

# political affairs

JUNE 1951 • 25 CENTS

*Had.*

- |                                   |       |  |
|-----------------------------------|-------|--|
| EUGENE DENNIS                     | [ 1 ] | The Fight for Peace Goes On                                |
| EDITORIAL                         | [ 3 ] | Defend the Freedom of Cultural Expression                  |
| ALEXANDER BITTELMAN               | [ 7 ] | MacArthur and the "Great Debate"                           |
| MAX GORDON                        | [18]  | Crime and Capitalism                                       |
| OHIO STATE BOARD, COMMUNIST PARTY | [31]  | Self-Criticism and the Struggle for Collective Leadership  |
| ROB F. HALL                       | [40]  | The Meeting of the American Foreign Ministers              |
| ESTHER CANTOR                     | [48]  | Tear Down the Walls of the Negro Ghetto                    |
| GEORGE LOHR                       | [58]  | The Meaning of a Unified, Democratic Germany               |
| G. ALEXANDROV                     | [70]  | A New Outstanding Contribution to the Treasury of Leninism |
| ISTVAN FRISS                      | [84]  | Wages in the Society of Socialist Construction             |

JUST PUBLISHED!

# THE WOMAN QUESTION

*Selections from the Writings of*

KARL MARX, FREDERICK ENGELS,  
V. I. LENIN and JOSEPH STALIN

The first part of this new International title deals with the origin of the woman question, and explains how and why, in the view of these leaders of world thought, it became a special question. The volume includes descriptions of the conditions of women workers in the early factories and the effects of women's employment upon family life and children.

The Table of Contents includes:

- I. The Enslavement of Women
- II. The Exploitation of Women
- III. The Bourgeois Family
- IV. Women In the Struggle for Socialism
- V. Socialism and the Emancipation of Women
- VI. The Relation of Sexes
- VII. Women in Socialist Construction

Appendix: *Lenin on the Woman Question*, by Clara Zetkin.  
Bibliography of Sources

This work provides a guide to a more profound understanding of the role and position of women today and, taken together with current writings on the subject, gives both historical perspective and theoretical insight into the tremendous force for peace and progress which women comprise in modern society.

Price: cloth \$1.25;  
paper \$ .50

**NEW CENTURY PUBLISHERS**

832 Broadway • New York City 3

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.



203

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

Editor: V. J. JEROME

## The Fight For Peace Goes On

By Eugene Dennis

*(Immediately following the Supreme Court decision affirming the Smith Act, on June 4, Eugene Dennis, General Secretary of the Communist Party, made the following declaration):*

In an atmosphere of war hysteria, the Truman court majority voted to substitute the Smith thought-control Act for the Constitution's First Amendment, which clearly forbids Congress to make any law abridging the people's right of free speech, press, assembly or worship. Its refusal to consider the case of the lawyers for the 11 Communist leaders strikes a blow at the historic freedom of Americans to their own counsel as well as the right of attorneys zealously to defend their clients and uphold the Constitution.

The nation is confronted with a clear and present danger—the danger of Wall Street's advanced drive toward war and fascism. The prolongation of American intervention in Korea and the warmakers' efforts to spread it into a world atomic holocaust is a clear and present danger. The establishment of an American police-state in the image of the Smith and McCarran Acts is a clear and present danger. The mad armaments drive and its crushing economic burden upon the working people is a clear and present danger.

The sole "guilt" of the Communist leaders is their advocacy of peace and social progress—their opposition to war and fascism. The Communist Party does not now advocate—and never has advocated—the forcible overthrow of the government. It has

worked—and will continue to work—for peace and democracy, for the unity of the people against the atomaniacs, against labor's foes and against the lynchers of the Negro people.

It is solely because of this advocacy and activity that the Communist Party is today being persecuted.

We warn the American people that reaction here, as in Nazi Germany, will not stop with the Communists. Reaction will try to exploit this decision not only to seek to suppress the Communist Party but to smash the trade unions, sharpen the terror against the Negro people and stifle the growing peace movement.

The Communist Party will apply to the Court for an immediate rehearing. It is confident that millions of Americans in the ranks of labor and the Negro people, and all advocates of peace will support this demand.

Come what may the Communist Party will continue its effort to unite the American people against the monopolists and their political puppets seeking to rush our nation into the disaster of a third world war. Come what may, the cause of peace, democracy and social progress will continue to gain supporters and triumph over its enemies.

An E

THE P  
the th  
tion of  
loving  
cultur

The  
college  
even

*Times*  
subtle,  
of thou  
college  
the cou  
Yale D  
growing  
conform

Every  
and deg  
plans fo  
conquer  
room is  
and the  
sergean  
rized an  
the mil  
is debas  
chauvin  
the kille  
accept t  
struction

The  
Hollywo

# Defend the Freedom of Cultural Expression!

## An Editorial

THE PEOPLE of the United States face the threat today of the utter destruction of all that is democratic, peace-loving, and forward-striving in the cultural life of the nation.

The policing of thought in the colleges has reached such a stage that even the reactionary *New York Times* is compelled to report: "A subtle, creeping paralysis of freedom of thought and speech is attacking college campuses in many parts of the country." The *Times* quotes the *Yale Daily News*: "We see the sky growing darker, the night of thought-conformity closing in."

Every field of culture is regimented and degraded—to serve Wall Street's plans for an aggressive war of world conquest! It is for war that the classroom is being turned into a barracks and the teacher converted into a drill sergeant. For war, science is militarized and the scientist is chained to the military machine. For war, art is debased—to whip up hysteria and chauvinism, to popularize the cult of the killer and condition the people to accept the "inevitability" of mass destruction.

The current "investigation" of Hollywood by the House Commit-

tee on "Un-American" Activities marks a new advance in the direction of total fascist "thought-control." The blacklist, introduced in the motion picture industry at the time of the previous hearings in 1947, is now publicly acknowledged and extended. The Un-Americans insist on their absolute control of the artist's life and conscience.

The artist must make public confession of any "dangerous thoughts" or associations—meaning any position he may have taken in behalf of peace, in support of labor, in the cause of equality for Negroes, or in the defense of the Bill of Rights. To obtain absolution from the Un-Americans, he must "crawl in the mud" and become a stool-pigeon. All honor to those who have refused to bend the knee to the warmakers and their inquisitors!

The degradation of the artist is a means to enforce the degradation of the "art" produced under monopoly control. Violence, death and sadism are glorified. The monstrous lie that served Hitler is revived by his American imitators: Rabid anti-Communism provides the excuse for outlawing all progressive ideas and spread-

ing the poison of racism and "Anglo-Saxon Supremacy."

We are dishonored by the export of this filth to foreign lands under United States domination. The economic exploitation decreed by the Marshall Plan includes the subordination of each nation's culture to the decadent products manufactured in the United States. The international control exercised by American finance capital is ideologically expressed in the cosmopolitanism of the "American Century" that would strangle national aspirations and convert the world into a colony of Wall Street.

Truman-MacArthur's "Operation Killer" unleashed against the colored peoples of Korea and China with the intent of enslaving all of Asia has its counterpart in the intensified legal-lynch terror directed at the Negro people in the United States. "Operation Killer," at home as well as abroad, is provided with a varying range of "cultural" defenses: from the cynical philosophy of genocide offered by the Neo-Malthusians to the "New Look" camouflage of Negro oppression in Hollywood's recent series of "Negro interest" films. These films deny the need or possibility of a militant struggle for Negro rights and national liberation. At the same time, vile stereotypes of Negro characters continue to appear in film, radio and magazines. The legal murders of the Martinsville Seven and of Willie Mc-

Gee are thus excused and reinforced by the "culture" of imperialism. The fight to end racist stereotypes and bring about honest representation of Negro life in all the arts must go hand in hand with a fight for jobs and equal status for Negro artists, for an end to Jim Crow in every field of American culture, and for the unrestricted right of Negro cultural workers to develop their creative skills and talents.

Honest artists, scientists, scholars and professionals have shown a growing awareness of the danger of thought-control, and a courageous unwillingness to be silenced. Their struggle is inseparable from the struggles of the working class and the Negro people for peace and security. At Peekskill we saw the face of American fascism; we saw its furious hatred of culture directed against the great people's artist Paul Robeson. And we saw the power of the people's resistance, an inspiring instance of what could be accomplished by the broad militant unity of labor, the Negro people, and intellectual forces.

Peekskill was an historic landmark in the struggle to defend our democratic heritage—the heritage of Tom Paine and Walt Whitman and Frederick Douglass, of Wendell Phillips and Mark Twain, of Theodore Dreiser and John Reed.

These mighty figures of the American past stood with Robeson at Peekskill, as they stood with the

Holly  
today  
W. E.  
devot  
'The  
ican p  
Squar  
Comm  
out fo  
and p  
the f  
peace,  
defens  
liberat  
freedo  
We  
the ad  
fully a  
cratic,  
ture, i  
ated b  
why t  
ceedin  
teachi  
tween  
and ex  
under  
for So  
fense o  
dom.  
We  
for the  
rable f  
democr  
on real  
the pec  
formali  
tortion  
order.  
right to

Hollywood Ten and as they stand today with the great Negro scholar, W. E. B. Du Bois, prosecuted for his devotion to the cause of peace.

