the cause of labor as Marcantonio in the 1950 Congressional election.

It is urgent for the Left and Progressive trade unionists to realize that the Progressive Party and the

who
dent
sig
of t
mill
draw
Taft
eral
bor
tion
gen
assu
app
gres
labor
initi
gan
of
the
the
islat
Pro
imp
sive
the
gre
and
and
dev
ers
or
sive
I
of
ran
atta
refe
mil
Th
lab

whole concept of labor's independent political action receive a new significance from the developments of the past eight months, and that millions of workers are ready to draw the lessons of the Truman-Taft-Hartley betrayal and the general scuttling of progressive and labor legislation by the Administration. It is therefore timely and urgent that the Lefts and Progressives assume a new initiative and bold approach to the building of the Progressive Party and united action of labor and the Progressive Party; to initiate and participate in the organization of joint actions in defense of the unemployed, the rights of the Negro people, for repeal of the Taft-Hartley Law and other legislative demands, together with the Progressive Party. It is of the utmost importance that Lefts and Progressives assume the responsibility for the systematic building of the Progressive Party within the trade unions and in working-class communities and find every possible avenue for developing united action with workers in Right-wing unions on a joint or parallel basis with the Progressive Party.

Labor can beat back the attacks of the employers if it solidifies its ranks and calls a halt to the divisive attacks of the Social-Democrats and reformist labor leaders upon the militant progressive-led unions. These attempts on the part of certain labor leaders to isolate and destroy

Left-led unions are most dangerous, not only to the Left, but to the whole working class. The purpose behind this drive is to make the C.I.O. as well as the A. F. of L. conform to the disastrous policies of Murray, Reuther and Green and to short-circuit the struggle of the workers against the ravages of the growing economic crisis. It is further designed to halt the growing sentiment among the secondary leadership and rank and file of the trade unions against the war policies of the Administration and against the brazen pro-Wall Street orientation of the Murrays, Reuthers and Greens. The violence of the attack against Progressive-led unions has been stepped up by the recent National Board meeting of the C.I.O., where steps for union-busting, raiding, inner union disruption and preparations for outright expulsions and splits were advanced by Murray and Reuther. The tactic of depriving the Left unions of representation on the National C.I.O. Board was also projected for action by the October Convention. The reason for the intensified anti-democratic and outright dictatorial methods of repression advanced by Murray and Reuther is to be found in the fact that the attempted destruction of the Lefts and Progressives, charted at the Portland Convention last November, failed to materialize. The disruptive attacks were in the main beaten back, although with serious losses for the

Left in particular instances, such as in Bessemer, Alabama, where, as a result of a terroristic and chauvinist campaign by the steel workers' union leadership, the Left-Progressive-led Mine, Mill and Smelter Workers' lost the representation. Nevertheless it is a fact that the campaign of disruption officially sanctioned at Portland, backed up by government agencies and the hierarchy of the Roman Catholic Church, failed to destroy any of the Left unions. The Farm Equipment Workers are a case in point. It is reported that Reuther spent as much as a quarter of a million of the Auto Workers' money in an attempt to destroy F.E. in the International Harvester Co. plant in Chicago; but he failed miserably and the raid was defeated.

FAVORABLE FACTORS IN FIGHT OF THE PROGRESSIVE- LED UNIONS

Among the reasons for the ability of the Progressive-led unions to withstand these attacks are the following:

1. The policies of class collaboration advanced by Murray and Reuther at Portland, which in effect meant abject surrender to the attacks of the monopolies, have proved to be very unpopular, not only among the membership of the Left-wing unions but among the membership of the steel and auto workers

unions as well. The auto workers demonstrated their opposition to Reuther's plan for class collaboration, based on increased productivity, by the strikes of the 60,000 Ford workers and by the strike of the Bendix workers whose main demand was precisely an end to the speed-up. Likewise, in the steel industry, there have been literally dozens of stoppages against the speed-up and a general worsening of conditions. These and many other struggles were expressions of the rank-and-file opposition to the effects of the defeatist class collaborationist policies advanced by Murray and Reuther. While on the other hand, the Left- and Progressive-led unions have been increasingly putting forth a militant program of defense of the interests of the workers, and to the extent that they have done so, the workers rallied behind their Progressive-led unions to beat back the raiding and disruption.

2. The estimate of the national leadership of the C.I.O. before the elections that it could split the progressive unions by whipping up hysteria under the slogan that the Progressives "endangered the Truman victory" has turned out to be a boomerang. If anything, the debacle of the national C.I.O. leadership policy of reliance upon Truman and tying labor to the Democratic Party, has served to weaken the Murray, Carey, Reuther hysteria.

3. As the crisis developed, the Ne-

gro workers have been bearing the brunt of the layoffs and the worsening economic conditions, while the Social-Democratic and reformist trade-union leaders have been continuing their policy of refusal to take up the struggle for the rights of the Negro workers. And this, under the guise of being for "equality" and therefore refusing to take any special steps to protect the interests of the Negro workers! To the extent that the Lefts and Progressives have undertaken effective struggle for the rights of the Negro workers, they have won increasing support among the Negro workers and generally among the Negro people, and the Negro workers have been an increasing source of strength to the Lefts and Progressives. This was evidenced in the auto union elections, as well as in the struggle of F.E., and in other Left-led unions.

4. The Social-Democratic and reformist leadership of the C.I.O. counted on an increasing mass war hysteria among the working class, helped to inflame that hysteria and expected to drive a wedge between the leadership and the membership of the Left- and Progressive-led unions by appeals to imperialist chauvinism and jingoism. But the opposite has happened. The intensification of the war drive, exemplified by the North Atlantic Pact, has been arousing increased opposition among large masses of the American working class. Thousands of local trade

union leaders of both Right- and Left-led unions have recently expressed themselves against the war drive, through association with the movement for a *National Labor Congress for Peace*, initiated by a number of mid-West trade unionists, which is scheduled to be held on October 1-2 in Chicago. Furthermore, the selling of the North Atlantic Pact to the American workers has proved to be a much more difficult task, since the camouflage of the Marshall Plan by the labor lieutenants of Wall Street as a plan for feeding the hungry, clothing the naked and housing the homeless has been ripped apart. The labor misleaders are becoming increasingly exposed as supporting a plan for arming reaction in Western Europe for aggression against the Soviet Union.

5. At the same time the Lefts and Progressives have shown increasing ability to unite in defense of the several unions under attack by Murray, Reuther and Co., as well as to unite and give leadership on important political issues facing the American workers. Such was the character of the Conference in Washington against the Taft-Hartley Act, initiated by a number of International presidents of progressive unions. It was further exemplified by the initiative of leading trade unionists in New York who mobilized appreciable numbers of trade unionists against the political frame-up

heresy trial in Foley Square; and it is further indicated by the common expressions of opposition by 11 International unions to the dictatorial—comply politically or else—edict of the last National Executive Board meeting of the C.I.O.

FOR THE DEFENSE OF THE INTERNATIONAL UNIONS' AUTONOMOUS RIGHTS

Murray, Reuther and Company are desperately trying to convince the C.I.O. membership that the Left-led unions are guilty of dual unionism and refusal to adhere to majority decision. But this attempt at falsifying the issue will not stand up to any serious examination. The Left-Progressive unions are fighting to maintain the organic unity of the C.I.O. They are fighting to stay in C.I.O.; and from all that has happened, every thinking worker will come to the inevitable conclusion that it is not the Left but the Right that is trying to split the C.I.O. As to the question of adhering to majority decision, this is but a hypocritical argument with which Murray, Reuther and Company are trying to justify their nefarious splitting work.

The C.I.O. is and has been since its very inception a federation of autonomous International unions. Hence, from the very beginning it operated on the basis of a minimum program which included organizing the unorganized, militant

defense of the economic conditions of its membership, the defense of the rights of the Negro people and concerted effort to improve the general status of its membership and the working class by economic and political means. The record of the C.I.O. conventions will show that despite this general program being unanimously adopted at many conventions, there have nevertheless been instances where Right-wing unions refused to carry out the elementary program of militant policy on wages and many other such issues. This is exemplified even today by the announcement of the textile workers' leaders, right after the Portland Convention, that they will not call for wage increases this year. But Philip Murray and the national leadership of the C.I.O. have never threatened to expel Right-wing unions who refused to carry out decisions of a trade-union character. This only highlights the hypocrisy behind the slogan of "conform to C.I.O. policy or get out," because the record will show that it is the Left-Progressive unions that have been most consistent in carrying out the basic policy upon which the C.I.O. was organized and built. A trade union is not a political party. It is made up of workers adhering to different political parties. A trade-union federation cannot remain united and unite the workers in defense of their economic interests and political advancement if its leadership tries to

impose its particular brand of political thinking on the membership and affiliates of the various Internationals. It would, of course, be very advantageous if the whole labor movement and all the affiliated Internationals could unite along an advanced program of genuine political action in the interests of labor, and it is the right and duty of the leadership of labor to advocate and fight for such unification by the democratic processes of education and conviction, and by progressive deeds. It was along these lines that the Left and Progressive leadership of several Internationals advocated support for Wallace and the Third Party within their International Unions and among the workers generally. But nowhere has the Left and Progressive leadership attempted to impose its working-class thinking upon any of its affiliate regional or local trade-union bodies. Nowhere has the Left and Progressive leadership of any union threatened to expel locals because they did not support the Third Party or because they did not oppose the Marshall Plan. On the other hand, the Murrays and Reuthers are attempting to impose by dictatorial means an anti-working class, pro-capitalist, pro-imperialist policy upon the various International unions.

Fundamentally we have two sets of issues facing the membership of the C.I.O. and A. F. of L. as well:

1. Which road is labor to follow?

Shall labor follow the Social-Democrats' and reformists' disastrous line of support to the war program of the Administration, of class collaboration and abject surrender to the attacks of the monopolies on the living standards and elementary rights of the working class? Shall it follow the road of subservience to one of Wall Street's two parties and of the Truman Administration, which has resulted in the retention of the Taft-Hartley Act? Or shall labor follow a progressive, militant working-class policy of opposition to the warmakers and support of the struggle for peace? Shall it follow a militant policy of uniting labor in the fight for its economic demands, for building labor's independent political strength in alliance with its allies in defense of democratic rights against the encroachment of reaction and fascism? There can be no moratorium on the struggle for winning the working class to a progressive and militant policy. But this struggle can be carried on within an organically united C.I.O. and within an organically united labor movement. There can be no justification for splitting the C.I.O. and expelling International unions because they exercise their right and duty to fight for this kind of a policy which, be it remembered, is the original basic program of the C.I.O.

2. The Left-Progressive forces, while fighting for these policies within their unions and jointly tak-

ing action in defense of the economic and political demands of the workers, are not placing the demand that all other unions do likewise as a condition for maintaining C.I.O. unity. The Progressive-led International unions place the issue as follows: while there are basic and decisive differences on important questions of policy within the C.I.O., every International union must have the autonomous and democratic right to adopt and follow the policy determined by its membership; every International must have the right to advocate and fight for these policies among the working class. While the Executive Board of the C.I.O. has the right to formulate policies and opinions based upon the will of the majority of the Board or Convention, it cannot impose those policies upon autonomous unions if they are in contradiction to the will of the membership of those unions.

Left and Progressive unionists are therefore conducting a two-fold battle: one, for a militant trade-union policy, and two, for the recognition of the autonomous and democratic rights of affiliates of the C.I.O., which is the only basis upon which the organic unity of the C.I.O. can be maintained.

ISSUES OF STRUGGLE

In conducting the struggle for a militant trade-union policy, special attention must be given by Lefts

and Progressives in developing a united front of struggle on the following issues:

1. The labor movement is now faced with a concerted refusal by the employers to grant wage increases or any of labor's demands in this fourth round of negotiations. It is necessary to emphasize that victory for labor in this round of struggle can be secured only if labor is prepared to take on and defeat the corporations' sharp economic and political offensive. This requires that the workers be given a clear and precise formulation of the demands for which they are called upon to struggle. One of the favorite devices of Reuther and other reformist labor leaders has been to becloud and refuse to spell out concretely the actual demands of the unions. This tactic is designed to weaken the determination of the rank and file to fight through for their demands and to leave wide loopholes through which the leadership can make settlements of the type made at Ford and at Bendix, where the workers' real grievances and demands were completely betrayed. The *main* demands of labor in this round of wage negotiations are:

a) Substantial wage increases as demanded by a number of Left-Progressive unions in terms of 20 to 30 cents per hour, and elimination of all wage-cutting escalator clauses;

b) a shorter work week to meet the growing unemployment and rapidly developing crisis;

c) against discrimination, for hiring and upgrading of Negro workers;

d) for pensions and other social benefits at company expense;

e) for extended unemployment benefits to cover the *entire* period of unemployment.

If this fourth round of negotiations is to result in substantial victories, it is imperative that labor and, in the first place, the decisive unions in the mass-production industries organized in the C.I.O., present a common front against the common front of the employers. In this connection, it must be pointed out that, not only must the Left unions take the initiative in urging such united labor action, but the workers in the Right-wing unions must put increasing pressure upon their leadership to force them to agree to such united action. It must be said that until now the policies pursued by the leadership of Steel and Auto has been in the opposite direction. Therefore, the workers in both Right and Left unions must be forewarned that any continuation of a policy of non-cooperation and such deals as Murray entered into with Truman on a two-month postponement of steel negotiations can lead to the most adverse results in this wage fight.

2. With the growth of mass unemployment, it is now necessary to

orientate the trade-union movement on the extent and the forms of the struggle in defense of the unemployed workers and the need for every union building the organization of the unemployed and the unity of the employed and unemployed workers. This will require not only that the trade unions establish a system of contact with their unemployed members and organize struggles of their members in unity with other unemployed workers and other unions for unemployment insurance and other immediate demands. It is also necessary that the trade unions undertake the initiative for organizing the unemployed in the communities into organizations encompassing the unemployed membership of all unions in a given area. In addition, conferences and other mass actions on unemployment can now be organized successfully as exemplified by the Conference on Unemployment held in Akron and the mass delegation of U.E. workers in Washington.

3. In conducting the struggle for militant trade-union policy, the Lefts and Progressives must give the most serious attention to developing a new initiative in the struggle for the rights of the Negro workers on jobs and in the unions. It is high time that a full-scale drive be opened by the trade unions to wipe out the pernicious system of Negro workers being last hired and first fired. This must involve the fight against indis-

criminate layoffs of Negro workers which has resulted in their wholesale elimination from industry; it must include a fight for upgrading and for promoting Negro workers to all levels of trade-union leadership.

Furthermore, the Left unions, if they are to strengthen their ties and those of labor generally with the Negro people, must show great concern for developments in the Negro communities and must participate in the organizations of the Negro people in their struggle for economic, political and social equality.