These mighty figures of the American past stood in the dock at Foley Square with the eleven leaders of the Communist Party, which is singled out for the most vicious vilification and persecution because it stands in the forefront of the struggle for peace, for democratic rights, for the defense of labor's gains, for Negro liberation, for progressive culture and freedom of cultural expression.

We Communists believe that only the advent of a Socialist America will fully and finally guarantee a democratic, free and truly people's culture, inspired by the people and created by and for the people. This is why today, we Communists, proceeding from the Marxist-Leninist teaching on the interconnection between the struggle for the defense and extension of democratic rights under capitalism and the struggle for Socialism, take our stand in defense of academic and cultural freedom.

We Communists regard the fight for the defense of culture as inseparable from the fight for peace and democracy. We stand for an art based on realism and truth in the service of the people, as opposed to the sterile formalism which embellishes the distortions and lies of a doomed social order. We stand for the scientist's right to explore freely with a view

to mastering nature and improving the lot of mankind, as against the warmakers' demand that he become a maker of bombs and a breeder of death germs. We believe that art and science must serve the people and must be dedicated to truth and social progress.

We condemn the cynical portrayal of brutality, pornography and despair as an insult to the human spirit, a denial of man's dignity and creativity. Against the racism and chauvinism of the "culture" of imperialism, we Communists assert the internationalism that unites the workers of all lands, giving fraternal strength and unity to the peoples' common struggle for peace and freedom.

Marxist-Leninist theory has demonstrated its liberating power as a great historical force for the progress, welfare and cultural advance of humanity. Marxism is attacked by the enemies of culture and progress because it lays bare the ultra-reactionary nature of capitalism in the period of its decay; because it reveals the class basis of all exploitation and oppression, of crises and wars; because it exposes the roots of the special, national oppression of the Negro people. Marxism-Leninism proclaims the historic role of the working class in building a society which, like the Socialist Soviet Union and People's Democracies, is free from exploitation and threat of crises, free from the forces making for fascism and war,

free to build a truly creative and flowering culture.

This is why the Party of Socialism bears the main brunt of the fascist attack. But the attack is not directed against the Communists alone. Each day brings new evidence that the Smith and McCarran Acts, the "loyalty" oaths and witch-hunts and "investigations" are directed against all who seek the truth by free investigation and discussion, against all who struggle for peace, who refuse to accept the lie that "war is inevitable."

As the fight for peace broadens, uniting all forces for peace under the leadership of the working class, the need for a people's culture grows and deepens as an indispensable part of the struggle. Honest intellectuals are drawn to the people's movement, finding new and inspiring opportunities for the use of their knowledge and talents.

The situation urgently demands the unity of all forces that cherish peace and democratic liberties in a broad movement for the defense of culture.

We Communists express our readiness to support all efforts leading to the rapid development of a people's cultural movement, embracing progressive artists, scientists, and professionals—a vital movement based on the trade unions, the Negro people, and all organizations concerned with the fight for peace and democratic rights. There is a great need for the independent production of plays, books, films, dances, music, painting, sculpture, and graphic arts.

The defense of culture is not solely the concern of artists and writers, scientists and scholars. It is the broad concern of the working class, the Negro people, the farming masses, the national groups, of professionals and intellectuals to join in united action for the defense of freedom of thought, freedom of association, freedom of expression!

Defend and build the culture of the people—as a weapon in the struggle for democracy, for our nation's safety and honor, for the peace of the world!

By  
Th  
thu  
pol  
duc  
war  
Un  
serv  
the  
pen  
ther  
the  
the  
not  
war  
ther  
ing  
the  
dan  
tack  
the  
brin  
H  
his  
H  
sign  
rea  
with  
main  
that  
peac  
polic  
dang



# MacArthur and the "Great Debate"

By Alexander Bittelman

THE SENATE HEARINGS ON MacArthur, the Korean war and foreign policy in general have already produced fresh evidence of the criminal war plans and conspiracies of the United States monopolies and their servants in both the MacArthur and the Administration group. This happened despite the fact that the actors themselves, the witnesses as well as the Senators, were trying desperately not to appear before the people as warmongers. They tried to present themselves as seekers of peace, blaming the Soviet Union and China for the war in Korea and for the war danger in the world, each side attacking the other for failure to end the Korean war successfully and to bring peace.

How did MacArthur try to present his case?

He insisted that his policy is designed to end the bloodshed in Korea and that he was mainly concerned with saving American lives. He maintained that his is the only policy that can bring peace without "appeasement." He argued that if his policy is no good, because it is too dangerous and risky, then we had no

business going into Korea. He said this is so because all the dangers which the Administration claims would follow the adoption of his policy (extension of the war, Soviet intervention, World War III), were inherent in our very entrance into the Korean war.

Thus a reckless and adventurous warmonger was seeking to present himself to the people as a champion of peace. In doing so he was also laying the basis for blaming Truman for the Korean war, for the bloodshed and for American defeats. He maintained that the whole trouble started because "we lost" China, and Truman is responsible for that.

As he proceeded with his testimony, MacArthur plainly discounted the value of the present United States alliances (Britain, France, etc.), as well as of the United Nations, because the governments of the allies of the United States are not dependable and because Communism is a force in a number of those countries. He also pretty nearly exploded the Truman myth that the Korean war is a "United Nations war." Pursuing the aim of placing the blame for

the defeats upon Truman and of dismissing the United Nations as of little account, he demonstrated that the United States government fully dominates the Korean war.

MacArthur's insistence that he was only a "theatre commander" and hence no authority on "global" policy may look like a blunder on his part at first glance. For the Truman Administration seized upon that to prove that MacArthur can be no authority for Korean policy either, since the latter must be determined by "global" considerations. But in the light of the situation as a whole, this "theatre commander" proposition looks more like a deliberate maneuver of considerable importance. By not committing himself, MacArthur retains a free hand in "global" policy with a view to trying to compose differences in the Republican Party. This maneuver is also aimed at securing support from the Wall Street grouping of monopolies (those now supporting Truman), in addition to the support of the mid-West and far-West monopoly groupings which already tend to support the MacArthur outfit.

Most sinister were MacArthur's observations about Communism. His first proposition was that the "enemy" is not the Soviet Union only but Communism, Communism everywhere. His second proposition was that there are great differences between Communism and fascism, setting forth the cynical thesis that

these differences are favorable to fascism. He refused to develop these propositions, saying "that is a great philosophical question that I would not care to discuss here." It is clear, however, that here MacArthur was seeking to lay the basis for a pro-fascist orientation at home, for a coalition with the fascist forces in the United States, as well as for a fascist line-up internationally. It is an orientation of building up and allying the United States with such forces as the Nazis in Western Germany, Franco in Spain, DeGaulle in France, etc., and of doing so more energetically and consistently than the Truman Administration.

And how did the Truman Administration try to present its case? From the testimony of Marshall and Bradley, and from the questions of the Administration Senators it is evident that the Administration was trying to establish the following:

That MacArthur's policy would lead to the extension of the Korean war and to World War III while Truman's policy seeks to prevent an atomic world war and will lead to the successful conclusion of the war in Korea; that Truman's policy is based upon the proposition that the main enemy is the Soviet Union; that it is a "global" policy which is "succeeding" in containing Communism in Greece, Turkey, Germany, Yugoslavia, western Europe and Korea. It is a long process, said Marshall, which will call for much "sacrifice,"

but  
wa  
As  
Arth  
ious  
not  
in m  
sure  
Adm  
thur  
Chin  
ple's  
Mars  
that  
for l  
the a  
the  
thing  
Mars  
go it  
to de  
allies  
No  
sides,  
to se  
cour  
their  
heari  
termi  
SIGN  
CO  
OF  
The  
Arthu  
ing d  
eign  
ism.  
frustr  
East,

but it is cheaper than a new world war.

As to the differences with MacArthur, the Administration was anxious to demonstrate that these are not differences on objectives but only in matters of judgment. Marshall assured the Senators repeatedly that the Administration policy, like MacArthur's, opposes giving Formosa to China and seating the Chinese People's Republic in the United Nations. Marshall went out of his way to show that it was "natural and inevitable" for MacArthur to see things from the angle of his own theatre, but that the government must and can see things from a global point of view. Marshall also insisted that "we cannot go it alone," as MacArthur is willing to do, but must hang on to "our allies."

Now, this is the way in which both sides, so to speak, wanted the people to see their respective cases. But of course this is not the real nature of their cases. We must examine the hearings very closely in order to determine their full significance.

#### SIGNIFICANCE AND CONSEQUENCES OF THE HEARINGS

These hearings, as well as the MacArthur removal, reflect the continuing deep crisis of the aggressive foreign policies of American imperialism. They reflect its defeats and frustrations in Korea, in the Far East, and in the world at large. The

hearings show that both sides, all of the warmongers involved here, seek to hide their war plans and aggressions, and are trying to appear before the masses of the people as champions of peace. Both sides declared that world war is not inevitable and that their policies are designed to bring peace.

These desperate attempts of the warmongers to appear as champions of peace testify to the power of the growing mass dissatisfaction with the war policies of American imperialism and to the mounting fear of the American people of what an atomic world war would do to the United States. In order to drag the American people into a new world war, the MacArthur and Truman warmongers feel compelled to parade as peacemakers.