4. For the first time since the beginning of the "cold war," there now exists a rallying center for labor in the struggle for peace, in the form of a call to a National Labor Congress for Peace initiated by some 200 local union leaders and already backed by thousands of local union officials and shop stewards. This opportunity must be fully utilized by all militants and progressives within the A. F. of L., C.I.O., and Railroad Brotherhoods. An outpouring of a great labor delegation to Chicago backed by millions of workers can be a great beginning for a powerful peace movement of the organized workers which can tremendously advance also the economic interests of all labor.

5. It is imperative that not only the Communists but all real progressive trade unionists take the initiative in breaking through the wall of silence which the top leaders of

the C.I.O. and A. F. of L. have erected around the trial of the 12 Communist leaders. An important step in that direction was taken by leaders of a number of trade unions, comprising the *New York Emergency Committee for the Freedom of the 12*, when they recognized this trial in Foley Square as a travesty of justice that challenges the most fundamental rights of political freedom, and as a direct threat to the very existence of the trade unions. There is no room for hesitation in speaking out on this issue. The time has come when militants in the labor movement cannot sit by quietly while three outstanding working-class leaders are jailed for refusal to turn stoolpigeon and when the National Committee of the Communist Party is subjected to a vicious frame-up thought-control trial. It is time to expose the dastardly game played on these issues especially by the leadership of the national C.I.O. While this trial has been going on, Philip Murray, Reuther and the other Social-Democratic and reformist leaders have refused to say one word or permit one action by their unions which would challenge this outrageous Truman-Clark edition of the Reichstag-fire frame-up, even though these labor leaders have not dared to condone the trial publicly.

This attitude of the top labor officialdom is against the grain of the healthy rank-and-file sentiment. Ways must be found for giving that

working-class sense of solidarity full expression.

The fight against the frame-up of the Communist leaders is not separated from the fight to defend the living standards of the workers—or from the fight against Taft-Hartley. The same Truman Administration that introduces thought-control and trial of books is threatening the conditions and rights of all labor in behalf of the labor-hating monopolies. It is behind the curtain of

Red-baiting and persecution of Communists and progressives that the ravages of the crisis are being forced upon the working people, that war and fascism are being prepared. Labor must learn in time that there is not a *single* case where persecution and outlawing of the Communists was not followed by the fascist enslavement of the whole working class and the destruction of the whole labor movement.

Remembering Sacco and Vanzetti

by Elizabeth Gurley Flynn

TWENTY-TWO YEARS AGO, ON August 22, 1927, Nicola Sacco and Bartolomeo Vanzetti were electrocuted in Charleston State Penitentiary in Massachusetts. They were innocent men, victims of legal frame-up. Millions have died during the intervening years—helpless victims of fascism, and brave youths fighting the unfinished struggle against it. Why do we remember with special significance these two obscure foreign-born workers—"a good shoemaker and a poor fisherman," as Vanzetti described Sacco and himself?

It is because their deaths climaxed the Red-baiting hysteria of the 20's. At their deaths, a roar of indignation swept America and encircled the globe. All the fine Wilsonian promises of "a world safe for democracy" were blasted before the whole world by this hideous travesty of justice in Massachusetts. The traditions of Bunker Hill and Plymouth Rock, Crispus Attucks and Paul Revere, faded out before the rebirth of witch-hangings, which had once occurred in Salem and on Boston Common. The European reservoir of good will toward America, which had risen during World War I, receded and finally ran dry in the 20's under the impact of the attacks upon labor

and upon the foreign-born here, under the direction of J. Edgar Hoover, and the use of food as a political blackjack in the hands of Herbert Hoover—over there. The two Hoovers are unfortunately still with us, after all these years. The story of the 1920's is told in "A Report on the Illegal Practices of the Department of Justice" prepared and signed by a group of the most eminent American lawyers of that day. The same pattern, under the Department of Justice at home and the Marshall Plan abroad, is repeated today, to the shame of America.

POSTWAR WAVE OF REPRESSION

Europe looked over here in the 20's and saw Eugene V. Debs in Atlanta Penitentiary; Mooney and Billings in prison in California; and Sacco and Vanzetti fighting in vain for seven long years for their freedom. They saw many acts of force and violence against American workers and the Negro people. Joe Hill had been shot to death in Utah Penitentiary a few years before. The prisons were full of workers—members of the I.W.W. There were the brutal Bisbee deportations,

the Ludlow, Centralia, and Everett massacres; Frank Little, labor organizer, was lynched at Butte, Montana, and Wesley Everest, veteran of World War I, was lynched in Centralia, Washington. There were the "Red Raids" of Attorney-General Palmer, ignoble forerunner of Tom Clark. Nationwide mass arrests were made on January 2, 1920. Homes, offices, buildings were raided and searched without warrants. Property was destroyed; workers were beaten and dragged to jail. Citizens were held under state "sedition" laws. Non-citizens were held for deportation. Agents' reports on their hauls were marked "*Attention Mr. Hoover.*" Several thousand "suspected Communists" were crammed into immigration detention stations—at Ellis Island, N. Y., Deer Island, Boston, and in Detroit. Eight hundred and ten aliens were torn from their families and deported, many of them to certain death in countries from which they had fled as political refugees.

The October Socialist Revolution, as well as the overthrow of the Hapsburg and Hohenzollern dynasties, had panicked the American capitalist class. The workers were on the move throughout Europe. There was great sympathy for them here. Wall Street was determined to smash the American labor movement, especially after 365,000 men, under the leadership of William Z. Foster, had battled them in the great steel strike of 1919. It was

a period of militant struggle against company unionism and the open shop.

HIGH POINT OF LABOR PROTEST

The burning resentment of the workers against repression found expression in the Sacco-Vanzetti case. American labor reached a high point of indignation and protest around their struggle, unequalled before or since. International solidarity grew, until monster demonstrations were held before American consulates in London, Paris, Rome, Moscow, Brussels, Berlin, Vienna—and in Brazil, Cuba, Mexico, Canada, South Africa, China, Japan and elsewhere. The A. F. of L., 3½ million strong then, passed resolutions for a new trial for Sacco and Vanzetti at three successive conventions. The All-China Federation of Labor, 2½ million strong, sent cables. Eugene V. Debs issued a "Call to Action" of which the International Labor Defense distributed a million copies. Tom Mooney, from his prison cell, appealed for Sacco and Vanzetti. Among those who spoke out for Sacco and Vanzetti abroad were Marcel Cachin, Henri Barbusse, Romain Rolland, Maurice Rostand (a grandson of Lafayette), and Alfred Dreyfus, famous victim of an anti-Semitic military frame-up in France. *L'Humanité*, the French Communist daily, warned the American Legion not to come to Paris for their conven-

tion if Sacco and Vanzetti died. When Governor Fuller of Massachusetts went to France, under an assumed name, for a vacation, he was forced to leave by the fury of popular resentment. On a National Petition Day, 1,500,000 signatures were collected in France.

Heywood Broun, first president of the Newspaper Guild, lost his job on *The New York World* for his spirited defense of the condemned men. Professor Felix Frankfurter of Harvard University, now on the U.S. Supreme Court, wrote a book, *The Case of Sacco and Vanzetti*, which is a caustic criticism of the methods of Judge Webster Thayer, the trial judge, and a devastating analysis of the so-called "evidence." More than 50 members of the British Parliament signed petitions; the Chamber of Deputies of Uruguay memorialized Massachusetts; a group of German Reichstag members cabled their protests. In Buenos Aires, there was a two-day protest strike; the dock workers of Bordeaux struck on all American ships; in Lyons, France, police killed four workers in a demonstration; there were strikes in Argentina, Uruguay, and a 24-hour strike in Paris. In Sofia, Bulgaria, Americans were warned of European reprisals if Sacco and Vanzetti died. In Mexico City, "Boycott American goods!" became the slogan. When the executions took place, American tourists felt the scorn of the European people for many years afterwards.

The anti-fascist character of World War II and the American participation in it, renewed "the reservoir of good will," but it is running low again in the year 1949, and for the same reasons that it dried up in the 20's.

The agitation and mass movement did not grow over night. When Sacco and Vanzetti were arrested in 1920, only a few of their friends and comrades knew it was a frame-up. They belonged to no union or political party. They espoused a vague anarchistic ideal of freedom without restraints which they called "The Idea." But Vanzetti had helped to organize the workers in the Cordage Works of Plymouth, Massachusetts, had led the exploited workers in a strike and had been blacklisted in consequence. Sacco had helped raise funds for the iron miners' strike on the Mesaba Range in 1916 and for similar struggles of workers. They helped to defend those who were held for deportation or were prosecuted in the Palmer Raids. Shortly before his arrest, Vanzetti had made a trip to New York to investigate the arrest of Andrea Salsedo, seized in such a deportation raid. Many Italian workers were deported. But this man was held a tortured prisoner without a hearing on the 14th floor offices of the Department of Justice, then in the Park Row Building. At dawn on May 3, 1920, his crushed body was found on the shattered pavement. He had either jumped or been pushed out of the

wind
Elia
media
invest
Saco
range
in Bro
could
May
up. T
backg
dom.
finally
ment
J. Ed
unbro
injust
Right
and li
worke

THE
DE

To
mass
wide
judici
Depart
ally,
round
like
Smith
have
lis Isl
for th
tration
person
Congr
ing,
wives,

window. His comrade, Roberto Elia, held there with him, was immediately deported before a public investigation could take place.

Sacco and Vanzetti hurriedly arranged a protest meeting on May 9 in Brockton, Massachusetts. Before it could be held, they were arrested on May 5, accused of murder and hold-up. This was the sinister and tragic background of their long martyrdom. If and when an investigation is finally made of the so-called Department of Justice and its deeds under J. Edgar Hoover, it will reveal an unbroken record of brutality and injustice, crimes against the Bill of Rights and the persons, liberties and lives of thousands of American workers, especially the foreign-born.

THE NEW DEPORTATION DELIRIUM

Today, avoiding the spectacular mass raids of the 20's which caused wide popular resentment and stern judicial rebuke, at that time, the Department of Justice is systematically, stealthily and persistently rounding up person after person, like Beatrice Johnson, Ferdinand Smith and Peter Harisiades, who have been held without bail on Ellis Island. Tom Clark, who lobbied for the infamous Hobbes Concentration Camp bill, has passed it by personal decree in spite of lack of Congressional action. At this writing, more than 80 non-citizens—wives, mothers, fathers, husbands of

American citizens—face deportation, face forcible separation from their families. Some are mothers and fathers of small children, others are war veterans and parents of war veterans, and one is the father of a war hero killed in action during World War II. Most of them have lived and worked in this country for over 25 years. Ten of them are women, two are mothers of veterans. It is evident that the disgraceful deportation delirium of the 20's is being repeated in a modern, streamlined version, stepped up by Nazi techniques developed since the 20's, and heading toward American concentration camps. There must be a repetition of the Sacco-Vanzetti struggle to focus our attention on this creeping fascism which not only menaces the foreign born in our country, but is a prelude to more fascist-like attacks on all militant workers, progressives and anti-fascists.

A FLAGRANT AND CYNICAL FRAME-UP

The Sacco-Vanzetti case was a palpable frame-up built around a crime, a hold-up double murder, similar to the frame-ups perpetrated on Mooney and Billings and on Joe Hill. It was because Sacco and Vanzetti were foreign-born that their frame-up could assume the monstrous proportions that it did. In all these cases, those guilty of the crimes escaped while innocent men were deliberately, falsely accused. By the

time of Sacco and Vanzetti's execution, however, millions had learned of the frame-up system — a long standing institution traditional to American class justice. Vanzetti said of this before his death: "*Never in our full life could we hope to do such work for tolerance, for justice, for men's understanding of man, as we do now by accident.*"

The case against them had collapsed completely by 1927. One of the first powerful blows for their defense was the pamphlet *Are They Doomed?* written by Art Shields, now a staff reporter for the *Daily Worker*. The cover design, showing the death of Salsedo, was drawn by a famous cartoonist, Robert Minor, who had been the first secretary of the Tom Mooney Defense Committee and had written the first pamphlet on that famous case. (Robert Minor, veteran Communist, has been confined to his home for a year by illness. He is now writing his reminiscences, which will be an invaluable contribution to the history and lessons of the American class struggle, especially in the field of labor defense.)

In spite of the confession of a professional hold-up man, which completely cleared Sacco and Vanzetti, the prejudiced Massachusetts Supreme Court and the sadistic Judge Webster Thayer would not grant them a new trial. The brutal Governor Fuller even went to the prison cell of the poor wretched convict Madeiro, who made the confession

and who was awaiting the death sentence for another crime, and taunted him: "So you are a double murderer. I will do nothing for you!" Thereby he implied he might extend clemency if Madeiro retracted his confession. One can hardly recall a more shameful scene in American legal history.

Judge Thayer, who referred to the defendants publicly as "Anarchist bastards," sentenced them to death on April 8, 1927. A final effort was made to persuade the U. S. Supreme Court to grant a new trial. The whole world united breathlessly for them to stop this modern crucifixion. But, like Pontius Pilate, the court washed its hands of it. The liberal justices, Holmes and Brandeis, both of Massachusetts, failed to wipe the blot from the record of their state, and shared it from then on. *Sacco and Vanzetti were doomed from that hour.*

If, today, there are those who feel complacent about the fate of the Communist Twelve at Foley Square and who rely upon higher courts to correct all errors or deliberate and vicious prejudice on the part of Judge Medina—let them remember Sacco and Vanzetti and have no such illusions. No higher court ever corrected either Judge Landis in the mass I.W.W. trial or Judge Thayer in his ferocious attacks upon Sacco and Vanzetti. No higher court gave Tom Mooney a new trial. If they had, possibly Judge Medina would be less of a prosecutor and more of

a judge today in his conduct of the case at Foley Square. His arrogant assumption of infallibility stems, undoubtedly, from his confidence in support from higher judicial bodies.

Tremendous mass movements finally secured the release of Debs, the I.W.W. prisoners, and Mooney and Billings, of Angelo Herndon and some of the Scottsboro boys. But if we had relied on court rulings alone, they would all have remained in prison. We developed tremendous unity around Sacco and Vanzetti—but too late. They were already convicted before their cases became known. It was at least five years after their arrest before the mass movement gathered real momentum. It was not sufficiently early, nor enough to save them. We had international solidarity—but not soon enough to affect the proceedings in this country. A mass movement, to be effective, should start the day of the arrest of a labor or political prisoner. This requires a permanent mass defense organization; otherwise new committees are created around each case, disbanded at their conclusion and the forces and experiences are dissipated.

The splendid, militant traditions of the International Labor Defense, organized in 1925, are inherited logically by the Civil Rights Congress today. Around this organization must be built nation-wide agitation of a mass character to meet attacks upon the rights of labor and the civil rights of the American peo-

ple today. It has successfully although temporarily halted a modern version of the Sacco-Vanzetti case in securing a new trial for the six Trenton framed-up Negroes. The saving of Mrs. Ingram and her two sons, faced with execution a few short months ago, is another instance of a Sacco-Vanzetti case in the making halted by mass action. The campaigns which have been launched must continue until the Trenton 6 and the Ingrams are free. It is the C.R.C. which is in the forefront of such efforts.

If we learned any lesson from the labor cases of the past, it was that legal defense alone is not sufficient. No matter how able or militant counsel may be in the courtroom, they are hedged in by hoary tradition and bound by precedents, red tape, procedure, prejudice of courts, arbitrary selection of picked juries, etc. We know that legal defense is necessary and we appreciate the devotion and militancy of the splendid lawyers who fight on this difficult front. But labor defense consists basically of meetings, literature, demonstrations—including strike action if necessary—the mustering and enlightening of public opinion on a large scale, so that the real issues will be clear and not obscured by legal charges, and will be exposed by the light of publicity and by the pressure of the people. Such a movement must be built once again in America, on a permanent basis, and on the broadest possible scale.

FOR A MASS LABOR DEFENSE

Stormy days are upon us that make the 20's look like child's play. The ruling class that was panicked then is frantic with fear today. It sees the prophetic handwriting on the wall and is feverishly fighting to preserve and maintain its decaying system. Let us profit by all our past experiences and muster again the militant forces of the people to defend and extend their democratic rights and labor gains against the power-mad profiteers and warmakers. Under present conditions, when reaction is attacking the working class on all fronts, when the danger of fascism recurring is acute, the role of labor defense is increasing immensely—as it did in the 20's. Our task is to make of it a genuine united-front mass movement to defend all fighters for the people.

Today, the ideological frame-up, the Hitlerian lie—not built as in the '20's around framed-up local crimes, but around political views—occupies the center of the many-sided attack. The thought-control trial of the 12 Communist leaders at Foley Square is the touchstone of the whole struggle for the Bill of Rights in America today. As the great Dimitrov fought in Leipzig in 1933, in

defiance of fascist reaction, so they are fighting today. Only a broad mass movement, such as we attempted to build in the '20's around Sacco and Vanzetti, can adequately defend their rights, and in so doing defend the rights of the whole American people.

We did not succeed in saving the lives of Sacco and Vanzetti, although the names of these two honest and brave workers were cleared of the despicable charge of murder and robbery. They will live forever in the hearts and minds of the people. But this is not enough. At Leipzig, Dimitrov was vindicated and liberated, and thus was able to give sixteen more precious years of invaluable service in the struggle against fascism in which he struck mighty blows.

The leaders of the Communist Party, U.S.A., are needed today—not as martyrs, but as active fighters. The forces of reaction are determined to silence them by long terms of imprisonment, to illegalize the Communist Party, to cancel the Bill of Rights. This is a mighty battle. It will take all we can put into that historical struggle and a great deal more to meet this all-out onslaught on the people. It can, it must and it will be done.

by Liu

THE
Comm
adopte
of Cor
condem
of the
clique.

The
this an
clique
progra
solutio
line ca
genera
republ
ence,
a col
tries."

The
Comm
of Ch
pointe
fallen
tional
Centra
passin
tion I
gation
world
defenc
from
Amer

* Tr
1949; t
.. M
tal Co

Internationalism and Nationalism*

by Liu Shao-Chi**

THE RESOLUTION CONCERNING the Communist Party of Yugoslavia adopted by the Information Bureau of Communist and Workers' Parties condemned the anti-Soviet position of the treacherous Tito nationalist clique.

The resolution pointed out that this anti-Soviet position of the Tito clique proceeds from the nationalist program of the bourgeoisie. The resolution states: "Such a nationalist line can only lead to Yugoslavia's degeneration into an ordinary bourgeois republic, to the loss of its independence, and to its transformation into a colony of the imperialist countries."

The resolution of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China on the Yugoslav Party also pointed out that the Tito-ites had fallen into the mire of bourgeois nationalism. At the same time, our Central Committee stressed that by passing this resolution the Information Bureau was "fulfilling its obligations to the cause of preserving world peace and democracy, and defending the people of Yugoslavia from the deception and aggression of American imperialism."

* Translated from *Pravda* (Moscow), July 7-9, 1949; text condensed.

** Member of the Political Bureau of the Central Committee, Communist Party of China.

What, then, is bourgeois nationalism? What is the attitude of Marxism-Leninism to the national question? Why is it that the anti-Soviet position of the Tito clique may make Yugoslavia a prey to the aggression of American imperialism, and forfeit Yugoslavia's independence, transforming her into a colony of imperialism?

It is the purpose of this article to clarify these questions; in this process, it will be necessary to deal with some of the basic problems of the present-day international situation.

THE BOURGEOIS-NATIONALIST POSITION ON THE QUESTION OF THE NATION

The national question is closely linked with the question of classes—and the national struggle, with the class struggle. "In different periods," Comrade Stalin has stated, "different classes appear on the arena of struggle, and each class has its own conception of the national question." For this reason, "the national question in different periods serves different interests, assumes different aspects, depending upon which class poses this question and in what period."

In order to understand the nature

of bourgeois nationalism, one must first understand the nature of the bourgeoisie as a class.

The bourgeois-nationalist position on the question of the nation, its approach to the national question and its program and policy on the national question, flow from the class nature of the bourgeoisie, which is motivated solely by its own narrow class interests.

It is common knowledge that the bourgeois system is based on capitalist exploitation. The bourgeois class itself is divided into several different strata, and each of these into several groups. In their pursuit of profits, the capitalists not only unscrupulously exploit the proletariat, but even within their own class the capitalists swallow up their rivals in the process of cut-throat competition, the big fish swallowing the little fish; the big bourgeoisie swallows the petty and middle bourgeoisie, one group squeezing out and swallowing another group.

The bourgeoisie strives to possess the means of production and the market of its own country. And since there is no limit to its appetite for profits, the bourgeoisie strives to expand beyond its own country, to seize foreign markets, sources of raw materials, and areas for capital investment. While subjugating other countries and exploiting other peoples in this process of expansion, it squeezes out the rival capitalists of those countries at the same time.

The exploitation of wage labor,

competition, the squeezing out, suppressing and swallowing of rivals, resorting to war, utilizing all means to secure a monopoly position in its own country and throughout the world—such is the class nature of the profit-greedy bourgeoisie. This is the root of bourgeois nationalism and of all bourgeois ideologies.

Conforming to this class basis, the domestic bourgeois-nationalist program and policy subordinates the interests of the nation as a whole to its own class interests. The bourgeoisie places its class interests, the interests of the small top stratum of society, above the interests of the whole people. Moreover, it tries to monopolize in its own interests the very concept of the nation, posing (in order to deceive the people) as the spokesman of the nation and defender of the national interests. At the same time, the bourgeoisie, in its foreign program and policy, aims at counterposing the interests of its own nation (in essence, of its bourgeois top stratum) to the interests of other nations. The bourgeoisie strives to place its own country above other countries and utilizes every means to oppress and exploit other peoples, completely disregarding their interests. It uses part of the loot gathered abroad to bribe certain groups of the population within its country in order to divide and weaken the resistance of the people in its homeland.

The most vicious manifestations of bourgeois nationalism include the

enslave
semi-co
periali
War, t
solini
which
lastly,
ment o
ternati
by Am
Who
subject
oppress
geoisie
pressio
interes
condit
the str
We
kind
the V
Franc
the F
bourg
for th
preser
coloni
takes
But a
nation
capab
it rac
begin
case
of th
Franc
Italy
bourg
chang
oppre
the i

enslavement of the colonial and semi-colonial countries by the imperialist powers, the First World War, the aggression of Hitler, Mussolini and the Japanese warlords which led to World War II, and, lastly, the scheme for the enslavement of the whole world by the international imperialist camp, headed by American imperialism.

When a given nation is held in subjection by another nation or is oppressed by feudalism, the bourgeoisie of that nation opposes this oppression for the sake of its class interests, and may, under certain conditions, join with the people in the struggle against these oppressors.

We may cite instances of this kind: the American bourgeoisie in the War for Independence; the French bourgeoisie at the time of the French Revolution; the Italian bourgeoisie during the movement for the unification of Italy. At the present time, the bourgeoisie in the colonial and semi-colonial countries takes part in national revolutions. But as soon as the bourgeoisie of any nation obtains power and becomes capable of subjugating other nations, it radically changes its policy and begins to oppress them. This was the case with the nationalist movements of the bourgeoisie in Great Britain, France, Germany, the United States, Italy and Japan. In these cases, the bourgeoisie, upon gaining power, changed its position and began to oppress other nations, disregarding the interests of those nations.

When capitalism reaches the stage of imperialism, the ruling top group in the capitalist countries becomes numerically smaller. The small clique of big bankers and finance magnates, on the one hand, treats its own country as its own financial domain, cruelly exploiting and oppressing the people; and on the other hand, resorting to the most brutal means of exploitation and oppression, it enslaves other nations, converting them into colonies and dependencies of a few financial empires in the imperialist metropolis. The greater the wealth amassed by the predatory bourgeoisie, the greater becomes its greed and desire to absorb and seize new wealth, the more it intensifies its oppression of the people within its own country and aggression against other nations. All this comes under the cloak of nationalism which demagogically exalts its own nation as a "superior race" endowed with the right to dominate other nations and to suppress the "inferior races."

With several imperialist powers seeking to plunder the weaker nations of the world, the result is imperialist wars for the redistribution of the colonies. And these crimes, the most monstrous in world history, are committed by the bourgeoisie under the banner of "nationalism."

* * *

As we have shown, the bourgeoisie of different countries, upon gaining power, does not hesitate to pursue a

policy of aggression against other nations. But under certain conditions, bourgeois nationalists sell out their own nation and help foreign imperialists, in order to crush the people in their own land. They sacrifice their own people for the sake of safeguarding their possessions and preserving their political power. Such may be the case when the sovereignty of their own country is suppressed by the mighty pressure of foreign imperialism or when the interests of the bourgeoisie as a class or of a certain upper stratum of this class come into sharp conflict with the basic interests of the people in their own country. The bourgeoisie will also betray its nation when the people rise in defense of their interests and threaten the power of the bourgeoisie, or when foreign imperialists intimidate or bribe the bourgeoisie of a weaker nation.

Among well-known historical instances of this kind we may cite the case of the representative of the French bourgeoisie, Thiers, who betrayed France to Germany at the time of the Paris Commune. More recent examples are the betrayals by the Chinese big bourgeois Chiang Kai-shek and Wang Ching-wei, Daladier and Petain in France, Pilsudski and Beck in Poland, and Quisling in Norway. Furthermore, since the end of World War II, owing to the critical condition of capitalism, the reactionaries of Great Britain, France, Italy, and other European countries are bowing even

more readily to American imperialism and act as its stooges.

Only when it is to its own advantage does the bourgeoisie use the banner of nationalism to arouse the people. But when it is against its interests, the bourgeoisie completely discards the sentiment of national pride and turns traitor to the nation.

Such is the bourgeois concept of the nation and the class base in which it is rooted. These are the main principles and basic program of bourgeois nationalism.

THE PROLETARIAN-INTERNATIONALIST POSITION ON THE QUESTION OF THE NATION

The proletarian-internationalist position on the question of the nation is in fundamental opposition to that of bourgeois nationalism. The proletarian-internationalist approach to the national question and its principles for dealing with the national question throughout the world flow from the basic interests of the masses of the given nation, and from the common interests of the masses of the people of every nation, which are the common interests of all mankind. National aggression is a product of the system of class exploitation. The proletariat, since it exploits no one and fights for a social system which precludes the exploitation of man by man, is opposed to any oppression of one nation by another. The proletariat cannot favor any system of oppression of man by man in society; otherwise it could not

achiev
For
pose
sion:
the o
any o
nation
comp
sociat
strong
count
prole
gradu
unity
paths
pursu
peria
the c
jority
volu
natio
volu
press
The
natio
ques
whic
prin
letar
tion
C
the
cons
figh
tion
tion
amp
thor
and
stat
nat

achieve its own emancipation.

For this reason, the proletariat opposes any kind of national oppression. It staunchly fights both against the oppression of its own nation by any other nation, and against its own nation oppressing another. It favors complete equality and freedom of association for all nations (big or small, strong or weak) both within a given country and on a world scale. The proletariat favors the idea of a gradual movement toward world unity through different concrete paths: of voluntary separation (in pursuance of its aim to smash imperialist oppression and do away with the dependent status of the vast majority of the world's nations); or of voluntary federation (with various nationalities uniting on a completely voluntary basis after imperialist oppression has been eliminated).

This is the proletarian, the internationalist position on the national question, and the class basis from which it flows. Such are the main principles and basic program of proletarian internationalism on the national question.

Communist Party members in all the oppressed nations have always constituted the staunchest vanguard fighters leading the national liberation movements of the oppressed nations against imperialism. For example, we Chinese Communists are thorough proletarian internationalists and are, at the same time, the staunchest revolutionary patriots and national revolutionary fighters op-

posing all imperialist aggression against the Chinese nation, defending China's freedom and independence and opposing all national traitors.

In China, the first to raise a clear-cut program of opposition to imperialism and for national independence was not the party of the bourgeoisie or the petty-bourgeoisie, but was the party of the Chinese proletariat. Our Communist Party of China has always been the leader and organizer of the united anti-imperialist national front of the Chinese people. This is a broad united national front including workers, peasants, intellectuals, the petty-bourgeoisie and other progressive elements. This kind of revolutionary national liberation movement is not in contradiction to proletarian internationalism. The two are entirely consistent with each other, constituting an extremely important organic part of the movement of proletarian internationalism, constituting its broad direct ally. The victory of this national liberation movement is a great step forward along the path of proletarian internationalism, giving great help and impetus to the socialist revolution of the proletariat throughout the world.

Therefore, it is clear that if the Communists of oppressed nationalities fail to carry out concrete opposition to imperialist oppression, and to fight for national liberation, if they merely regard "internationalism" as an empty ornamental phrase—then they are betraying proletarian

internationalism, and descending to the level of low and contemptible trotskyites, agents of imperialism.

Furthermore, if, after their own nation has rid itself of imperialist oppression, the Communists descend to a position of bourgeois nationalism, carrying out a policy of national self-interest and sacrificing the common international interests of the working people of all the nations of the world and of the proletariat to the interests of the upper strata of their own nation; if they not only fail to oppose imperialism but on the contrary rely on imperialist aid to carry out aggression against other nations, and oppressing them, or opposing proletarian internationalism with national conservatism, reject the international solidarity of the proletariat and the working people and oppose the Socialist Soviet Union—then all this is also a betrayal of the proletariat and of Communism, which helps the international imperialists, and makes these traitors themselves a pawn of the imperialists. The Tito group in Yugoslavia is now taking this path.