Both sides used the hearings deliberately to intensify the war incitements against the Soviet Union and the People's Republic of China. Both sides were deliberately seeking to mislead the masses of the American people into believing that the Soviet Union and the People's Republic of China are the aggressors in Korea and that American imperialism is a victim of aggression. This was war agitation—preparation for war against the Soviet Union and China.

The hearings also show that the internal struggles in the camp of the warmongers, in the camp of the monopolies, are continuing and grow-

ing more acute. These inner struggles are further accelerated by the fight among rival monopolies and monopoly groupings for larger shares of war contracts and strategic positions in the war economy and in the state capitalist war agencies. This fight is assuming the nature of a struggle for the control of the Federal government and is reflected in the political struggles of monopoly spokesmen within and between the two major parties.

A close examination of the hearings discloses the important fact that the actual differences on policy between MacArthur and the Truman Administration are becoming narrower and narrower. But because of the deep crisis of Wall Street's aggressive foreign policy, and the intensifying fight between the monopolies for war contracts and domination of the war-economy agencies, the political struggle between the monopolies, as well as their spokesmen, is becoming sharper and sharper. On the issue of bombing the so-called Manchurian bases, the difference may still be on the scale and scope of such bombings, but not on the bombings themselves. Such bombings have been taking place continually and may now be speeded up. So-called aid to Chiang Kai-shek on Formosa is growing in volume. An economic boycott is being put into effect, and so is a partial naval blockade against the People's Republic of China. These are the points of major difference. What

stands out in the hearings is that both warmongering cliques seek world domination for the American monopolies and are driving toward a new world war.

The hearings disclose further the growing danger that American imperialism will *in fact* extend the war in Korea, in the Far East, and will considerably accelerate the organization of a new world war. This is the central point in the estimate of the hearings. Marshall admitted that the government favors the policy of so-called "hot pursuit," which is nothing else but an excuse for bombing Manchuria. The Chiefs of Staff memorandum to MacArthur of January 9, 1951, clearly reveals the fact that the Administration was making preparations *to extend the war*, especially if the United States forces continue to suffer defeats.

When MacArthur proposed in the hearings that a virtual war ultimatum be sent to the Chinese People's Republic at once, this was a very alarming sign of the increased war danger since his removal—an alarming sign which the growing and active peace forces did not fully appreciate or adequately react to. But this danger becomes even greater when it is realized, as we must, that the Truman Administration which fraudulently claims to oppose the extension of the war is *in fact* extending it, is preparing to extend it further, and is hastening war preparations in all areas.

The state of mind of the warmongers in all cliques, as revealed in the hearings, clearly shows the adventurous nature of these criminal war conspirators, their growing desperation, confusion and panic, their readiness to precipitate a new world war as their aggressions encounter ever greater difficulties and resistance abroad and at home. Their thinking is of war and war only. Marshall's chatter about "a negotiatory basis" for settling the Korean war is significant in this sense: it demagogically takes note of the fact that the majority of the American people favor peace by negotiation. It seeks to exploit these peace feelings of the masses for war purposes and to strengthen the position of the Truman Administration in the domestic political situation.

Consequently, the main tendency of the hearings was to accelerate the extension of the war in Korea, to speed up general war preparations and mobilization, while misleading the masses into believing that both sides seek peace in the world and a speedy end to the war in Korea. Herein lies the great danger of these hearings.

The hearings, as well as the "great debate" in general, also have the effect of drawing the broadest masses of the people into discussion of foreign policy. This is an objective effect, so to speak. And this gives the peace camp a great opportunity to unmask the warmongers of all mo-

nopoly groupings and to promote peace actions. The testimony of both sides and the questionings by the Senators can be used most effectively, by quoting the actors themselves, to expose their warmongering and peace demagogy. The peace forces ought to make the widest use of the hearings' testimony for that purpose.

However, there exists a real danger that the warmongers, all groups, may succeed in drawing into their channels and away from the peace movements the growing peace feelings of the masses of the American people. This danger became apparent with the very opening of the so-called "great debate" between Truman-Dulles-Dewey-Eisenhower, on the one hand, and Taft-Hoover, on the other. With the removal and return of MacArthur and the opening of the hearings, this danger has increased and will continue to increase.

It therefore becomes necessary for the peace forces to intensify the campaign of enlightenment of the widest masses: to demonstrate before them that the aggressor in Korea and China is American imperialism and its satellites that these are the world aggressors and promoters of a new world war; to demonstrate afresh and with greater vigor that the Soviet Union and the People's Republic of China want peace—peace in Korea, in Asia and in the whole world; to dissipate the feelings of helplessness and fatalism which are affecting certain sections of the

American people, to awaken their confidence in the ability of the peace forces to win the fight for peace.

It is also imperative that the peace forces, including most especially the Communist Party, should intervene more often and more effectively in this "great debate." This is fully possible, and precisely because the organized peace forces of the American people have in the recent period made some significant advances in which the Left and progressive elements, including the Communists, have played an important part. One need only point to the growth of the American Peace Crusade, its pilgrimage to Washington, its peace referendum campaign and the forthcoming national Congress in Chicago. Other peace currents of still broader nature are becoming more active and articulate in the fight for peace.

Consequently, it is now possible for the peace forces to undertake more frequent and effective interventions in the "great debate" with concrete proposals for action that will mobilize mass struggles for peace and will expose the peace demagoguery of the warmongers. This was quite possible during the Congressional debate on sending troops to Europe. Similarly, effective intervention was possible in reply to the radio appeal of the People's Republic of Korea for a Five-Power Far-Eastern Conference to negotiate a peaceful settlement of the Korean war. And prior to that, the peace forces had a good

opportunity for effective intervention *into the very midst of the "great debate"* in connection with the Nehru proposals on Korea and those of the Asian and Arab delegates to the United Nations.

We repeat: just because the peace movements are advancing it is possible to bring these movements into the center of the discussions and struggles on foreign policy. For example, when MacArthur proposed the sending of a war ultimatum to China, the peace forces could have at once initiated actions denouncing this proposal, warning that the Truman policy leads in the same direction and demanding that the government accept the proposal of the Korean People's Republic for a conference to negotiate a settlement. Similar tasks and opportunities arise daily in connection with the conference of the Deputy Foreign Ministers in Paris on such major peace issues as reduction of armaments, demilitarization of Western Germany, and most especially for promoting the campaign for a Five-Power Peace Pact.

The conclusion is that *the peace forces face the task of breaking through to the midst of the "great debate" instead of running along its periphery.* This can be attained by intervening more frequently and directly into Congressional debates and hearings *with mass actions for specific peace demands* linked with the daily course of these debates and with

the issues as they arise every day. We must find ways and means of exposing more effectively the warmongers of all monopoly groups and to direct the mass actions of the masses *toward the Administration*, against its war policies, with demands for peace, with the aim of imposing upon the Truman Administration the people's will for peace.

This is the main avenue for making the major peace slogans the property of the American people. Such slogans as, End the War in Korea, For a Five-Power Conference to negotiate a settlement, Bring the boys home, Defend your living standards and civil liberties, For Negro rights and support of Negro national liberation, For a Five-Power Peace Pact, etc., must be connected with the daily course of the "debate" and hearings in order to become the slogans of broad mass movements. This is also the best way of promoting the campaign for the most important and central peace slogan—the demand for a Five-Power Peace Pact.

When Secretary Marshall was speaking in the hearings about "a negotiatory basis" for settling the Korean war, playing demagogically with the ardent desire of the American people to make an end to the bloody adventure, it was necessary for the peace forces to intervene in the following way. A negotiatory basis already exists. It only has to be made use of. It is the proposal of the Korean People's Republic for a Five-

Power Conference to negotiate a settlement. If Marshall wants a negotiated settlement, why does he not accept the proposal? Similarly with the resolution for an armistice proposed by Senator Johnson of Colorado. The peace forces had an opportunity effectively to intervene for peace by challenging the Senator to make good on his professions for peace by including in his proposal a demand that the United States government accept at once the proposal of the Korean People's Republic for a conference to negotiate a settlement. In a similar way, it was urgent for the peace forces to intervene when General Bradley, in order to defend Truman's line for a "limited" war in Korea, was forced to expose the Truman line of preparing the unlimited, all-out atomic world war against the Soviet Union. It was necessary to intervene, to arouse mass protests and condemnations of these criminal plans for "the right kind of war at the right time," to warn that the continuation of the Truman line in Korea is leading to a world war, and to demand a conference for peace negotiations.

The up-to-date lessons of the MacArthur hearings and of the "great debate" must be made available to the broadest masses. These lessons can play an important part in the preparations of the Peace Congress in Chicago and in the further development of the peace movements.

## SOME INNER POLITICAL ASPECTS

It is quite clear that the "great debate" and the MacArthur hearings have some very important inner political aspects. In many respects, we may already be witnessing the opening phases of the national elections of 1952.

Significant for the inner political situation is the fact that the internal struggle in the camp of the monopolies, reflected in the "great debate," is a serious fight for political power. It is a fight between the so-called Wall Street group of monopolies, the "older" ones, and the mid-West and far-West monopoly groupings, the "younger" ones. There are, of course, many overlappings and interlockings, but these are the main contestants and have been, as we know, for a long time. It is this fight for the control of the Federal government that stimulates such alignments on foreign policy as that of Truman-Dulles-Dewey, and also Eisenhower, on the one hand, and MacArthur-Taft-Hoover, on the other.