* * *

Guided by the principles summarized above, the Communists in all oppressing nations, in all imperialist countries, have always staunchly and unreservedly opposed aggression upon colonial and semi-colonial countries and the oppression of these countries by the rulers of their own nations or by an imperialist bloc.

The Communists of these countries have done everything to extend unselfish aid to the national liberation movements of the colonial and semi-colonial nations. The Communists fight for the liberation of their own country from imperialist oppression and for the complete emancipation and independence of all oppressed nations. As examples, we can refer to the Communists in the former Russian empire, the Communists of Great Britain, the United States, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, the Netherlands, Belgium, etc. As staunch internationalists, they resolutely oppose the imperialists who oppress their own country and who carry on aggressive policies against India, Malaya, the Philippines, Indonesia, Viet-Nam, China, Central and South America and other colonial and semi-colonial countries. They consistently fight for the independence and freedom of all oppressed nations.

The Communists take this position because they have a profound understanding of Marx' statement that no people which oppresses other nations can itself be free. They understand that were it not for the national liberation movements, which weaken and undermine the foundations of imperialist domination, it would be extremely difficult for the proletariat of the imperialist-metropolis countries to achieve victory in the struggle against monopoly capital and to attain its emancipation. Hence, to aid the liberation

movements of the colonial and semi-colonial nations is to aid the cause of the emancipation of the proletariat in the imperialist countries. Therefore, in conformity with the principles stated above, the working class, led by the Communists, upon overthrowing the imperialist bourgeoisie and gaining power, must immediately put an end to every oppression imposed by "their" imperialists upon other nationalities, whether within or without that country. Thus, as soon as the Great October Revolution in Russia had overthrown the bourgeois provisional government and placed the toilers in power, Lenin and Stalin immediately proclaimed the annulment of all the unequal treaties which the Czarist government had concluded with China and other countries, abolished the whole system of enslavement which Russian imperialism had imposed on its colonies and semi-colonies and proclaimed the complete equality of all nationalities within the country. Such is the application, in deeds, of the great principles of proletarian internationalism.

Therefore, if there are individuals in the ranks of the proletariat of oppressor nations who talk of internationalism as if it were merely an empty, high-sounding phrase or who sink to the position of bourgeois nationalism, who do not extend support to the national liberation movements of the colonies and semi-colonies, but rather help the impe-

rialists of their own countries to suppress the colonial, semi-colonial and backward countries, they are traitors to proletarian internationalism, to the cause of Socialism and Communism, and become agents of imperialism. As examples, we have the representatives of the labor aristocracy bribed by imperialism, the Right wing of the Social-Democratic parties in various countries and the Right wing of the British Labor Party; all of these are renegades of this type who have betrayed the proletariat. On the other hand, if Communists, coming into power after imperialist domination has been overthrown in their country, do not immediately do away with the imperialist oppression of various nationalities, do not proclaim complete equality of all peoples within their country, but continue national oppression and pursue an aggressive policy toward other peoples, this too is a betrayal of proletarian internationalism, of the cause of Socialism and Communism; it means that they use the term "internationalism" only for empty, high-sounding chatter; it signifies degeneration to the position of bourgeois nationalism.

* * *

However, under certain historical conditions, oppressor countries may become oppressed countries. Thus, when Hitler invaded and conquered France, Belgium and Holland, the Communists of those countries, in contradistinction to the bourgeois

traitors, heroically fought in the forefront of the national resistance movements against the fascist aggressors.

The European countries subjugated by American imperialism by means of the Marshall Plan may serve as another example of this kind. The reactionary bourgeoisie of these countries continues to suppress the national revolutionary struggle in the colonies with the aid of American imperialism: France wages war in Indo-China, Britain in Malaya and in other countries, the Netherlands in Indonesia. The Communists of those countries must, on the one hand, offer determined resistance to American imperialism's encroachment and oppression, must fight against the capitulation of their bourgeoisie to the United States and against the betrayal of their nation by the bourgeoisie and must defend the independence of their nations; on the other hand, they must resolutely oppose the imperialist colonial policy of the bourgeois rulers of their own country and the oppression and exploitation of the colonial peoples by their bourgeoisie, and must extend all possible aid to the liberation movement of the colonial peoples against the imperialists of their own countries.

In this situation, the Right wing of the Social-Democratic parties in the European countries and of the British Labor Party continue to pursue an imperialist policy toward the colonies and support the Marshall Plan, which enslaves their own coun-

tries. The Communist parties relentlessly fight these renegades.

Such are the policies and various concrete programs which proletarian internationalism adopts on the national question in different countries and under different conditions. These programs and policies are motivated solely by the basic common interests of the masses of the people of the given country as well as by the interests of the masses of the people of all countries. In other words, they proceed from the vital common interests of all mankind and at the same time accord fully with the class interests of the proletariat.

Such is the concrete application of the viewpoint of proletarian internationalism in different concrete historical conditions.

A comparison of the bourgeois-nationalist and proletarian-internationalist positions on the question of the nation reveals that bourgeois nationalism and proletarian internationalism constitute two antagonistic conceptions, ideologies and slogans, representing two different classes. Lenin said:

Bourgeois nationalism and proletarian internationalism—these are two irreconcilable, mutually antagonistic slogans. They conform to the two great class camps of the whole capitalist world, and manifest *two* different policies on the national question (and especially two different world outlooks).

A sharp difference must be drawn between proletarian internationalism and its position on the national ques-

tion,
Comm
tion
train
whene
again
them
assist
ence
that
an o
again
howev
not d
pende
presse
make
again
establ
over
comp
The
tablist
of th
establ
greate
nese
of Ar
Plan
for K
sistan
ence,
and
the li
to est
nation
their
No
real
throu
rialist

tion, and bourgeois nationalism. A Communist who descends to a position of bourgeois nationalism is betraying Communism. Imperialism, whenever possible, wages aggression against weaker nations and oppresses them and certainly will not honestly assist other nations to win independence and liberation. It may happen that one imperialist country may help an oppressed nation to struggle against another imperialist country; however, the imperialist country does not do this for the sake of the independence and liberation of the oppressed nation—it does it, rather, to make use of the oppressed nation against its competitor, scheming to establish its own imperialist rule over the oppressed nation after its competitor has been removed.

The purpose of Hitler's plan to establish "the New Order in Europe," of the Japanese warlords' plans to establish the "co-prosperity sphere in greater East Asia" and "Sino-Japanese co-existence and co-prosperity," of American imperialism's "Marshall Plan for European Recovery," "Aid for Korean Independence" and "Assistance for Philippine Independence," of Britain's "Aid for Indian and Burmese Independence," and the like—the purpose of all these is to establish their rule over other nations, to preserve and increase their profits.

No oppressed people could obtain real liberation and independence through the so-called help of imperialist powers. No imperialist coun-

try can be expected to extend genuine help to the cause of real independence and liberation. Thus, it would be extremely erroneous and harmful to harbor illusions that American imperialism would in good faith help the Chinese people to achieve real independence, peace and democracy.

Guided by the proletarian-internationalist position on the question of the nation, by the proletarian-internationalist program and policy on the national question, the Communists must be the staunchest, most reliable and effective leaders of the movement for the national liberation and independence of all oppressed peoples. They must be the most determined defenders of the interests of their own people and aid in every possible way the liberation movement of all oppressed peoples the world over. Obviously, they cannot pursue a policy of aggression against any other people or of oppression of the national minorities within their own country.

There is not the slightest basis for such demagogic and slanderous allegations of the imperialists as: "Inasmuch as the Communists are internationalists, they cannot lead movements for national liberation and independence, they cannot defend the interests of their people or their country"; "The Soviet Union is guilty of Red imperialism"; "The Soviet Union pursues an aggressive policy toward China, Korea, and other countries"; "The Soviet Union carries on an expansionist policy"; etc.

Only the Communists and the world proletariat, only the Soviet Union and the New Democracies, are the true and reliable friends of all oppressed nations fighting for their liberation and national independence. The aid of the Soviet Union, of the world proletariat and of the Communists is the most important condition for the victory of all nations in fighting for liberation from imperialist oppression, for national independence.

Mistrust and unfriendliness toward the Soviet Union and the New Democracies which the Tito-ites are seeking to inculcate among the people of Yugoslavia, advancing the "argument" that the "capitalist countries are less dangerous to Yugoslavia than the Soviet Union" can only bring harm to Yugoslavia.

To declare as the Tito-ites do that the same attitude should be adopted toward the Soviet Union and the New Democracies, led by the Communist Parties, as is adopted in relation to imperialist countries—this is but the outcome of betrayal of the principles of Marxism-Leninism, a betrayal of proletarian internationalism and of switching over to a bourgeois-nationalist position.

PRESENT-DAY DIVISION OF THE WORLD INTO OPPRESSED AND OPPRESSOR NATIONS

Imperialist aggression has divided the nations of the world into two categories—oppressed nations and oppressor nations. After World War

I, Lenin described the situation with regard to these two categories as follows:*

A billion and a quarter oppressed in the colonies—countries which are being cut up alive, like Persia, Turkey, and China; and countries which have been vanquished and flung into the position of colonies. Not more than a quarter of a billion inhabit countries which have retained their old positions, but have fallen into economic dependence upon America, and all of them during the war, were in a state of military dependence, for the war affected the whole world and did not permit a single state to remain really neutral. And finally, we have not more than a quarter of a billion inhabitants of countries in which only the upper stratum, of course, only the capitalists, benefited by the partition of the world.

This pictures also the present-day situation with reference to the national question. The imperialists of a few countries mercilessly oppress and plunder the colonial and semi-colonial countries the world over. This is the situation in the sphere of national inter-relationships, which reflect the sharpening of the contradictions in the capitalist world, and the intensification of the uneven development of capitalism in different countries in the epoch of imperialism. This situation inevitably leads to a sharp struggle of the imperialist countries for colonies and simultaneously to an upsurge of the worldwide national liberation movement

* V. I. Lenin, *Selected Works*, Vol. X, p. 183.—Ed.

of the oppressed peoples for freedom from imperialism.

During the latter period of the First World War, the Russian proletariat pierced the imperialist front over one-sixth of the earth's surface and carried out the Great October Socialist Revolution. As a result, the world was divided into two different economic systems. The First World War and the October Revolution led to the general crisis of capitalism. Under the conditions of this general crisis bourgeois nationalism became even more narrow, cruel and aggressive. Fascism in Germany, Italy, Japan and other countries, aiming at enslaving the world, was the product of the most rotten, most reactionary monopoly capital and appeared under conditions of the sharp contradictions inherent in the general crisis of capitalism. During the Second World War, the German-Italian-Japanese fascists were defeated by the international anti-fascist forces, headed by the Soviet Union. With the help of the Soviet Union, the peoples of Eastern Europe established a new democratic order in their countries.

The Communist Parties of the world proved to be the most heroic leaders and staunchest defenders of their motherland during World War II; their prestige among the people is extremely high and they became unprecedentedly powerful; the national revolutionary struggles of the East are sweeping like a forest fire through China, Viet-Nam, Indo-

nesia, Burma, Malaya and other countries. The world situation after World War II underwent a new basic change signifying a new accentuation of the general crisis of capitalism much greater than that which followed World War I.

At present, in place of Hitler and the Japanese warlords, we are faced with American imperialism, which is hatching its vicious plans of domination and enslavement of the peoples of the world and carrying on an expansionist policy throughout the world. Needless to say, this is another offspring of the most decayed, most reactionary monopoly capital in the period of a new accentuation of the general crisis of capitalism.

* * *

The principal features of the global map after World War II may be depicted as follows:

On one side—the Socialist Soviet Union, leader of all the peoples of the world in the struggle against imperialism and fascism, the country which, after defeating the fascist Axis, continues to advance toward ever-greater prosperity, the country which leads the struggle for universal peace, in defense of democracy and independence of all peoples (its population totalling almost 200 million people).

Next, the long-liberated Mongolian People's Republic (population —1,000,000). Then, the countries of People's Democracy in Southeastern Europe with a total population of

85 million, which since their liberation from German and Italian fascist slavery are marching toward Socialism under the leadership of their Communist Parties. However, in one of these countries, Yugoslavia, the Tito clique has committed treason to the proletariat, which is now waging a struggle against these renegades.

Next we have liberated Northern Korea and Eastern Germany, with a population of approximately 30 million. Besides these, there are the peoples who are still directly engaged in the struggle against foreign imperialism and against the betrayers of their countries. These include the liberated parts of China (with a population of 168 million), which have been completely freed of imperialist oppression and which are carrying on new, democratic construction under the leadership of the Communist Party of China. If we add to these the already liberated parts of the population of Viet-Nam, Indonesia and other countries, we find that over 500 million people out of the total global population of two billion people have already been liberated from imperialist oppression. These people have attained the position of really independent, free masters of their countries.

Thus, the liberated people exceed one-fourth of the population of the globe. This signifies a regeneration of the world and bears testimony to the scope and level that mankind has already attained in its struggle

for emancipation. There can be no doubt that this number will steadily grow. The day is not far off when all mankind will be freed from imperialist domination. Whatever the zigzags that may occur in the process of this struggle, the general course of development is inevitably toward liberation as an irresistible law of history.

In China, the perspective of the complete liberation of its 475 million population is especially clear, in view of the series of victories by the great Army of Liberation.

This is one side of the situation.

On the other hand, with the defeat of the fascist Axis, three of the six greatest imperialist powers have been smashed, namely Germany, Italy and Japan.

At the present time, the imperialist powers possessing colonies (differing in magnitude and number) comprise the United States, Great Britain, France, the Netherlands, Belgium, Portugal and others. The number of the imperialist powers has decreased. But we have now the unprecedented situation of a single imperialist power, the country of American imperialism, subjecting the peoples of the world. Even such countries as Great Britain and France, not to mention the Netherlands, Belgium and Portugal, have been weakened as a result of the enormous losses inflicted by the war. It is true, the reactionaries of these countries continue to use sanguinary, violent means to suppress the liberation

move
Nev
of th
own
the p
Socia
Britis
have
tecto
can i

Th
500 m
1,300
worl
State
indir
Ame
tiona
the M
have
natio
ican
Ame
outst
Mor
lon,
actic
abou
eigh
their
hand
citize
on
dire
the
Uni
ples
big
or i
qua
globe

movement of the colonial peoples. Nevertheless, since the bourgeoisie of these countries have sold out their own nations, and also as a result of the policy of the Right wing of the Social-Democratic parties and the British Labor Party, these countries have become dependent nations, protectorates under the aegis of American imperialism.

Thus, while on one side we have 500 million people already liberated, 1,300 million people throughout the world (exclusive of the United States) find themselves directly or indirectly under the domination of American imperialism; and the reactionaries in Great Britain, France, the Netherlands and other countries have in effect become traitors to their nations and junior partners of American imperialism. The 140 million Americans carry on their backs eight outstanding finance groups, those of Morgan, Rockefeller, duPont, Mellon, etc., and a handful of their reactionary representatives (in all only about a thousand people). These eight major finance groups with their representatives, on the one hand, rule the 140 million American citizens within their country, and, on the other hand, directly or indirectly enslave all the nations of the world, except for the Soviet Union and the other liberated peoples. The domination of the eight big American finance groups directly or indirectly extends to almost three-quarters of the population of the globe (including the American peo-

ple), that is, to more than 1,400 million people. On top of this, the American reactionaries are mapping fantastic plans for imposing their system of imperialist enslavement on the Soviet Union and the other liberated countries.

This is the present-day situation with reference to the national question on a world scale.

THE TWO GREAT CAMPS AND THE PATH OF THE NATIONAL LIBERATION MOVEMENT

As indicated above, the national question in the present-day world is in essence tantamount to the issue of the exploitation and oppression of the nations the world over by American imperialism versus the resistance of the nations throughout the world to that exploitation and oppression and the struggle for national liberation and in defense of national independence.

Even during World War II, the American imperialists made their plans for plundering and oppressing the nations of the whole world. After the war, they put into operation the Truman Doctrine and the Marshall Plan, bringing, step by step, many of the world's nations under their control and rule, preparing a network of military bases throughout the world and interfering in the domestic affairs of other countries. All these aggressive plans—just as was the case with Hitler, Mussolini and the Japanese warlords

—are being carried out under the slogan of “defense against the Soviet Union, defense against Communism.”

The American imperialists are exerting all their forces to mobilize the people of their own country in support of their plans, they are suppressing all forces among the people of their own country who oppose their plans. They are cultivating the myth of the “American Century,” the “theory” of the “superiority of the Anglo-Saxon race,” declaring that Americans should “lead the world,” and that all the nations of the world should be under their rule. They are persecuting the Communist Party of the United States, the progressive trade unions, the progressive movement under the leadership of Henry Wallace and are in the process of establishing fascist-like rule in America. In attempting to realize their plans of world domination, the American imperialists are opposing the U.S.S.R., the People’s Democracies, the Communist Party of China and the liberation movement of the Chinese people, the national liberation movements of Greece, Viet-Nam, Indonesia, Malaya, Burma and the Philippines; they are opposing the Communist Parties and the peoples’ democratic forces of all countries.

Therefore, when the Tito-ites take up an anti-Soviet position, leave the Communist Information Bureau and, within their own country, destroy the vital forces of real progress,

the American imperialists display uncontrollable glee.

In their preparations to unleash a third world war, the American imperialists must search for stooges and agents in the various countries who will carry out their behests. They seek out national renegades and traitors and give them their backing in suppressing the resistance movements of the peoples of these countries and in opposing the Soviet Union. American imperialism helps the reactionaries of all countries and supports the revival of the remnants of fascism in Germany, Italy, Japan and other countries. Everywhere the reactionary parties and groups of the bourgeoisie of these countries and the remnants of fascism have become the agents and stooges of American imperialism, suppressing, with American aid, the resistance movements of the peoples of their own countries and of the colonial countries and opposing the Soviet Union and the democratic forces of the peoples of all countries.

However, precisely because American imperialism seeks to enslave the world, and because the reactionaries of the European countries are betraying their nations, the national question has become a vital issue for even a greater part of the population than after World War I. The anti-imperialist front of the national liberation movement has become even wider. While the number of imperialist countries has been reduced, while they have become more

isolated, and the base of imperialism is becoming ever more and more unstable and its strength has been greatly weakened and continues to weaken—the oppressed are rising on an ever-broader scale to fight against imperialism, bringing ever nearer the end of imperialist domination.

* * *

The class enemies of the proletariat of the capitalist countries are at the same time the national betrayers of these countries. To win socialism, the proletariat of these capitalist countries must oppose both enslavement by American imperialism and the national traitors of their own countries. The class question and the national question are linked together. This enables the proletariat of the countries of Europe to unite still broader masses of people within their countries and link up the defense of their national independence with the cause of achieving Socialism, and, on the other hand, to unite broader masses of the colonial and semi-colonial peoples, linking up the national liberation movements of the colonies and semi-colonies with their own cause of achieving Socialism.

The schemes of American imperialism seeking to enslave the world and the betrayal of their own nations by the reactionaries of the European countries reflect the process of the general crisis of world capitalism, the extreme accentuation of the various contradictions of capitalism. They

reflect the fact that American imperialism and the imperialists of other countries who plan a mad and deadly struggle are sitting on a volcano which threatens new severe crises. The plans of the American imperialists accelerate even more the development of the general crisis of capitalism, accentuating the basic contradictions of the capitalist world: the contradictions between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat, between the various capitalist countries fighting for markets and colonies, and between imperialism and the oppressed peoples. The vast majority of the peoples of the world are strengthening their unity on a world scale in the struggle for their liberation, while the schemes of American imperialism seeking to dominate the world hasten the doom of imperialism.

As we have seen, the world today is divided into two mutually antagonistic camps. These two camps include the peoples of the world, all countries, classes, sections of the population, parties and groups. When these two camps are in sharp conflict, people line up with one or the other side.

That is, if one is not in the imperialist camp, if one is not assisting American imperialism and its helpers to enslave the world or one's own country, then one must be in the anti-imperialist camp, assisting all oppressed peoples of the world to achieve liberation; then one must fight for the liberation of one's own country and resist American impe-

rialism and its helpers in other countries. Neutrality, sitting on the fence, is impossible.

As pointed out by Mao Tse-tung in his *New Democracy*, so-called neutrality is nothing but deception, intentional or otherwise.

To win their liberation, all the oppressed nations can only oppose American imperialism and its accomplices within their countries, can only unite with the Soviet Union and the New Democracies of Eastern Europe, unite with the national liberation movement and peoples' democratic forces of other countries, unite with the proletariat and the Communist Parties—that is to say, they must line up in the anti-imperialist camp which is waging a stubborn struggle against American imperialism. No nation can win real liberation any other way. . . .

MARXIST-LENINIST VIEW OF BOURGEOIS NATIONALISM

Marxism-Leninism considers all questions in their historical aspects. Marxists view bourgeois nationalism under the given historical conditions, weigh its differing objective roles and adopt different attitudes to bourgeois nationalism in different historical epochs.

In the early period of capitalism, the national movement, led by the bourgeoisie, had as its objective a struggle against oppression by other nations and the creation of a national state. This national movement

was historically progressive, and the proletariat supported it.

In the present period, such bourgeois nationalism exists in the colonial and semi-colonial countries. This variety of bourgeois nationalism also has a certain objective progressive historical significance.

The bourgeoisie of Europe, the United States and Japan has established in many backward countries the imperialist system of colonial and semi-colonial oppression. In these colonial and semi-colonial countries—China, India, Korea, Indonesia, the Philippines, Indo-China, Burma, Egypt, etc.—there was an inevitable development of bourgeois nationalism. Since the national bourgeoisie of these countries has interests antagonistic to those of imperialism and also to those of the internal reactionary feudal forces, and since the feudal forces unite with imperialism for the purpose of harming and restricting the development of the national bourgeoisie, the latter is in a certain historical period to some degree revolutionary. The nationalism of the bourgeoisie in these countries has definite progressive significance when the bourgeoisie mobilizes the masses of the people in the struggle against imperialism and the forces of feudalism. As Lenin pointed out, nationalism of this type "has historical justification." Therefore the proletariat, with the view of overthrowing the rule of imperialism and the feudal forces, should support this bourgeois nationalism

which plays a definitely anti-imperialist and anti-feudal role; provided, as Lenin said, that these allies do not hinder us in educating and organizing the peasantry and the broad masses of the exploited people in a revolutionary spirit. The clearest example of such collaboration is that which existed between us Chinese Communists, and Sun Yat-sen. . . . This collaboration was absolutely correct and necessary for national liberation and was in accord with the interests of the proletariat at the time, even though that collaboration was temporary, unreliable, and unstable, and was later undermined by the shameless betrayers of the cause of Sun Yat-sen.

Although Sun Yat-sen's outlook was even then still of a bourgeois or petty-bourgeois character, and his nationalism was still a variety of bourgeois nationalism and even preserved some reactionary characteristics (for instance, the concepts of a "dominant race within the country," of a "Greater Asia," etc.), nevertheless he fostered the doctrine of a national revolution, of "arousing the people and uniting for a common struggle with all the nations in the world who regard us as equals." He also carried into effect the three great principles of unity with the U.S.S.R. and with the Communist Party, and of extending support to the workers and peasants. This was a manifestation of the highly progressive character of the nationalism of the revolutionary bourgeoisie of the colonial

and semi-colonial countries in the new period—the period of the world socialist revolution. It was of enormous revolutionary significance.

However, shortly after Sun Yat-sen's death, the brazen betrayers of his cause—the representatives of the big bourgeoisie, Chiang Kai-shek, Wang Ching-wei and other reactionary leaders of the Kuomintang—began to divert the national-revolutionary doctrines of Sun Yat-sen in a counter-revolutionary direction. They turned from the anti-imperialist struggle to capitulation to imperialism, from alliance with the Soviet Union to a struggle against it, from unity with the Communist Party to fighting the Party, from supporting the workers and peasants to suppressing them. Moreover, they used the conservative and reactionary features of Sun Yat-sen's nationalism as their anti-national banner. It therefore became necessary for the Communist Party, in order to defend the national interests, to launch a firm policy of opposition to the Kuomintang reactionaries, headed by Chiang Kai-shek and Wang Ching-wei. Of course, the Communists in the other colonial and semi-colonial countries, in India, Burma, Siam, the Philippines, Indonesia, Viet-Nam, Southern Korea, etc., must similarly for the sake of the interests of their country, adopt firm, irreconcilable positions toward national betrayal by the reactionary part of the bourgeoisie, principally the reactionary big bourgeoisie, which has already

surrendered to imperialism. Otherwise the Communists of these countries will be guilty of committing a grave error.

On the other hand, the Communists should establish anti-imperialist collaboration with that national bourgeoisie which is still opposing imperialism and does not oppose the anti-imperialist struggle of the masses of the people. Should the Communists fail to establish such collaboration in earnest, but on the contrary, oppose and reject collaboration, in that case, too, they would commit a grave error. Such collaboration must be established, even if it should be of an unreliable, temporary and unstable character.

* * *

The experience of the revolution in various countries, in particular the experience of the Chinese revolution, fully confirms the correctness of the Marxist-Leninist scientific analysis, which shows that the national question is closely linked with the class struggle, and the national struggle with the class struggle. An historical analysis of the class relations reveals why in certain periods one country is oppressed by another and becomes a colony or semi-colony of imperialism; why national traitors may appear in such a country not only from the ranks of the feudal classes, but from the ranks of a part of the bourgeoisie as well—for instance, from the ranks of the comprador bourgeoisie in China. It also

reveals under what conditions and under the leadership of which class national liberation can be achieved.

An historical analysis of the class relations also shows the following: although such outstanding national revolutionists as Sun Yat-sen in China sprang from the petty bourgeoisie or national bourgeoisie, nevertheless the bourgeoisie of that country, generally speaking, views the national question solely in the light of its own narrow class interests and changes its position solely in accordance with its own class interests. Only the class interests of the Chinese proletariat are really in full accord with the fundamental interests of the people of that country and accord fully with the common interests of all nations the world over, with the interests of all mankind. When the proletariat of an oppressed country, as is the case in China, enters the arena of struggle and becomes the leader of the national liberation struggle against imperialism and the savior of the whole nation, then every genuinely patriotic social group, party, league or individual inevitably comes to collaborate with the Communist party, as did Sun Yat-sen, who took the position of uniting with the Soviet Union and who supported the interests of the workers and peasants. Those, on the other hand—like Chiang Kai-shek and Wang Ching-wei—who actively oppose the Communist Party (an opposition which is linked with opposition to the Soviet Union and

fighting the interests of the workers and peasants), inevitably become servile lackeys of imperialism and contemptible traitors to the nation; they sell out their own country.

An historical analysis of the class relations shows further that in the new conditions, in the new period of accentuated international and internal struggle, as a result of threats combined with all kinds of baits of the imperialists, and owing to the developing struggle within the country, there may appear in the revolutionary ranks such people as Ch'en Tu-hsiu and Chang Kuo-t'ao in China or Tito in Yugoslavia. These people capitulate to reactionary bourgeois nationalism, betray the common interests of the toilers of all countries and place in serious jeopardy the liberation of the people of their own country. They are representatives of bourgeois nationalism in the ranks of the proletariat, readily deserting the national liberation struggle when it is reaching a climax and propelling their country onto the path of transformation into a colony of imperialism. The Communist parties of all countries and each Communist individually must be alert to this danger.

CONCLUSION

Genuine patriotism is intimately linked with internationalism. All of the above expresses the point of view and the principles of the Marxists-Leninists, of the Communists, on the

national question. It is the point of view and principles of proletarian internationalism, indissolubly connected with patriotism.

It is clear that the genuine patriotism of the masses of the people in all countries is not in contradiction to proletarian internationalism, but is, rather, intimately connected with it. Comrade Mao Tse-tung wrote during the period of the anti-Japanese war: "For us patriotism is intimately connected with internationalism. Our slogan is—struggle against aggression, in defense of our fatherland." "Patriotism is the application of internationalism in the national-revolutionary war." Needless to say, these statements fully accord with our present patriotic revolutionary war.

Lenin evaluated patriotism as one of the most profound manifestations of the sentiments of countries in the process of consolidation after they had been split up in the course of many centuries or over thousands of years.

Genuine patriotism is devoted love of one's country, one's people, language, culture, literature, and of the best traditions of one's nation developed in the course of thousands of years. This kind of patriotism is completely at variance with present-day selfish, anti-foreign, bourgeois nationalism, as well as with the narrow policy of the closed door, of isolationism and other nationalist prejudices of the small peasant, reflecting the patriarchal system.

Genuine patriotism respects the equality of other nationalities and at the same time cherishes the hope of realizing the best ideals of mankind in one's own country and defends the unity of the peoples of all countries. On the other hand, reactionary bourgeois nationalism fosters mutual hatred and hostility between nations, while the national prejudices of the old patriarchal system isolate their own nationality from the rest of the world, sinking within the narrow confines of their own stagnating outlook. We must resolutely reject both of these positions.