Of course, these alignments are not yet fixed by any means. The situation is extremely fluid and many shifts may yet take place as the crisis of the aggressive American foreign policy continues to deepen. But certain alignments and political trends are already indicated. One of these is the possibility that MacArthur may become the political center of those

groups and tendencies which are backed and supported by the mid-West (Chicago, Cleveland) and far-West monopoly groups with some elements of the Wall Street groupings. This would lay the basis for a MacArthur-Hoover-Taft alliance. At the same time, MacArthur is seeking to neutralize the Dewey group in an effort apparently to attain maximum unity in the Republican Party, while playing with the idea of a coalition between the Republicans and the Dixiecrats.

An equally intensive political activity is taking place in the other warmongering monopoly camp—the camp represented by the Truman Administration. This Administration, as we know, is trying to put the MacArthur outfit into the position of a war party, and itself into the position of a "peace" party. The Truman group is seeking to realize the orders of the dominant Wall Street grouping of monopolies to place full control of the war mobilization and its agencies in its hands. It can be said plainly that the Truman Administration is thus helping to build up a more and more open wartime dictatorship of the Wall Street group of monopolies. It is this fact that tends to create a basis for such alignments as Truman-Dulles-Dewey-Eisenhower. At the same time, the Truman Administration is engaging in many maneuvers to tighten its hold upon the reactionary

trade-  
it, u  
The  
litical  
mong  
mong  
lated  
crisis  
icy an  
variou  
why  
bound  
thoug  
cign  
Of  
strugg  
of the  
are th  
curren  
masse  
class f  
that a  
can w  
tinct  
Large  
ize th  
Reuth  
policie  
A feel  
new  
taken  
politic  
becom  
lions  
labor  
signs  
eleme  
failur  
way o  
Wh  
circles



trade-union bureaucracy and, through it, upon the trade-union movement.

These are some of the current political trends in the camp of the warmongers, in the monopolies, stimulated and further promoted by the crisis of American imperialist policy and the internal rivalries among various monopoly groups. *That is why these internal struggles are bound to become sharper, even though the actual differences on foreign policy are becoming narrower.*

Of decisive importance for the struggle for peace and for the future of the American people in general, are the political moods and attitudes currently developing among the masses of the people and the working class first of all. Here we must note that among the organized American workers there is going on a distinct process of political awakening. Large masses are beginning to realize the bankruptcy of the Murray-Reuther - Green - Dubinsky political policies of dragging behind Truman. A feeling is spreading that something new and different must be undertaken politically. What to do in a political way and where to go are becoming burning questions for millions of workers in the organized labor movement. But there are also signs of political dis-orientation and elements of passivity caused by a failure to see a practical and effective way out.

What is happening is this: broad circles of organized workers are wak-

ing up to the Truman demagogy, to the betrayal of his promises to the people, to the dangers of his war policies, to the bankruptcy of the policies of the reactionary trade-union bureaucracy and Social-Democratic leaders. At the same time, the workers are becoming aware of the MacArthur-Taft-Hoover menace and its fascist accompaniment. Certainly, these workers are making no mistake when they feel *the increasing fascist dangers* growing out of the crystallizing MacArthur-Hoover-Taft combination. And even without such a political combination becoming finally fixed, the MacArthur outfit is already activating all fascist and pro-fascist forces in the country. Thus these broad and growing masses of organized workers are beginning to look for some new political alignments and independent methods of political struggle. And the reformist trade-union bureaucracy (Potofsky, Dubinsky, Reuther, Mazey, etc.) is already trying to get hold of these new moods and attitudes in order to divert them into reformist and reactionary channels.

Among the unorganized masses of workers, especially in the small towns, and among the masses of working farmers and city middle classes, the picture is different, of course. There, the MacArthur-Hoover-Taft groupings have made definite headway, and not only in the mid-West. The result is a widening gap between the organized workers and

their allies among the Negro people, on the one hand, and large masses of unorganized workers, farmers and city middle classes, on the other. If this process is not checked, then there is a very serious danger that the labor movement may become isolated from the mass of the unorganized workers and also from masses of farmers and city middle classes who are being drawn into the MacArthur-Hoover-Taft sphere of influence.

This process is not being checked but, on the contrary, accelerated by the political policies of the reformist trade-union bureaucracy and reactionary Social-Democratic leaders. The longer the bureaucracy succeeds in keeping labor chained to Truman and his war policies, and the longer the bureaucracy succeeds in preventing labor from striking out along the path of independent political action for peace and democracy and living standards, the wider will grow the gap between the organized labor movement and decisive masses of the American people. And the wider this gap becomes, the greater the danger of the organized labor movement becoming isolated, the greater the danger of a 1952 victory for the MacArthur outfit, the greater the danger of fascism.

The conclusion is clear. The organized labor movement has not much time to lose in the light of these dangers. The longer it hangs on to Truman and his war policies,

the greater these dangers become. Consequently, organized labor must strike out independently on the political field, and as soon as possible, since the opening phases of the 1952 election struggle are already on. *Independent working-class political action, in opposition to and in struggle against both war outfits—Truman and MacArthur—this and this alone will unite the working class, build its alliance with the Negro people, the working farmers and the city middle classes, and save the American people from national disaster in a new world war and economic catastrophe and ruin from war economy.*

A sober political estimate of the present situation shows beyond doubt that elements and forces are now maturing in the United States for the emergence of an American peace front. Conditions are becoming ripe for the rise of a peace coalition as a major factor in American political life and in the elections of 1952. And as part of this process, forces are growing and accumulating for a new political and party alignment of the people headed by the working class. It is the task of all progressive forces, and especially of the Communists, to project forcefully this perspective before the broadest masses and to make this a major issue of struggle against the bankrupt political policies of the reactionary trade-union leaders.

The surest way to promote the

struggle for independent political action in the present situation is to build the broadest unity of action—the united front of the working class and the democratic people's front—in the daily struggles for the immediate demands and needs of the masses. This is the daily struggle for the concrete and specific demands for peace. It is the many-sided struggle for the defense of the living standards of the masses and against the war economy. It is the fight for the equal rights of the Negro people and for support to Negro national liberation. It is the fight for civil liberties, for the democratic rights of the masses of the people,

tion and fascism.

The daily mass struggles on these issues will help promote the fight for independent political action. They will lead the masses inevitably in that direction. In its turn, the struggle for independent political action, the fight to crystallize and consolidate mass support for the policy of independent working-class political action in alliance with the Negro people, the working farmers and city middle classes, will reinforce powerfully the daily struggles for peace, living standards, equal rights and democratic against all forms of national discrimination and oppression, against reactionary liberties.

# Crime and Capitalism

By Max Gordon

In such a state [a bourgeois-democratic republic], wealth exerts its power indirectly, but all the more safely. This is done partly in the form of direct corruption of officials, after the classical type of the United States, or in the form of an alliance between government and bankers which is established all the more easily when the public debt increases and when corporations concentrate in their hands not only the means of transportation, but also production itself, using the stock exchange as a center.

(Frederick Engels, 1884, *Origin of the Family, Private Property, and the State*.\*)

It doesn't matter whether it is a banker, a businessman or a gangster, his pocketbook is always attractive.

(William O'Dwyer, 1951, explaining Frank Costello's influence in New York City politics, in his testimony before the Kefauver Senate Investigating Committee.)

EVERY ONCE in a while, the blood stream of our nation's political life throws up a boil, the bursting of which gives the public a fleeting glimpse into the vast rotteness which lies beneath. The people are told this is just an indisposition affecting an

otherwise healthy organism; that some minor medication from a judicial or executive bottle will remove the boil, while the system itself will be purified through a legislative corrective.

The Special Senate Committee Inquiry into the link between "organized crime" and politics, originally headed by Senator Estes Kefauver (D., Tenn.) and now chaired by Senator Herbert O'Connor (D., Md.), arose out of one of those periodic scandals that give us a view of the ways in which "the concentration of economic power," to quote the Committee's report of May 1, enables those who have it to "control government" and "corrupt substantial portions of the community."

The Committee concerns itself mainly with the lower levels of this corruption, those which link racketeers and gangsters, on the one hand, with local government officials, on the other. But while local governments are bought up by the gamblers and racketeers who need "protection" from local laws, this is only the lower rung of the ladder. On the upper levels we get the more subtle, more pervasive, infinitely more sig-

\* Kerr Edition, p. 210.

significant forms of control of Federal government and politics by those with far wider appetites and greater financial resources—the moguls of finance and industry.

#### NEW FORMS OF CRIME IN THE PERIOD OF CAPITALIST DECAY

The Committee's report makes the significant admission that "organized crime" in the last thirty years "has taken on new characteristics." The most dangerous gangs, it states, engage in "any racket where money is to be made," instead of the "more frankly predatory" crimes of robbery, burglary, or larceny. Today the ways of crime involve various forms of betting, narcotics smuggling, prostitution, racketeering practices in businesses and trade unions controlled by gangsters in collusion with employers, etc. The report notes that these new forms of crime necessarily involve systematic corruption of large sections of the community who are the victims, not of an occasional hold-up, but of the demoralizing effects of continuous gambling, use of narcotics, prostitution, etc.

The report does not, of course, note that this vast extension of the forms of crime reflects the advanced decay and greatly increased parasitism of our decomposing capitalist society, which entered its general crisis with the outbreak of the First World War.