The foregoing clarifies in a general way the difference between proletarian internationalism and bour-

geois nationalism. At present, both within and outside of our Party, there is considerable lack of understanding in regard to proletarian internationalism and bourgeois nationalism. Moreover, the fascist elements are carrying on reactionary and demagogic propaganda on this question. Failure to liquidate this lack of understanding, this confusion, and to expose this fascist propaganda, will result in a great harm to the present liberation movement of the Chinese people. This article is published in the hope that it will help to do away with the misunderstandings and to expose the fascist propaganda.

November, 1948

by H

IN THE
people
Comm
to ov
minat
of in
while
racy i
The
away
tion o
than
posed
tendi
sovere
other
ican
prese
of th
in th
flecte
Ame
falls
from
early
its g
nant
1898,
Civil
comp
whic
quer
from
durin
cont

Myths and Realities of U. S. China Policy

by Henry Newman

IN THE YEAR 1949 the heroic Chinese people, under the leadership of their Communist Party, are writing finis to over a century of imperialist domination of China. The pirate flag of imperialism is being lowered, while the flag of China's new democracy is triumphant.

The mask is being finally torn away under which American reaction concealed its policies. For more than a century American reaction posed as the friend of China, pretending to preserve its territory and sovereignty from the rapacity of other imperialist powers. The American imperialists seek to screen their present role by trading on the myths of this supposedly benevolent policy in the past. Actually this policy reflected the imperialist drive of the American economic royalists and falls into three basic periods: (1) from 1785 to 1860, the period of the early development of capitalism and its growing conflict with the dominant slavocracy; (2) from 1860 to 1898, the period beginning with the Civil War, of transition from free competition to monopoly, during which American capitalism conquered its home market; and (3) from 1898 to the present, the period during which the monopolies won control over the economy and en-

tered full-swing into the imperialist struggle for re-division of markets and world domination. This policy was also influenced by rivalries with other imperialist powers, by conflict with Chinese reactionaries and the Chinese people, and since 1917 by hostility to the Soviet Union.

A study of this China policy helps illuminate also the origins of the Marshall Plan and the whole expansionist goal of U.S. imperialism, with its concentration on Europe rather than Asia. The historic U.S. policy of expansion through economic penetration was incubated in the formulation of policy toward China.

1785-1860

This period began with the peaceful establishment of trade relations with China. The merchants of the infant American republic, struggling to accumulate capital, were attracted by the great profits of China trade, which began in earnest with the return from China of the U.S. ship *Empress of China* in 1785. This trader's El Dorado had a drawback: the Chinese, with their self-contained feudal economy, were not interested in buying American wares; and as a result, Americans were forced to pay for imports with silver. Later on,

this was overcome partly by large exports of opium to China and then, with the development of slavery, by exports of cotton cloth which by 1850 constituted nine-tenths of all exports to China. The free trade policies of the slave-holders favored the extension of these exports. Trade included the sale of Chinese into slavery, many thousands of whom were brought to Cuba, for example. The relatively peaceful expansion of trade came to an end and the "gun-boat" policy was launched with the attack on China by Great Britain in 1840 to force, among other "privileges" from the feudal Manchu emperor, the legalization of the import of opium into China and the seizure of Hongkong. With world industrial and naval supremacy and a secure nearby base in India, Britain was in the key position to lead off the imperialist assault on China.

Shortly thereafter, in March 1840, Caleb Cushing in a speech in the House of Representatives, denounced "the base cupidity and violence . . . of the British" and pledged that England would not "receive aid or countenance in the United States in that nefarious enterprise." Cushing's speech marked the official birth of the now hoary myth that America played the role of an angel of light in China.

Cushing's protest, however, did not impede American acceptance of some of the extra-territorial rights extorted by the British. In 1844 this same Caleb Cushing, at the time the American envoy to China, after

some "gunboat persuasion" and with tacit British approval, negotiated a treaty further expanding rights for foreigners. Among other features, U.S. citizens committing crimes in China were to be punished only by a U.S. consul or other authorized U.S. official. The treaty also contained a "most favored nation" clause. This provided that if China in the future made any concessions "to any other nation, the United States and citizens thereof shall be entitled thereupon to a complete, equal and impartial participation in the same." Here was plainly expressed a demand for an equal share in the imperialist spoils wrested by others, a "me-too" policy. This Emily Post code of etiquette required that each guest at the feast should share in the tasty morsels cut from the body of China. Tyler Dennett, the bourgeois authority on the Far East, candidly characterized this: "The tap-root of American policy has been not philanthropy but the demand for most favored nation treatment. . . ."

The increasing foreign exactions were added to the already heavy feudal exploitation borne by the Chinese people. The resistance of the people to these mounting demands conjoined with the weakness of China's feudal rulers in repelling foreign aggression led to the Taiping Uprising which began in 1849. The American government joined with the British and French in aiding the Manchu dynasty to suppress this peasant uprising. With Chinese reaction both weakened and in-

debte
to ex
1858)
for u

1860-

Du
encie
mosa
the s
Chin
In th
rapic
trem
merc
draw
prof
indu
Chin
"hit
with
their

Co
pow
bour
can
A hi
and
1864
47-5
decli
preo
with
edly
dent
U.S.
Grea
turin
trans
capit
Chin
in au

debted, the U.S. utilized the occasion to expand foreign rights (Treaty of 1858) while professing full regard for the sovereignty of China.

1860-1898

During this period the dependencies of China—Indochina and Formosa—were wrested from her, and the stage was set for the partition of China itself by the Western powers. In the U.S. capitalism developed very rapidly in this period, and made tremendous profits. Much of U.S. merchant capital in China was withdrawn in order to gain the higher profits from investment in domestic industrial expansion. U.S. interest in China declined and American policy "hitch-hiked" along as best it could with the French and Japanese in their assaults on China.

Corresponding with the shift in power from the slaveholders to the bourgeoisie in the Civil War, American policy underwent major changes. A high tariff policy, adopted in 1862 and continued thereafter to 1900 (in 1864 import duties were raised to 47.5 per cent), immediately caused a decline in trade with China. The preoccupation of American capital with domestic expansion was pointedly emphasized when in 1883 President Arthur refused to accept for the U.S. the right granted by China to Great Britain to establish manufacturing concerns. He declared: "The transference to China of American capital for the employment there of Chinese labor would in effect inaugurate a competition for the con-

duct of markets now supplied by our home industries." Trade with China dropped steadily from 1860 to 1897, from 3 to less than 2 per cent of the total American trade.*

America during this period had little interest in territorial annexation in the Far East. This attitude was not founded on principle. The reasons were based on U.S. capitalism's preoccupation with developing the home market and on the feasibility and costs of acquiring and retaining territory. The proposal of Secretary of State Seward in 1867 to join with France in the division of Korea was defeated. American policy, however, stole a march on its rivals in opening Korea to trade in 1882. The United States, which had taken the lead in negotiating the first trade agreement with Japan in 1858, increasingly supported Japan as a counterweight to the advance in China of Czarist Russia.

Meanwhile, in China the imperialist attack was renewed in the Sino-French War of 1885, followed by Japan's aggression in 1894. The defeat of China by Japan, a secondary world power, signaled to the imperialists that the sick man of China was ready to breathe his last, that Japan might continue to swallow more and more, and that the time for partition of China had therefore come. Within the space of two years (1897-99) Czarist Russia grabbed Southern Manchuria, was extending

* The unfavorable balance of trade for the U.S. with China totaled over \$300,000,000 from 1871 to 1894. U.S. exports to China amounted to only \$6,000,000 in 1894.

her grip on Formosa and other areas, and Japan, Great Britain, France and Germany greatly enlarged their "spheres of influence." Instrumental in this spheres of influence policy were railway concessions. The inferior American position was shown in the fact that as of December 1898, out of 7,500 miles of railway concessions, Americans had secured only 300 miles.

During the period from 1869 to 1898, American diplomatic policy sought in limited ways to expand its trade with China with its eye to the future, when, having conquered the home market, American capitalism could embark on a program of foreign expansion. This policy has been thus aptly described: "American Far Eastern policy already showed its peculiar characteristic: namely, the pressure of the future on the present, and the resulting desire to guard the former by providing for it in the present."^{*}

1898 TO DATE

American policy toward China in this period was conditioned particularly by the following factors: (1) a late start in the imperialist race, (2) strong competition of its rivals, (3) easier profits nearer home, such as Latin America, (4) the opposition of the American people to imperialist adventures, (5) increasing U.S. economic and military strength, and (6) the growing anti-imperialist resistance of the Chinese people, parti-

The 1898 period constitutes one of the turning points in American history and inevitably influenced the China policy of dominant monopoly capitalism. An over-all summary of U.S. trade and investment in China is presented first, in order to help place U.S. policy toward China since 1898 in focus.

OVERALL ECONOMIC SUMMARY: U.S. TRADE

One of the contradictions of U.S. China policy which has spurred it on the imperialist path has been that, while China was potentially a great field for U.S. expansion, it has in fact never become a major field of American trade or investment.

From 1861 to date, trade with China (exports plus imports) has been only about 3 percent of total U.S. trade. The British Empire, including Canada, accounted for almost 50 percent and Latin America for 20 percent. The inferior position of U.S. trade with China can be shown by other individual comparisons. American trade with Japan, for example, since 1900 has been more than double that with China.

Except for the period from 1914 to 1919, when during the war the U.S. had a comparatively free hand and quadrupled its trade, U.S. trade with China has remained relatively stagnant. From 1785 to date, with the exception of only a few years, the U.S. has imported more than it has exported to China. China has thus remained throughout a potentially

^{*} E. Herbert Norman, *Japan's Emergence as a Modern State*, Institute of Pacific Relations, New York, 1940, p. 40.

rather
ket.*
U.S. I

Nei
in Ch
it con
perce
ments
the to
000 in
chara
ther s
perce
ness i
public
ter of
been
vestm

The
lativel
the in
rest in
nation
have
ing th
be sa
unsuc
both.

1917
bank

The
lation
princ
Britis

* Ch
yet it
per cap
of the
of wor
2.2 per
* S
1875-\$
...
Macmi

rather than an actually large market.*

U.S. INVESTMENTS IN CHINA

Neither has American investment in China ever been large.** In 1930 it constituted slightly more than one percent of the total foreign investments of the U.S. and 6 percent of the total foreign capital of \$3,300,000,000 invested in China. The limited character of U.S. investment is further shown by the fact that over 20 percent of the total American business investment in 1930 was in two public utilities in Shanghai. The center of American financial interest has been Manchuria, but American investments there have been small.

The immediate causes for this relatively small China investment "are the increasing disturbances and unrest in China, and the success of the nationalist movement. . . . Not only have Americans been late (in entering the field of investment); it may be said that they have been either unsuccessful or unfortunate or both."*** For example, from 1901 to 1917 there was only one American bank in China.

The study of China's economic relations with imperialism has meant principally the study in turn of British, Japanese, and more recently

American trade and investments in China.

Aside from trade, the relatively primitive character of imperialist penetration of China is also reflected in the nature of foreign investments. As of 1931, investments in transport equalled the total of those in manufacturing, public utilities, mining, banking and finance. Needless to say, the relatively small U.S. trade and investment in China is only a limited measure of Wall Street interest, which brought about American intervention to the extent of more than six billion dollars since V-J Day.

THE 1898 TURNING POINT

The period beginning with the turn of the century marked a qualitative change in the development of American capitalism. In iron, steel and other basic industrial production the U.S. began to exceed and undersell all its rivals. This was reflected in the composition of exports, in which manufactured goods constituted 35 percent as compared with 15 percent in 1860. With the consolidation of the home market completed in the settlement of the West, the rise of the trusts and the ouster of British capital from control of many industries, production outstripped domestic consumption. It became imperative to win foreign markets in which the surplus goods could be sold and raw materials secured. Two schools of thought developed among the bourgeoisie. One favored expansion through economic

* China's trade quadrupled from 1900 to 1930, yet it still constituted less than 4 percent of the per capita trade of the highly developed countries of the West. China's trade was about 1.5 percent of world trade at about 1900 and only about 2.2 percent before World War II.

** Some figures—in millions—are: 1835-\$3; 1875-\$8; 1899-\$20; 1913-\$49; 1930-\$197.

*** C. F. Remer, *Foreign Investments in China*.

*** C. F. Remer, *Foreign Investments in China*, Macmillan, New York, 1933, p. 337.

penetration, the other, expansion through territorial annexation. The latter group argued that the markets to be secured had to be colonial markets, since high duties imposed by other countries could limit the export of the admittedly cheaper American goods. The underlying economic factors were thus analyzed by the imperialist theoretician Brooks Adams in 1899*:

Upon the existence of this surplus hinges the future, for the United States must provide sure and adequate outlets for her products, or be in danger of gluts more dangerous to her society than many panics such as 1873 and 1893.

He warned that if expansion was curtailed, "competition will force it [the U.S.] to abandon the individual for the collective mode of life." He served notice on the other imperialist powers that the U.S. would demand a place commensurate with its new strength:

Our geographical position, our wealth, and our energy preeminently fit us to enter upon the development of Eastern Asia, and to reduce it to a part of our economic system. . . . Americans cannot be excluded from China without a struggle . . . and as these struggles for supremacy sometimes involve an appeal to force, safety lies in being armed and organized against all emergencies.**

* Brooks Adams, *America's Economic Supremacy*, Harpers, New York, 1900, p. 32.

** *Ibid.*, pp. 221-222.

Senator Beveridge, the political spokesman of the expansionists of 1898, embellished this theme with a new "imperialism of righteousness." He developed further the Manifest Destiny doctrine of America's responsibility to bring democracy to backward peoples first proclaimed by the slaveholders to justify their aggression against Mexico in 1846. He declared:

Fate has written our policy for us; the trade of the world must and shall be ours. . . . We will establish trading-posts throughout the world as distributing-points for American products. . . . And American law, American order, American civilization, and the American flag will plant themselves on shores hitherto bloody and benighted, but by those agencies of God henceforth to be made beautiful and bright. . . .

Beveridge proposed to realize this through an Anglo-American division of the world:

If it means Anglo-Saxon solidarity; if it means an English-American understanding upon the basis of a division of the world's markets so that the results may be just . . . if it means such an English-speaking league of God for the permanent peace of this wartorn world, the stars in their course will fight for us and countless centuries will applaud.

In his maiden speech to the Senate in 1900, Beveridge made clear America's interest in the Philippines as a stepping-stone to China:

The
. . . A
are C
will n
not ren
our rac
civiliza
power
power
power
Americ
Star of
of the
comme
order
the sta
of the

Ref
Philip
of Co
hither
Britan
mark
ing w
we sh
somet
suppo
can
1898)
Philip
Amer
conn
tion
war
spire
Euro
sider
earth
prov
In
Rail
(Au
ing

The Philippines are ours forever. . . . And just beyond the Philippines are China's illimitable markets. We will not retreat from either . . . will not renounce our part in the mission of our race, trustees under God, of the civilization of the world. . . . The power that rules the Pacific is the power that rules the world . . . that power is and will forever be the American Republic. . . . Westward the Star of Empire takes its way—the star of the empire of liberty and law, of commerce and communication, of social order and the Gospel of our Lord—the star of empire of the civilization of the world.