The Kefauver Committee would have us believe that parasitism and plunder spring only from the "lawless elements in our society," the hoodlum gamblers and racketeers. It seeks to cover up the fact that the "take" of these elements is picayune when compared with the "take" of the master gamblers of the stock and commodity markets, who literally gamble with the people's bread and butter. This vast robbery is effected by extraction of immense surplus value from the workers, the greatest ever known in history, and by a wild, conscienceless profiteering.

There is infinitely greater political rigging of the "gambling" devices of these master crooks than those with which the Kefauver Committee concerns itself. The rigging is done literally with the blood of tens of thousands of Korean people of all ages and sexes; with the sweat and suppressed liberties of hundreds of millions around the globe; with the labor and resources of our people.

To give but one minor example, an official of the Department of Agriculture, J. M. Mehl, recently told a Congressional committee:

A speculator [on the Commodity Exchange] who purchased just before the Korean episode and deposited the minimum margin could have cashed in five weeks later on July 28 with an approximate 450 percent profit on lard, 300 percent on cottonseed oil, 300 percent on soybeans, 150 percent on cotton,

and a comparatively modest 100 percent on the relatively sluggish wheat futures.

This kind of gambling with the necessities of life for 150,000,000 Americans, and with the blood of their sons, is not criticized by Congressional committees. In fact, it is jealously protected by Congress.

The rigging is done, too, with billions upon billions in arms appropriations, and with creating the necessary war-like, pro-fascist and jingo atmosphere which makes possible these appropriations. It is this atmosphere of war tensions, economic and political insecurity, pro-fascist and chauvinist agitation, physical weariness induced by intense speed-up in the factories, as well as the vast profiteering, which makes it possible to draw into the quagmire of corruption large numbers of Americans, as admitted by the Kefauver Committee.

#### "TOP LEVEL" CORRUPTION

That there is a relationship between corruption of local government by organized crime and domination of national politics by organized finance has been suggested indirectly by none other than Senator O'Connor, member of the Committee who became its chairman on May 1. A United Press dispatch from Washington, dated March 22, reported the following:

The Senate Crime Committee has

found that gangsters and racketeers control numerous large industries in which they may eventually be able to "corrupt the top levels of our Government," Senator Herbert R. O'Connor, Democrat of Maryland, said tonight.

It is significant that the Senator made his remark soon after the Committee's New York hearings, for it could not have escaped his attention that the techniques, motives and pattern of corruption of local government uncovered there have their parallel in monopoly capital's relation to the "top levels of our government."

The report significantly quotes the attorney general of Florida in explanation of the racketeers' ability to buy up local officials:

The profit motive in this thing is tremendous, and they *naturally* have to protect their investment; and if they can bribe or buy anybody, they *naturally* will do it. (My emphases—M.G.)

The Senate Committee tries to make it appear that this judgment applies only to the gamblers and racketeers. But the logic is inescapable. For big industry, the profit motive is its reason for existence, due to the very nature of capitalism as a system resting on the exploitation of wage-labor; hence, big industry *naturally* has to "protect its investment."

Capitalism, with its inherent evils — exploitation, insecurity, poverty, crises, unemployment, wars, oppres-

sion, racism, chauvinism, mental anguish, cultural degradation—is the source of crime. The elimination of crime is therefore made possible only by elimination of its source—the exploitation of man by man. But while crime and social corruption are always an accompaniment of the capitalist system, they increase with the accumulation of capital and reach their height in the period of the sharpening general crisis of capitalism. They become most pronounced in this period of the sharpened danger of world war, of intensified chauvinist nationalism and Negro oppression. For aggressive, imperialist war, more than anything else, expresses the immorality of a criminal social system, doomed by history. And what expresses truer morality than the efforts to prevent war, than the struggle for peace, than the fight for national liberation!

In the present situation any effective struggle of the American people against criminality in public office must be waged in connection with, and as part of, the struggle for peace, for democracy, and for Negro rights. The dictum of the Florida official is the morality which dominates the American political scene today. It is the morality of Wall Street's aggressive foreign policy and is the "way of life" which our imperialist ideologists are trying to "sell" as the agitational cover for the military adventures aimed at unleashing war for world domination.

#### THE O'DYWYER-COSTELLO- ADONIS CABAL

By far the most devastating attack on a public official made by the Committee was directed at ex-Mayor of New York, William O'Dwyer. In fact, outside of O'Dwyer and a few small fry, criticism of specific public officials is extremely gentle and mild. Perhaps among other things, this is because O'Dwyer is already a dead duck politically, while others can still swing votes at national conventions.

The report charges O'Dwyer with failure to prosecute the "Big Six" gangsters of Murder, Inc., and their chief gunmen; of blocking efforts to nail these gangsters, and of defending public officials who played their game. It implies that O'Dwyer's failure to take "effective action against the top echelons of the gambling, narcotics, water-front, murder or bookmaking rackets" is due to the political power of Frank Costello and Joe Adonis. Costello is the dominant figure behind Tammany; and Adonis, who is described as "free with his money" where politicians' election needs are concerned, is pictured as a shadowy power behind the Brooklyn Democratic organization. The report traces the inter-relations between O'Dwyer's associates and the two czars of vice and crime.

The pattern revealed here is not uncommon. The mobsters establish their influence in the political ma-

chines through financing local politicians in primary fights or regular elections. Through this influence, they soon begin to dominate the machine and use it, not only to protect their racketeering enterprises, but to establish a monopoly.

The fact that in the face of this sharp exposure of O'Dwyer at the New York hearings and the judgment contained in the report, he has been defended repeatedly by President Truman and retained as Ambassador to Mexico is a measure of the political morality of the Commander-in-Chief of our Administration's war policy, as well as of the policy itself.

Now let us see how this technique of corruption operates in the realm of "hochpolitik," a realm Congressional committees prefer not to investigate. James A. Hagerty, veteran political writer for the *New York Times* and father of Governor Thomas E. Dewey's executive Secretary, James C. Hagerty, made the following report on August 31, 1950, a week before the G.O.P. state convention which renominated Dewey for Governor:

On the Republican side, the movement to draft Governor Dewey for renomination gained momentum when it was learned that Winthrop W. Aldrich, chairman of the board of the Chase National Bank, and Herbert Brownell, Jr., both close friends of the Governor, had taken a leading part in the drive to get Lt. Governor Joe R. Hanley to

withdraw as a candidate and join in the appeal to Mr. Dewey to run again.

Hanley, front man for dissident state G.O.P. elements close to the midwest industrial and banking crowd headed politically by Senator Robert A. Taft, had jumped into the gubernatorial picture after Dewey announced early in 1950 that he would not run again.

But the Korean war broke out. Tactical differences between major groups of finance capital behind Truman and Dewey, on the one hand, and the Taft crowd, on the other, resulted in more intense struggle for control of the G.O.P. In this situation, Dewey reconsidered, or was told to reconsider, his declination to run.

After having so bluntly retired, however, he found it necessary to get Hanley out of the way "voluntarily" and to make it appear that he himself had been "drafted" for renomination. This was done by the offer of a job, as revealed in the notorious "Hanley Letter" which shook up the New York election campaign. It was charged at the Democratic State Convention that Winthrop Aldrich, perennial treasurer of Dewey's campaigns, had said that no money would be forthcoming for the G.O.P. election drive if Hanley refused to make way for Dewey.

Thus, we have one side of the Costello-Adonis-O'Dwyer coin as etched by the Kefauver Committee. The man of money is the most powerful factor within the political machine,



and uses his power and wealth to compel selection of his candidate.

The Committee, incidentally, is remarkably gentle with Dewey. It slaps him softly on the wrist for trying to whitewash the state police responsible for wide-open gambling in Saratoga; and while it gives the facts showing he had this gambling shut down only after Congress had set up the committee to study crime and politics, it refrains from making the charge.

It tells of the parole granted the overlord of vice, Charles "Lucky" Luciano, in 1946, with the proviso that he be deported, and describes how Luciano today, from Italy, is a major figure in the narcotics trade. Dewey has never told the real story of the Luciano parole, despite the wide notoriety it has received. The committee fails to note that he was responsible for the parole. Nor did it call on him to explain it.

Also, Dewey, as Governor, bears ultimate responsibility for law enforcement everywhere in the state. The Committee made no attempt to find out why he did not intervene in the scandalous New York situation; or in the wide-open gambling set-up in Albany, where he lives and works; or in other upstate communities where corruption is blatant.

Why was the Kefauver Committee so gentle with Dewey? Part of the answer may lie in the fact that State G.O.P. leaders threatened to set up an investigating committee of the

State Legislature to rake over New York City if the Committee dared to touch Dewey or upstate G.O.P. machines. When the Kefauver Committee avoided upstate, except for Saratoga County where a political intimate of Joe R. Hanley is county G.O.P. chairman, the Legislature dropped its threatened investigation of New York City.

Was there an understanding between the Committee and the Dewey crowd? The circumstances seem to suggest there was.

But there may be a more potent reason for the Committee's anxiety to keep hands off Dewey. The Governor has become the acknowledged mouthpiece for Truman's foreign policy in New York. His intimate, John Foster Dulles, is a leading architect of this policy which is fashioned in the interests of finance capital. Senator Kefauver himself is a darling of the Social-Democratic-controlled Americans for Democratic Action, which recently hailed with fervor a Dewey sabre-rattling speech dedicated to defense of the Chase National Bank's world raw materials monopoly drive.

During O'Dwyer's regime, New York politics was dominated by the underground agreement between the Mayor and Dewey whereby the city administration, in direct violation of the expressed will of the people, went along with the economic and social policies of the Rockefeller-dominated state administration. The

results, among other things, were the ten-cent fare, increased sales taxes, starvation of schools, and reduction of other vital city services.

#### RACKET-RIDDEN LOCAL MACHINES AT THE BASE OF THE POLITICAL PYRAMID

In its discussion of Chicago racketeering and the operations of the notorious Capone "syndicate," the Kefauver report flagrantly glosses over the tie-ups with politics. For these tie-ups would involve the Kelly-Nash machine, which for many years dominated Chicago and Illinois politics. The Kelly-Nash machine spearheaded the drive in 1944 to procure the Vice-Presidential nomination for Harry S. Truman.

The report also discusses the "shocking" release of three top Capone mobsters from jail after serving minimum periods of imprisonment "although they were known to be vicious gangsters."

"A prominent member of the Missouri bar presented their parole applications to the parole board, which granted the parole against the recommendations of the prosecuting attorney and of the judge who presided at the trial," the report declares.

But it fails to note that the "prominent member of the Missouri bar" was Paul Dillon, a not inconsiderable factor in the release of the Capone mobsters. May it be because Dillon had been Truman's campaign

manager in his two elections to the U.S. Senate as nominee of Missouri's Pendergast machine?

Truman's reverence for local racketeering politicians is reflected in his naming as Attorney General, J. Howard McGrath, former National Chairman of the Democratic Party. Note the choice conclusion of a fairly lengthy description of the political career of McGrath, the chief enforcer of the law in the United States, as contained in the book *Truman Merry-Go-Round* by Robert S. Allen and William J. Shannon:

Howard McGrath's known record of compliance with regard to gambling and police corruption in his own state during his service as federal attorney and Governor (of Rhode Island), his personal holdings in the Lincoln Downs race track, his public association with race track elements, his quick acquisition of great wealth during a period spent wholly in public office, his open connivance in the Textron tax dodge, and his year-old record of indifference and obstructionism in gambling matters as Attorney General, brand him unmistakably unfit to hold the post of highest law enforcement officer in the land.

Needless to say, the Kefauver Committee did not call McGrath as a witness, though judging from the facts just quoted, he doubtless could have given it a wealth of information out of his own personal experience.

What a commentary on the "above-

class  
stat  
fire a  
racy"

BI-PA

In  
ferre  
mitte

Ne  
hook  
hood  
their  
pay  
give

O'  
obser  
sansk  
ago,  
ducti  
Civil

Th  
tician  
tinct  
Amer  
partie  
other  
trolle  
of po  
the le  
as we  
make  
for th  
rewar  
here  
ulator  
of the  
the n

class" pretensions of the bourgeois state which has set out to export with fire and sword this brand of "democracy" and way of life!

### BI-PARTISAN CORRUPTION

In the U.P. dispatch earlier referred to, Senator O'Connor admitted:

Neither party has a corner on the hook-up with organized crime. The hoodlums are bi-partisan. They give their money where they think it will pay back the biggest dividends. They give to both sides.

O'Connor is hardly original in his observation concerning the bipartisanism of corruption. Sixty years ago, Frederick Engels, in his Introduction to Karl Marx' pamphlet, *Civil War in France*, wrote:

There is no country in which "politicians" form a more powerful and distinct section of the nation than in North America. There, each of two great parties which alternately succeed each other in power is itself in turn controlled by people who make a business of politics, who speculate on seats in the legislative assemblies of the Union as well as of the separate states, or who make a living by carrying on agitation for their party and on its victory are rewarded with positions . . . we find here two great groups of political speculators, who alternately take possession of the state machine, and exploit it by the most corrupt means and for the

most corrupt ends—and the nation is powerless against these two great cartels of politicians, who are ostensibly its servants, but in reality exploit and plunder it.

Engels wrote this when America's "robber barons" were ruthlessly seizing hold of the vast wealth of the nation. Through these plundered riches, the politicians became instruments of their will. But by the very process of wholesale bribery, where politics became the path to wealth, the politicians developed as never before a vested interest in their careers. Venal politics became a separate and established "profession." And all the alleged legal checks, set up by a hypocritical capitalism supposedly to bar the money relation between the politicians and the masters whom they serve, are futile. Big Business, operating cynically and ruthlessly through its lobbies, fashions a thousand techniques for the "pay off," infinitely more subtle than the crude briberies of the racketeers, which are described by the Kefauver report, though it does not disdain to use these as well.

### WHY THE INVESTIGATION?

The question arises as to why a Democratic-controlled Senate has undertaken the crime investigation, knowing in advance that it might hit some of the very Democratic machines to which many Senators

owe their political lives. A clue to the answer is contained in Senator O'Connor's complaint that the racketeers are invading "large-scale industry." The Committee's report deals extensively with this "infiltration." It lists some fifty areas in which racketeer elements have penetrated, including automobile, banking, coal, communications, construction, electrical equipment, food, garment, export-import trade, insurance, newspaper, oil, radio broadcasting, real estate, shipping, steel, and transport.

The report notes, too, the complaint of businessmen that the racketeers have competitive advantages, flowing from their political "contacts," their greater ability to bribe, etc. This developing competition with "legitimate" business is doubtless one factor in forcing the investigation, particularly in the face of the huge seventy billion dollar armaments pork barrel provided by the government. The large-scale monopolies have the inside track, and they want no "muscling in" by the racketeers.

There are, however, a couple of general political reasons why the issue of corruption has at this time emerged so strongly on the national political scene.

1. With the development of ever-closer ties between the monopolies and the Federal government, and particularly as the war crisis advances, political control assumes greater importance to contending

financial interests. For, while basic policy is the same, there are important differences of emphasis depending on whether one or another aggregate of finance-capital is dominant in the state power. Each has its own representatives in the major political parties. With so much at stake, the struggle of these political groupings within and between the two major parties becomes sharper, with fewer holds barred. Neither hesitates to use whatever weapons are at hand, including revelations of corruption. It is worth noting that this struggle within the G.O.P. in New York State resulted in public exposure of the notorious Hanley Letter.

2. With both major parties, and the contending groups within them, united on questions of basic policy, the issues on which they can come to the public are considerably narrowed. Hence, they tend to veer toward such issues as "clean government," centering their campaigning on the rottenness of the opposition. There is always a lot of ammunition in this for both sides.

#### MOB VIOLENCE AGAINST LABOR

While businessmen are not happy about racketeer invasion of industry, the Kefauver report provides us with a few vignettes showing how freely major industrialists promote racketeering and feed the big-time mobsters.

"The Western Union aided and abetted the violation of the gambling laws of the state (Missouri) because it was profitable to do so," the report complains at one point.

But the major Big Business motive for alliance with gangsters is to smash trade unionism, either by strong-arm methods or corruption from within. The Committee's report is forced to discuss in some detail the award of the Edgewater, N. J. Ford plant's haul-away contract to a firm controlled by Joe Adonis, and the granting of lucrative Ford Agency and haul-away contracts to a Detroit gangster, Anthony D'Anna. It attributes both contracts to Henry Ford's "chief of staff," Harry Bennett, who "employed virtually a private army recruited from ex-convicts and criminals to engage in battles against labor and in other anti-social activities."

The report states further: "The question which remains unanswered, however, is why nearly six years after Bennett was removed from command of the Ford Motor Company, these two mobsters remain in lucrative relationships with this organization."

The record of the Committee's Detroit hearing does not reveal that it made strenuous efforts to get at the answer. It is not hard to understand, however, that the company's tough speed-up policies, its efforts to weaken the union through plant decentralization, etc., account for its

retaining the mobsters.

Outside of Detroit, the report touches, in a single sentence, on the use of the Anastasia murderers by Phelps-Dodge to break the United Electrical Workers strike in Elizabeth, N. J., in 1946. It completely omits the complicity of Elizabeth authorities in the bloody attacks on the workers, resulting in the murder of Mario Russo, and their protection of Anthony Anastasia, who was arrested in connection with the murder.

In sharp contrast to the picture regarding industry, the Committee report emphasizes that hoodlum elements in the unions have been "largely driven to the wall in all but a few important instances." The exception given is "King" Joe Ryan's International Longshoremen's Association (A. F. of L.) which is described as "one of the ugliest situations in labor-union history."

But it closes its eyes to the fact that credit for driving the mobsters out of the unions must rest in large part with Left-wing progressives, including Communists, such as the leaders of the Fur Workers, whose heroic struggles rid the industry and the country of the notorious murderers, Lepke and Gurrah; the New York painters, who ousted the gangster-ridden Zaussner machine; the food unionists, cleaners and dyers, and others.

The report omits entirely the killing of Pete Panto by Murder, Inc., in

1939 because he challenged mobster-rule in the I.L.A. Panto was leader of the rank-and-file movement among the longshoremen. Though his murder was referred to in testimony before the Committee, it made no real effort to investigate the O'Dwyer regime's neglect in tracking it down. If the Committee were motivated solely by the desire to clean out racketeering in the I.L.A. and on the New York waterfront, it would have paid much attention to Panto's murder, and would have indicated that the development of a rank-and-file movement within the union under progressive leadership is what the gangsters fear most.