Referring to the seizure of the Philippines, the *New York Journal of Commerce* boasted in 1898 that hitherto we had "allowed Great Britain to fight our battle for an open market in China: with our flag floating within 500 miles of Hong Kong we shall be able to give that policy something more than merely moral support in the future." The *American Banker* smugly wrote (May 1898) that the retention of the Philippines would add weight to American diplomacy, particularly in connection with the "inevitable partition of the Chinese empire. That a war with Spain should have transpired at precisely this time, when Europe is tending to divide a considerable section of the inhabited earth, is a coincidence which has a providential air."

In order to remove any doubt, *Railway World* concisely suggested (August, 1898): "One way of opening a market is to conquer it. . . ."

The bourgeois democrats who opposed expansion were attacked as traitors and their constitutional rights curtailed. To this, Moorfield Storey, a leader of the Anti-Imperialist League, replied:

It is not strange that they (the expansionists) would stifle free speech in Massachusetts and Pennsylvania and visit upon all their opponents the penalties of treason. It is easier to call those who resist their policy traitors than to defend the policy itself. By such treason, this government was founded and by such treason it has been saved.

The territorial expansionists such as Beveridge were challenged by another imperialist group who favored expansion through economic penetration. Their position was expressed by former President Harrison in a debate with Beveridge:

I have no argument to make against territorial expansion, but I do not as some do, look to expansion as the safest and most attractive avenue of national development. By the advantages of abundant and cheap coal and iron, of an enormous supply of food products, and of invention and economy in production, we are now leading by a nose the original and greatest of the colonizing nations. Great Britain cannot hold the trade of her colonies against American offerings of a better or cheaper product. The Central and South American states, assured of our purpose not only to respect, but to defend their autonomy, and finding that peace and social order which a closer and larger commercial intercourse with the world will bring over to our com-

merce a field, the full development of which will realize the El Dorado.

In essence, the form of expansion espoused by former President Harrison—of economic penetration—was adopted as the dominant American policy. This did not preclude, on a secondary plane, a territorial policy as evidenced in the retention to this day of Puerto Rico.

THE "OPEN-DOOR" POLICY

The economic strength of the U.S. had been greatly augmented by 1898 and its military position improved in comparison with the position of the other powers. However, quite apart from the above-noted differences in approach to the mode of American expansion, open seizure of Chinese territory was not feasible. Secretary of State Hay privately admitted (March 3, 1899) that those in the government did "not think that the public opinion of the United States would justify this government in taking part of the great game of spoliation now going on."

The reason that the U.S. did not seize territory in China after 1898, when American production began to exceed the production of its rivals, was partly due to the fact that expansion in the form of territorial annexation was not immediately necessary. Economic penetration, in view of the costly Philippine annexation (1899-1902)* and the inexpensive seizure of much of Latin America without an-

* Admiral Dewey's quick and easy victory in May 1898 over the Spanish fleet was followed by three years of war to suppress the heroic Filipino independent movement. This military campaign, costing \$170,000,000, took thousands of lives. p.

nexation, was momentarily adopted as adequately effective, less costly, more suited to by-passing the opposition of the American and Chinese peoples to an openly imperialist course, and more likely to avert a head-on collision with imperialist rivals. Expansionists such as Theodore Roosevelt spoke of the outright annexation of the Philippines as an "American Achilles heel." Sections of the bourgeoisie viewed as an "aberration," not only the conquest of the Philippines, but also the preservation of the territorial integrity of China which that conquest was to help reinforce. They regarded economic penetration as sufficiently effective for the U.S. to overcome any exclusion from a partitioned China. Samuel Flagg Bemis, the authoritative bourgeois historian, writes in support of that view: "It never occurred to these hasty thinkers that trade with a partitioned China might be greater than trade with a preserved China."*

America's economic strength, in other words, became relatively so great that it could exploit the exploiters, the European colonial powers, by investing in their industries and trading in their markets. This enabled Americans indirectly, and without bearing the financial costs or moral responsibilities, to secure a share of the colonial profits.

The problem as to the form of sharing in the colonial spoliation was solved by the enunciation of the

* Samuel Flagg Bemis, *A Diplomatic History of the United States*, Henry Holt, New York, 1934, p. 471.

Open-
1899,
asked
time
Great
strong
trolle
Britai
monc
Mano
Chin
have
Chin
wher

Ha
most
mem
Depa
lishm
devic
to a
Brita
niqu
in a
actu
lianc
of H
call
ritor
of C
inter
"sph
speci
crim
road
with
Ba
"sph
with
Chin
and

* 7

Macr

Open-Door policy in September 1899, to which the other powers were asked to adhere. This policy at that time coincided with the interests of Great Britain, up to that time the strongest world power, which controlled 60 percent of Chinese trade. Britain sought to bar the threatened monopolization by Czarist Russia of Manchuria, the industrial heart of China. In addition, Britain did not have the power by itself to dominate China and was preoccupied elsewhere.

Hay's declaration in fact was almost word for word based on a memorandum written for the State Department by Hippisley, an Englishman. Hay's declaration was a device to by-pass popular opposition to an open alliance with Great Britain. It was "a diplomatic technique by which the open door could in a measure be guaranteed without actual resort to either force or alliance."* Contrary to legend, the text of Hay's notes reveal that he did not call for the preservation of the territory, sovereignty and independence of China but demanded: (1) non-interference by one power with the "sphere of interest" of another, and specifically (2) uniform and non-discriminatory customs duties and railroad charges on trade of all powers within the "sphere of interest."

Basically the recognition of "spheres of interest" was inconsistent with a demand for observance of China's sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity. Under such

circumstances this demand, which Hay later made, only served to shed an aura of philanthropy over what would otherwise have been a naked imperialist proposal. What Hay objected to was not the seizure of special privilege at the expense of China but the monopolization of any privilege by any one imperialist power other than the U.S.A. Hay did not call upon the powers to renounce their "spheres of influence" but to open them to others, particularly to the U.S. Like Caleb Cushing in 1844, he sought not to abolish but to share privilege. This was clearly shown in Hay's protest (in 1902) to the proposed agreement between China and Czarist Russia regarding Russia's efforts to appropriate Manchuria. The protest was based on the ground that Russia would receive the "exclusive right . . . to industrially developing Manchuria. . . ." He complained that such exclusive rights "constitutes a monopoly. . . ." Nor was Hay's opposition actually to monopoly as such, but to a monopoly not held by the U.S.

As far as trade with China was concerned, the Open Door policy was not reciprocal. Though an open door was demanded for the entry of U.S. goods into China without tariff restrictions, at no time was this privilege mutually accorded to China for the entry of its goods into the U.S.

The Open Door doctrine essentially demanded, not an end to imperialist aggression, but an American share in its proceeds. The doctrine was a device by which a trick by the most aggressive power redounded

* Tyler Dennett, *Americans in Eastern Asia*, Macmillan, New York, 1922, p. 645.

equally for the benefit of all powers while at the same time the other powers did not seem to assume any moral responsibility for the method by which the privilege was obtained. Yet it is on this double-dealing policy, which extended one hand of friendship to China to her face while with the other stabbing her in the back, that certain myths of a supposedly benevolent U.S. policy toward China are founded. True, the people of the U.S. and China have been friendly, but the policy of our government toward China was fundamentally the friendship between a cannibal and his dinner. The friendship of the American policy makers consisted of trying to curb the appetites of the other powers so that there would still be much of China left when the U.S. would be strong enough to take a seat at the head of the dinner table. China's territorial integrity was to be "preserved" — for ultimate consumption by ourselves. Aggression was not negated but only postponed.

THE FURTHER DEVELOPMENT OF U.S. POLICY AFTER 1898

China mainly owed its preservation from partition after 1898 to the resistance of its people and the rivalries of the great powers, and after October 1917 also to the example and influence of the Soviet Union which had renounced the privileges extorted by Czarist Russia.

The indignation of the Chinese people at the huge spheres of influence claimed by the imperialists

was a major factor in the Boxer Uprising in 1900. U.S. military forces joined with those of other powers in its suppression. After the defeat of Russia by Japan in 1905 in a war in which the U.S. supported the latter—the battle among the imperialists for the economic partition of China was resumed. It particularly centered around railway concessions in Manchuria in which Harriman, the railway magnate, J. P. Morgan and Kuhn, Loeb and Co. took part. American interests were being more and more excluded from railway financing by a coalition of the British, French and German banks. President Taft openly intervened with a note in 1909 to the Chinese government asking for "equal participation": "I have an intense personal interest in making use of American capital in the development of China as an instrument for the promotion of the welfare of China . . ." he wrote. His interest was indeed "intense," but not for the welfare of China. Secretary of State Knox declared that the "formation of a powerful American, British, French and German financial group" to exploit China would be "best calculated to maintain the open door and the integrity of China." Backed up by this State Department support and a guarantee of their investment, American banks shared in financing a loan to China.

These demands of Taft and Knox reveal a characteristic feature of U.S. China policy. In the conditions of intense imperialist rivalry, U.S. de-

plom
co-op
and
one
bank

The
the
the
sions
the
ing
to sa
polic
geois
with
tion
to is
Yat-
viser
now
to C

It
lord
dem
man
tung
area
aski
con
"pri
191
fuse
trea
form
flue
Wil
the
part
was
pos
of c

plomacy was marked "by the closest co-operation between foreign finance and foreign policy. The period was one of conquest by railroad and bank."^{*}

The corruption and impotency of the Manchu dynasty in the face of the imperialist scramble for concessions of 1908 to 1911 culminated in the 1911 Revolution and the founding of the Chinese Republic. Unable to save the Manchu rule, American policy endeavored to split the bourgeois revolutionary forces from within, giving its support to the reactionary Yuan Shih-kai and seeking to isolate the democratic leader, Sun Yat-sen. Yuan Shih-kai's political adviser was an American, Frank Goodnow. The next most serious threat to Chinese sovereignty came in 1915.

It was then that the Japanese war lords submitted their infamous 21 demands on China claiming the German "spheres of influence" of Shantung, South Manchuria and other areas. The U.S. reacted by simply asking Japan for a consultation in connection with maintaining the "principle of equal opportunity." In 1919 the Japanese threatened to refuse to sign the Versailles peace treaty unless permitted to retain the former German "spheres of influence" in China, and President Wilson submitted. The reaction of the Chinese people, who had taken part in the war on the Allied side, was climactic. Betrayed by their supposed allies and influenced by the

October Revolution, the Chinese people held giant demonstrations on May 4, 1919, unleashing a tremendous national upsurge. This upsurge, in conjunction with the numerical and ideological growth of the Chinese working class which had occurred during World War I and was stimulated by the October Revolution, helped provide the conditions for the founding of the Communist Party of China in 1921.

The position of American imperialism had been strengthened by World War I and the opening of the Panama Canal in 1914. After the war, the opportunity seemed much more favorable for acquiring the tremendous Chinese market. To encourage penetration, tax exemption was granted in 1922 to American-owned concerns on profits earned in China. While prior to 1917 there had been in China only on American bank with 5 branches, by 1925 there were 6 with 28 branches. Simultaneously, blows were struck by Wall Street at Japan. The Japanese were restricted from making any independent loans by being "invited" to join a banking consortium organized by American interests. A further limitation upon Japan was imposed by the U.S.-sponsored Nine Power Disarmament Conference of 1922 in which the Japanese Navy was limited and Japan was pledged to respect the "Open Door or equality of opportunity in China" and not to seek any "superiority of rights" or "mutually exclusive opportunities."

^{*} T. W. Overlach, *Foreign Financial Control of China*, Macmillan, New York, 1919, p. II.

The rivalry between the U.S.A. and Japan over the Chinese market sharpened tremendously in this period.

Foreign capital, attracted by huge profits from sweatshop labor, flowed into China. As compared to 1914, by 1931 American investments had almost quadrupled, British business investments had doubled, and Japanese had quintupled. American investments increased from \$42,000,000 to \$155,000,000. The mounting resistance of the Chinese people to imperialist exploitation found a high point in the strikes and demonstrations of May 30, 1925, which signaled the national revolution of 1925-27 and the Kuomintang-led expedition against the northern feudal militarists who had sold out to Japan. Unable directly to intervene and crush the national revolutionary alliance of the Communist Party, the trade unions, the Kuomintang and other mass organizations, the American and other imperialists succeeded in 1927 in splitting the alliance from within. They gave support to Chiang Kai-shek in his seizure of dictatorial power and his "extermination" campaigns against the Communist Party and the workers' and peasants' organizations. American gunboats in 1927 helped bombard Nanking, then controlled by the people. Again, in 1930, American gunboats fired on Changsha in order to help Chiang Kai-shek oust the Chinese Red Army. The bloody treachery of Chiang Kai-shek, the big capitalists and feudal elements greatly weak-

ened China and paved the way for the subsequent aggression by Japan which broke the imperialist stalemate of the 1920's by annexing Manchuria in 1931.

From 1931 to 1941, the United States, while feebly "protesting" Japan's violation of the Open Door "equality" principle, supplied Japan with more than \$300,000,000 worth of war material, as well as with capital for the expansion of Japanese war industry.

WORLD WAR II AND POST V-J DAY PERIOD

American strategy in the Pacific during World War II is well known. The U.S. fought Japan while aiding Chiang Kai-shek to hoard troops and supplies in preparation for attacking the Communist-led Liberated Areas after the defeat of Japan. Stilwell's ouster grew out of his refusal to support this diversion of forces from the fight against Japan. The U.S. gave no weapons to the Chinese Red Army, despite its valiant and effective struggle against Japan and the military intelligence it provided to the U.S. forces. Since V-J Day more than 6 billion dollars have been expended by the U.S. in an effort to conquer China through support of the puppet Chiang Kai-shek regime in its war against the people. This one of the largest postwar U.S. expenditures, demonstrates the great importance American imperialism places on holding China. Throughout, the United States acted unilaterally without consulting its imperial-

ist rivals. Parallel with this, the U.S. sought to oust its rivals with the negotiation of the Sino-American commercial agreement of 1946. By virtue of American superior military and economic power, the treaty in effect gave the U.S. finance-capitalists a preferential position in connection with trade and investment in China. The reference in the treaty to equality was mere hollow pretense. The demand in the past for the Open Door, for equality, was shown as only an embryonic stage in the unfolding of U.S. imperialist policy in its striving for domination.