#### "MORALITY" OF ANTI-COMMUNISM

During the course of the Committee's work, an effort was made by Senator Alexander Wiley (R., Wis.) to direct it into Red-baiting channels. Wiley wanted to know whether any evidence had been uncovered concerning gangster methods by "Communists" in the unions. He did not get far, because no such evidence could be easily manufactured. But the Wiley question illustrates the techniques which gangsters and corrupt officials allied with them often use as a cover-up.

Just as the financiers and their political agents seek world plunder under a smokescreen of anti-Communism and anti-Sovietism, so the

smaller fry plunderers try to divert attention from their criminal antics by hysterics against Communists. The tone was set by Al Capone, who made this classic statement:

Bolshevism is knocking at our gates. We can't afford to let it in. We have got to organize ourselves against it and put our shoulders together and hold fast. We must keep America whole, safe and unspoiled. We must keep the worker away from red literature and red ruses; we must see that his mind remains healthy.

With a patriotism no less noble, the Red-baiters today carry on their witch-hunt trials, as in Pittsburgh; put over local anti-Communist ordinances in every part of the country; conduct raids and petty persecution of Communists. And everywhere hooligan politicians, fearing exposure of their links to racketeers, seek refuge in patriotism Capone-style.

#### DANGEROUS PROPOSALS

In its recommendations, the Kefauver Committee proposes some 22 changes in the law, designed to expand law-enforcement agencies, tighten up on income tax evasions, expand penalties for betting, etc. These can scarcely change the situation much, since the source is the corrupt social system in which the nation's wealth is concentrated in the hands of the capitalist class which wields state power for further en-

richment at the expense of the people.

While only Socialism can *completely* eliminate crime and corruption, the ultimate victory of the working class is not a pre-condition for effecting important immediate changes in the situation. But the road to such changes is the course of independent political action of the working class and its allies. *The situation requires the dethroning of the two major parties of Big Business, and the rise to positions of power of an anti-monopoly, anti-war, people's party based on the working class and dedicated to the welfare of the people.*

But, of course, the Kefauver Committee, itself an instrument of the monopoly-controlled Truman Administration, makes no such recommendations. Its recommendations are not directed at the source of the trouble. In fact, some of its proposals are extremely dangerous. One recommendation would grant immunity to witnesses before grand juries and congressional committees. The purpose of this is to compel the witness to answer such questions which he is at present accorded the right by the Fifth Amendment to refuse to answer on the grounds of possible self-incrimination. This recommendation, if it should become law, would seriously undermine the Bill of Rights and would greatly advance the witch-hunting powers of local grand juries, of the un-American Committee, and

similar pro-fascist bodies.

Several proposals would enlarge the deportation powers of the Department of Justice. The Committee maintains this is needed because many racketeers are foreign-born. But the chief effect of the proposal, it may be taken for granted, would be felt by militant workers and progressives, by fighters for peace.

#### TACTIC FOR PROGRESSIVES

What is the political effect on the people of the revelations of the Kefauver Committee? Undoubtedly, they have given the masses additional evidence of the immense corruption that is American politics. But it would be wrong to conclude from this that the masses will spontaneously draw fundamental conclusions from these revelations. Indeed, due to the long "conditioning" of the public mind in the United States to graft and corrupt politics as a way of life, there is danger of an increase in public cynicism toward politics in general, and a resulting apathetic acceptance of crime and corruption. This danger is especially great because of the long subordination of the trade-union movement by the top officialdom to the corrupt political parties of Big Business and their current bi-partisan program of ultra-reaction and war. It is therefore, first of all, the duty of Communists to help the working masses draw

basic *class* conclusions from the crime exposé. The Kefauver disclosures should be made the occasion for stimulating the development of the urgently-needed coalition movement of the people, under the leadership of the working class, for independent political action, leading to the emergence of a People's Party, independent of Wall Street control, free of corruption and addiction to underworld connections, and fully devoted to the interests of the people, to peace and democratic liberties.

The labor and progressive movements must be warned against the danger of demagogic and illusory "good government" maneuvers, with their promises to eliminate the conditions exposed in the report. They might find themselves lined up behind "liberal" war-supporters, who use the "clean government" issue as a ruse to gain a mass base for impe-

rialist aggression and war. No political movement today can claim to wage a truly consistent fight against corruption and crime without relating it to the major issues of war and peace, Negro rights, civil rights generally, and the economic welfare of the working people.

This understanding, coupled with the indignation of many Americans on purely moral grounds, can be developed into a movement directed against the major parties of Big Business. The problem for Communists and progressives generally is the projection of such tactics locally as will stimulate and broaden this current, channel it toward political independence, and unite it on a minimum programmatic basis with the more conscious foes of the bi-partisan policies of war, repression, chauvinism, racism, and hunger.

By t

CRIT  
a m  
Mar  
longTh  
ward  
most  
judg  
how  
towa  
Frank  
ing t  
condi  
ough  
ing it  
party  
its d  
educ  
masseWith  
its w  
derta  
nor c

Th

\* Th  
series o  
by the  
discuss  
as rep  
After i  
tional  
these  
made  
—Ed.  
••



# Self-Criticism and the Struggle for Collective Leadership

By the Ohio State Board of the Communist Party\*

## I

CRITICISM and self-criticism constitute a most vital factor in the life of a Marxist-Leninist party. As Lenin long ago pointed out:

The attitude of a political party towards its own mistakes is one of the most important and surest ways of judging how earnest the party is and how it *in practice* fulfills its obligations towards its *class* and the toiling *masses*. Frankly admitting a mistake, ascertaining the reasons for it, analyzing the conditions which led to it, and thoroughly discussing the means of correcting it—that is the earmark of a serious party; that is the way it should perform its duties, that is the way it should educate and train the *class* and then the *masses*.\*\*

Without such an attitude towards its work, no party can seriously undertake to lead the working class, nor can it long survive.

These things apply with special

force to the attitude of the Party leadership toward its own work and its own shortcomings. Obviously, what is demanded of Party leaders, and what they must demand of themselves, not only goes much beyond the Party's demands on the rank and file, but increases in proportion to the level of Party leadership. Hence, the ability of Party leaders to assess their work self-critically, both individually and as a collective group, to examine their weaknesses and mistakes with the aim of correcting them and of constantly improving the caliber of their work—these are indeed essential features of a serious, mature leadership capable of guiding the work of the entire Party.

The general validity of these principles will be readily recognized and agreed to by everyone. But between such acceptance *in general* and concrete application *in practice* there frequently exists a very wide gap. Even despite good intentions, criticism and self-criticism are all too often viewed in a superficial, mechanical manner. All too often self-criticism is vulgarized and reduced to a mere breast-beating and confession of sins which, in the end, only serves as a hypo-

\* The following article is an outgrowth of a series of self-critical discussions conducted recently by the Ohio State Committee of the Party. These discussions were attended by Comrade Gus Hall as representative of the National Committee. After hearing a report by Comrade Hall, the National Committee considered the lessons from these discussions to be of such value as to be made available to the entire Party membership.

—Ed.

\*\* V. I. Lenin, *Selected Works*, Vol. X, p. 98.

critical device for covering up one's weaknesses.

The practice of glossing over and concealing mistakes—a practice especially characteristic of Social-Democracy—is a manifestation of opportunism, of bourgeois influence in our ranks. Like all other such manifestations, it must be continuously and relentlessly fought. Real, effective criticism and self-criticism do not occur of themselves. They can be achieved only through constant struggle, only in the course of striving to overcome the obstacles created by petty-bourgeois habits and influences.

Chief among these obstacles, as Gus Hall points out, is petty-bourgeois subjectivity. Concerning this weakness, Comrade Hall states:

It seems to me that one of the signs of continuing lack of maturity in our leadership, a basic weakness, is the subjectivity we find among our comrades. We must speak about this weakness, bring it into the open and burn it out. There is altogether too much of it in our ranks. This subjectivity is the greatest obstacle to the proper exercise of criticism and self-criticism in our Party. Subjectivity is one of the greatest obstacles to building a collective leadership in our Party. It shows a lack of Marxist understanding of the relationship of the individual to the Party.\*

Such subjectivity manifests itself in many ways, for example in a reluctance to criticize other comrades for fear of hurting their feelings, or in a tendency to confine self-critical dis-

ussions to small circles of top leaders (usually full-time functionaries) for fear that involving more comrades would destroy the prestige of the leadership. Not infrequently, this is combined with varying degrees of bureaucratic arrogance which belittles and casts aside the opinions and criticisms of the membership.

The discussions consequently lose most of their value. Weaknesses are not brought fully to light and corrected, but become more deeply imbedded; criticism of the leadership by the rank and file, instead of finding open and constructive expression, is diverted into unhealthy, destructive forms—into griping, gossip and disgruntlement—which provide grist for the mills of the enemy agents who seek to operate in our midst.

These weaknesses are all forms of that corroding liberalism which Mao Tse-tung so pungently criticizes,<sup>2</sup> that liberalism "which gives up the ideological struggle and advocates peace at the cost of principle." Among the varied forms in which such opportunism shows itself, Mao includes in his description:

Advancing no arguments on matters of principle; or on matters concerning the patently obvious misdeeds of acquaintances, relatives, schoolmates, intimate friends, loved ones, old colleagues and former subordinates; letting things drift and doing anything for a quiet and friendly life . . . criticizing people behind their backs without any

\* *Political Affairs*, February 1951, p. 18.