DETERMINANTS OF U.S. CHINA POLICY

The history of American policy toward China from 1785 to the present indicates that this policy flowed essentially out of the internal contradictions of American capitalism and was further influenced by its external contradictions.

Since 1945, U.S. China policy has been increasingly motivated by the struggle against the Soviet Union. China became a projected base for an anti-Soviet attack, and for domination of the entire East more than a source for any large immediate profits. In relation to U.S. Far Eastern policy as a whole, China has been the focal point, the strategic goal of U.S. expansion, with Japan, the Philippines and other areas in Eastern Asia essentially viewed as auxiliary to the central prize of China.

A second aspect of American im-

perialism's strategy was its struggle within China against its imperialist rivals, its support of Chinese reaction against the Chinese people. As regards its rivals, American policy until V-J Day rested mainly on an unavowed alliance with Great Britain and, for a time, with Japan. Britain throughout had naval supremacy and powerful Far Eastern bases. During this period the U.S. pursued the limited objective of maintaining a foothold in China against the efforts of other powers to exclude the U.S. altogether. After V-J Day the U.S. sought to dominate China and exclude all its rival. As regards Chinese reaction and the Chinese people, the U.S. followed the contradictory policy of exerting pressure on Chinese reaction in order to wring concessions while simultaneously supporting it against the blows of the Chinese people. The U.S. thus in turn supported the Manchu dynasty, Yuan Shih-kai and Chiang Kai-shek, extorting concessions which if realized by Chiang Kai-shek, for example, would have converted China into a Wall Street colony. Their support by the U.S. imperialists reflected the policy of capitalism in the colonial and semi-colonial countries of alliance with feudalism to suppress the revolutionary movement of the people.

The fact that China was never fully partitioned was due mainly to the strength of its people and the divisions among its imperialist enemies, which weakened Chinese reaction and eliminated many of the

imperialist powers from the field.

Contrary to Browder and other imperialist apologists, the economic penetration of China by the United States was throughout fully imperialist. This imperialist expansion, based on economic penetration rather than immediate, open annexation, is today expressed in the Marshall Plan, the North Atlantic Pact, the arms plan, and Truman's proposal for the so-called development of "backward" areas. These present policies represent a more aggressive economic, political, and military domination which even brings into its orbit the more backward Western European countries.

The Open Door policy is now in limbo, not only because the U.S. does not wish now to keep the door open for others, but even more importantly because *the Chinese people are closing the door* to American imperialism itself. Having finally won supremacy over all other rivals, American imperialism came face to face with its final enemy in China—the Chinese people armed with Marxism-Leninism—and is meeting defeat. Aggression against China, no matter how forcefully waged and demagogically veiled, now has no future. The future of China now belongs to its people and not to imperialism!

After the Spanish-American War and after World Wars I and II, American imperialism had dreams of fabulous profits from trade and investment in China. In each case hard reality permitted a much more

narrow orbit to imperialist ambitions. American imperialism could, however, postpone with greater equanimity, after the Spanish-American War and World War I, its vision of conquest of the Chinese market and satiate itself with investment and trade in Europe and Latin America. But today its glut of capital to export and wares to sell is more pressing both because there is more to dispose of and the capitalist markets are smaller. The victories of the Chinese Liberation Armies have set an example for all the peoples of Asia. At the same time, the conflict between the U.S. and Britain for a share in the China market is sharpening. As for U.S. imperialism, the loss of China makes precarious the U.S. retention of control of Japan and other areas adjoining China. Japan depended to a great degree for its coal, iron and many other basic materials on Manchuria and northern Korea, which are now closed to foreign exploitation.

Wall Street plans for its war of aggression have been to concentrate on Europe while trying to hold Asia. But the rest of Asia is, no more than China, scheduling its liberation struggles to suit the timetable of its would-be master. The course of events in China serves to demonstrate the correctness of Stalin's statement that the warmongers are doomed to "ignominious failure."

American imperialism's counter-revolutionary efforts, however, will not cease, but intensify in new forms with the aim of undermining China

new democracy from within as well as conspiring to attack it from without. Through its Kuomintang puppets, operating from their Formosa base, U.S. imperialism is blockading the coast of China, dreaming of reversing the verdict of history in a third world war.

The defeats inflicted on American imperialism by the victories of the Chinese Liberation Armies, guided by the brilliant Leninist, Mao Tse-tung, have already made a tremendous contribution to peace and democracy.

American labor and all progressives have a responsibility to lead the American people in struggle for a program of genuine friendship and cooperation, including: (1) full rec-

ognition of the new, people's government being established in China; (2) trade without political "strings" and especially the export of American machinery with long-term credit; (3) financial, technical and other aid by the American people direct to the Chinese people; and (4) expression by individuals and organizations of solidarity with the Chinese people, their trade unions and other people's organizations.

We who have gained so much from the struggles of the Chinese people must aid them in every way while using their advances to bring the whole struggle of the American people for peace, security and democracy to a higher level.

by Michael Salerno

[The writer of this remarkable document, an outstanding Italian-American Communist leader, is editor of the progressive Italian-language newspaper, L'Unita del Popolo. Comrade Salerno is one of the 80-odd progressives, labor leaders, and Communists who are currently being victimized and persecuted by the fascist-like deportations campaign of the Department of Justice.

[We are pleased to present this communication, especially in the context of the present-day struggle for the progressive, Mitchurin position in biological science—the triumphant outcome of which represents a major event in the ideological life of the Soviet people, as well as of all peoples. Comrade Salerno, twenty years ago, at the age of twenty-seven, showed a remarkable insight into the application of Marxism-Leninism to the science of biology and held to his position with a tenacity born of his scientific, Communist conviction.—Editor.]

THE EDITOR, *Political Affairs*

The ideological lackeys of American imperialism, these "gentlemen's gentlemen" who are paid to extoll the scientific achievements of their masters in the field of war preparations and annihilation, cannot but attack Lysenko's report on *The Science of Biology Today** which embodies the triumphant efforts of Soviet biologists to make man the conscious master of nature as he becomes master of his social organization.

In their vain efforts to belittle the

* Trofim Lysenko, International Publishers, New York.

revolutionary value of Lysenko's report, they say that "here we have a typical product of Soviet society." They do not realize of course that this remark, in spite of its obviously derogatory intent, is the highest tribute that any one could pay to the creative power of Socialism. For there is no doubt that only on the fertile soil of Soviet society could the Mitchurinian principles of biology fully blossom out and carry the day against the reactionary, idealistic and pseudo-scientific ragweed cultivated by Mendel, Weismann and Morgan—that only where the people are already masters of their social organiza-

ization could men of science such as Lysenko and his followers score so decisive a triumph over their opponents in the field of biology.

But the lackeys of American imperialism are dead wrong when they imply that outside the borders of the Soviet Union no one ever dared to challenge the tenets of Mendel, Weismann and Morgan. And it is only for the purpose of illustrating this point that I wish to recall an obscure episode of the struggle for a correct, Marxist approach to the problem of heredity—an episode that took place 21 years ago right here in the United States of America and in which I played a modest role.

At the beginning of 1928 I sent to *The Communist*, which was then the theoretical organ of the Communist Party, an article on the problem of population. In it I criticized of course Malthus' point of view, according to which the growth of population takes place geometrically whereas that of the means of subsistence occurs at best only arithmetically. To show how false this point of view really is, I pointed out that if, as Malthus maintained, the means of subsistence were inevitably inadequate to the needs of a faster-growing population, this would bring about a change in the human reproductive faculty. I wrote:

"The effect of environment upon the human reproductive faculty was clearly recognized by Darwin. 'It is highly probable', he said, 'that savages, who often suffer much

hardship, would be actually less prolific.'"

Bertram D. Wolfe, who at that time was Editor of *The Communist* and who a year later was expelled from the Party as a renegade, together with the notorious Lovestone, objected to this point of view. On April 12, 1928, he wrote to me:

Your article is valuable in that it correctly states the fact that the law of population is different for each form of society, and as such it would be well worth publishing in *The Communist*, were it not for certain errors in other portions of the article.

Specifically, I disagree with the article's estimate of the nature of the evolutionary process. You seem to imply that acquired characters are transmittable. . . .

Thus, in my judgment, your main thesis is entirely correct, but your secondary one, which is nevertheless highly important, both in itself and to your article, is not correctly stated.

If you should be willing to rework your article in that direction, the magazine would welcome it, or if you eliminate that section or your article.

To this I replied as follows on April 22, 1928:

. . . as a Marxist I do believe in the inheritance of acquired characters and let me add that not to believe in it would mean to divorce Marx's Historical Materialism and marry the Eugenic doctrine. It would mean, that is to say, to marry a doctrine which in its logical conclusion is utterly anti-Marxian and petty bourgeois.

In fact, according to this theory, which

is the offspring of Weismann's refusal to admit the influence of environment upon the race, the reformation of this world of ours—that even in the Eugenists' opinion is far from being an Eden—depends only and wholly on the biological reformation of men secured through natural selection; but from a Marxist angle of view even the biological betterment of the race is to a certain extent quite dependent on the betterment of the world worked out, as you know, by a revolutionary change in the mode of production.

You will object, I fear, that I am overestimating the value of the Marxist method of investigation by deeming it apt to explain not only the social history of man but even his philogeny; and I beg to say therefore that, whereas it was a fatal error to let the positivists *naturalize*—so to say—Marx's doctrine and convert it into a pernicious fatalist theory which suited very well the Social-Democrats of every country, it will lead us nearer the truth to *Marxize* the biological history of man and humanize it. And when we do so, when, in other words, we resort to Marxian dialectics to solve the puzzling mystery of evolution, we see quite clearly that to deny the transmissibility of acquired characters is just as wrong as to affirm that the industrial and technical experiences of capitalist society will not be inherited by a communist society.

This is what I think, and although I feel that the controversy is by no means benefited by my opinion, I insist upon it and hope that you will publish the article as it is.

I thought that I had thus laid the ghost of Weismann which Wolfe

had conjured to prevent a Marxist—that is to say, a really scientific, approach to the problem of heredity. That I was mistaken is indicated by this retort which I received a few days after and which is an outstanding example of anti-Marxian double talk:

It seems to me that you are underestimating the influence of environment upon the individual, after birth, and exaggerating the possibility of the environment influencing the individual before birth. . . .

It is precisely man's ability to change his environment, to prolong and enlarge his biological self with tools which become ever more complicated, and which his children's children are born into the inheritance of, not because of changes in the germ-plasm and the embryo, but because of changes in the social environment that man has created for himself—it is precisely this which differentiates him from the lower animals in the question of the possibility of progress, and the conquest of nature.

On April 29 I replied as follows:

First of all let me say as emphatically as I can that I do not underestimate the influence of environment upon the mature individual; and then let me see how we stand.

We both admit that after birth the individual is not refractory to the suggestive powers of his surroundings. We both affirm that to understand the nature of man it is absolutely necessary to reckon with the world into which he is born, with the society which nurses him, reshapes him and urges

him to
analysis—
which
society and
you know
atmosphere
ment and
ioned in
Marx will
the exte
man at t
nature.
But w
go a litt
the trans
tics thus
vidual.
even the
influence
vitality o
and the
Weism
firm the
that the
upon the
constituti
I will no

him to exert himself, and—in the last analysis—with the mode of production which is the hidden basic force of society and its institutions. I know and you know that man imbibes the atmosphere created by his social environment and that his character is fashioned in the process. We agree with Marx when he says that by acting on the external world and changing it, man at the same times changes his own nature.

But while you abruptly stop here, I go a little further. I admit moreover the transmissibility of the characteristics thus acquired by the mature individual. I admit—that is to say—that even the germ-cell is to some extent influenced by environment because its vitality depends upon the parent life and the parent life is liable to change.

Weismann and his disciples may affirm the contrary. They may affirm that the germ-cell is not dependent upon the other cells surrounding it and constituting its immediate environment. I will not divorce my opinion on ac-

count of theirs, and I will not do it because I know that self-sufficiency is not an attribute of living organisms and much less the characteristic of the simple cell. Only in heaven, the priest says, there is a self-sufficient being called God, but we deny his existence because we know that a self-sufficient being is not a being at all.

A cell divorced from the organism of which it is a part and parcel is a mere abstraction, and Weismann and his followers would have understood this had they known that life "is born in the storm and stress of opposition" and had they realized that self-sufficiency excludes opposition and by so doing excludes life itself. But they do not know that dialectic is the only law of evolution and they are furthermore so steeped in their learned ignorance that they do not realize how unscientific and how theological, I would say, the conclusion of their theory is.

Comradely yours,
MICHAEL SALERNO.

RECENT INTERNATIONAL BOOKS

SOVIET ECONOMY DURING THE SECOND WORLD WAR

By N. A. VOZNESENSKY \$1.25

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

By M. Ilin and E. Segal \$2.50

NEW CENTURY PUBLISHERS

832 Broadway, New York 3, N. Y.

A KEY TO THE POLITICS OF WAR AND FASCISM

MUST WE PERISH?

The Logic of 20th Century Barbarism

By **HERSHEL D. MEYER**

Marxist in content, both in its analysis of the war politics of imperialism between the two World Wars and in its probing of the present and future, Dr. Meyer reveals the underlying reasons why peace is looked upon with fright by the men of the Wall Street trusts. Encyclopedic in range, this new study may well be thought of as a key to the sources of American foreign policy. It poses and answers the question of why it is that American imperialism has now replaced Germany as the central threat to world peace.

Price: Cloth, \$2.00; Paper, \$1.00

Handbook of Philosophy

Edited by **HOWARD SELSAM**

This new International volume, translated and adapted from the *Short Philosophical Dictionary*, first published in the Soviet Union, sold over two million copies in the U.S.S.R. The *Handbook of Philosophy* is a different kind of dictionary, partisan as well as integrated, taking its point of departure from the philosophy of dialectical materialism and calculated to take the reader ever further into philosophical thought at the same time that it leads him out to progressive action in the world around him.

Price: \$1.50

NEW CENTURY PUBLISHERS

832 Broadway, New York 3, N. Y.

A GREAT PUBLISHING EVENT!

"THE TWILIGHT OF WORLD CAPITALISM"

By **WILLIAM Z. FOSTER**

This new INTERNATIONAL book sums up the lessons of the epochal changes which have transformed the world during Foster's own lifetime, and in which he has played the role of a leading creative Marxist.

First printing, 100,000 copies

35¢ each; 3 for \$1.00

In Defense of the Communist Party and the Indicted Leaders

By **WILLIAM Z. FOSTER**

The complete text of the outline of the defense's case in the trial of the Communist Party National Committee members, written by the National Chairman of the Communist Party, William Z. Foster.

96 pages; price 15 cents

NEW CENTURY PUBLISHERS

832 Broadway, New York 3, N. Y.

F
M''

arty