<sup>2</sup> *Political Affairs*, September 1950, pp. 61-63.

sense of responsibility and not actively offering suggestions to the Party authorities; not speaking against others in their presence but doing so without restraint in their absence; keeping silent in meetings but grumbling vehemently afterwards . . . deeming it advisable not to talk much about what is obviously wrong; trying to behave circumspectly to avoid committing any offense . . . expressing no indignation, giving no advice or explanation, not checking conduct prejudicial to the people's interest but sulking at it . . . knowing one's own errors but not wanting to correct them; establishing oneself as a liberal.

Obviously the struggle against these weaknesses is a prerequisite for achieving any real criticism and self-criticism in the Party, and this in turn is a prerequisite for the establishment of collective leadership and work. This struggle is by no means an easy one; consequently, every example of a successful advance in this direction is of great interest to the entire Party.

From this point of view the recent critical discussions conducted by the State Committee of the Party in Ohio, in conjunction with the State Convention, are of exceptional interest. Here an evaluation of the work of the Ohio leadership took place, in which some difficult obstacles were overcome and some very fruitful criticism and self-criticism were developed. Because the lessons from these discussions are of universal value, we are undertaking to present them here.

## II

Prior to the State Committee discussions, a number of serious weaknesses in the Party leadership had been evident for a long time, weaknesses which were manifested in all phases of work.

Mass work was at an extremely low ebb. The Party was making virtually no contribution toward the building and development of the peace movement. While the struggle for peace was repeatedly discussed in generalities, no concrete approach was developed, and one opportunity after another to advance the struggle was allowed to slip by. Whatever practical activities the Party did attempt along these lines were hamstrung by a sectarian approach which denied any possibility of rallying the broad masses for peace. Similarly, the Party had failed to play any appreciable role in the important 1950 election campaign.

Concentration work in basic industry and in the Negro communities remained non-existent. The district was failing to pull its weight in key Party campaigns such as the recent *Worker* subscription drive. And such important activities as literature distribution and education suffered almost total neglect.

There was a glaring lack of collective leadership, accompanied by persistent factional tendencies at the top. In place of a common concern for successfully carrying out Party responsibilities, there was constant

bickering over who was responsible for what. The fight for collective work was neglected, starting with the fight for the functioning of the Party clubs as the basic collective groups, and continuing up to the top levels of leadership. The Party leadership found itself becoming increasingly isolated from the rank and file.

Not only were all these weaknesses becoming more aggravated, but there had developed among some of the leading comrades a feeling of inability to cope with the situation, to get at the root of the problems and solve them.

Some previous self-critical discussions had been held, but these were both limited in scope and confined to the full-time staff. Hence, they failed to dig into the problems sufficiently and to lay an adequate base for correcting the weaknesses.

On the present occasion, however, the discussion broke through these limitations. In this case the entire State Committee took part in evaluating the work of the leadership. Nor was the scope of the discussion limited. Every aspect of the work of both the district leadership and the whole Party cadre was thrown open for criticism.

An especially new and striking feature was the participation of those State Committee members who were not full-time functionaries. These comrades, more than any others, were able to speak for the Party membership. And speak they did—constructively, but very sharply and critically.

In doing so, they injected into the discussion not only a much greater degree of concreteness but also a healthy objectivity which had been largely lacking on previous occasions.

For example, in one phase of the discussion the full-time functionaries in general sought to attribute the lack of collective work and other weaknesses primarily to bad methods of work on the part of one particular leading comrade. They were caught up rather sharply, however, by some of the other comrades who pointed out that a basic weakness, for which the *entire* leadership was responsible and which none of the functionaries had even mentioned, was the growing isolation from, and neglect of, the membership. This responsibility, they correctly insisted, could not be dodged by subjectively harping on the faults, however serious, of any one comrade.

Many weaknesses which the leadership was led to believe had gone unnoticed by the members, because they had not previously said anything about them, were now brought sharply into the open. It was a novel experience for the Party leaders to get an objective, clear, critical picture of how the membership regards their work. This is something which, unfortunately, does not happen very often in the Party.

Why is this the case? Why, for instance, had not these same comrades expressed their criticisms, many of them of long standing, on earlier occasions? In general, it is not be-

cause there is no atmosphere of freedom of criticism in our Party. Rather, it arises in large measure from the fact that the membership and lower cadres do not yet have a fully political relationship to the leading comrades, that in these relationships political and personal elements tend to be confused. Hence, because they feel their ties to the leaders as personal ties, these comrades tend to hold back in order not to hurt anyone's feelings. Because of this, it is necessary to *draw* a cadre into such a discussion, to create the proper conditions for it.

It must be admitted that in the atmosphere which prevailed there had been little previous opportunity or encouragement for these comrades to speak up. On the contrary, the weaknesses in the leadership, which were by no means undetected by the rank and file, created an atmosphere which tended rather to encourage behind-the-scenes griping and which gave rise to widespread cynicism toward the leadership.

On the present occasion, however, the necessary conditions *were* present. In view of the existing situation, the discussions that took place in the full State Committee were not preceded by any preliminary discussions by the full-time staff. No reports were presented and no analyses or conclusions were offered. Instead, the problem was briefly posed and the State Committee members were then called upon to express their opinions on a very practical question,

namely a proposed reorganization of the state leadership. Each comrade was asked to give his recommendations for filling the posts in question, and in this connection freely to express himself with regard to the qualifications and weaknesses of any of the leading comrades.

This type of approach served to create an atmosphere in which everyone felt free to speak fully and unreservedly. Moreover, the fresh, objective approach of the other comrades helped the full-time functionaries to reduce subjective barriers to a minimum and to deal with their own work and that of the others in a genuinely critical and self-critical fashion.

### III

This discussion of the work of the leadership was very concrete and detailed; at the same time, it led to generalization of the main types of weaknesses.

Thus, the criticism of one of the top functionaries was that, although he had been in the district for some time, he still was looked upon as a newcomer. He had failed to integrate himself into the Party in Ohio, and was still acquainted only with the top. He was criticized further for a tendency to look down on the workers and to orient himself toward middle-class and professional elements. His social relationships were confined to these circles. In general, he led a middle-class life and

showed distinct signs of a "social worker" approach to the Party membership.

The implication was clear that the inability of this comrade to integrate himself into the Party stemmed from his essentially petty-bourgeois attitude toward the working class. With such an approach, no matter how long he continued to work in the district, he would always remain a "new-comer" and could not give real Marxist leadership to the Party.

The discussion centered especially around the bureaucratic tendencies exhibited by a second leading comrade. This comrade was criticized for a bureaucratic arrogance which implied contempt for the thinking of his colleagues. Closely associated with this were a continual indulgence in moods, repeated sulking, and resort to "lone wolf" methods of work. These habits, it was pointed out, rendered collective work a thousand times more difficult and in no way helped to overcome any shortcomings of other comrades.

Here, for the first time, this comrade got a concrete picture of what the members really think about his bureaucratic tendencies, and how they feel about the political instability expressed by his moods and the resultant lack of collective leadership on top.

Still another leading comrade was criticized for habitually speaking only in generalities and abstractions, and for failing to get down to brass tacks and find solutions for specific prac-

tical problems. The work of this comrade suffered from a generalized, mechanical approach to problems and a lack of concreteness and imagination in tackling them.

The discussions brought out, not only these and other weaknesses, but also many good features in the work of leading comrades. One functionary in particular was widely praised for his ability to get down below, to work closely with the membership and effectively to combine practical-organizational and political work.

Another feature of the discussions was that there were virtually no sharp disagreements over the characterizations of the top leaders. Nor did the leading comrades themselves express any basic disagreement with the criticisms of their work. On the whole, those who participated left the discussions with the feeling that the evaluation of the Party leadership which had been hammered out was generally correct and valid.

The State Committee did not limit itself, however, to evaluating the work of the top functionaries. There took place also a self-critical discussion of the entire leading cadre in the district, a discussion which disclosed some general lines of weakness in the cadre as a whole.

It showed, for example, that basic weaknesses, such as failure to fight for collective work and especially for the functioning of Party clubs, or a sectarian approach to mass work, were characteristic of both the leadership and the cadre. It also showed

general ideological weakness in the struggle against petty-bourgeois liberalism and particularly in the struggle against white chauvinism.

Expressions of white chauvinism had become increasingly widespread in all levels of the Party. Against this development, which was a reflection in our own ranks of the intensified drive of the monopolist warmakers to infect the American working class with the fascist-imperialist poison of chauvinism, a very inadequate struggle had been waged.

In addition, the discussion brought to light a number of weaknesses in methods of work, of which the chief ones were expressed as follows:

1. A large section of the cadre is pretty much in a rut, going about its work in a lackadaisical, business-as-usual manner. The cadre as a whole lacks freshness of approach to problems, and tends to repeat the same answers to all questions.

2. Both the leadership and the cadre generally do not dig into problems in order to obtain pertinent, specific answers, but instead are satisfied to give stereotyped answers. There is an increase of phrase-mongering and talking in vague generalities.

3. There is a growth of general sloppiness and looseness in work, and a growing failure to check up on decisions.

4. The work of the Party is approached as if it were a business and not a movement of living human beings.

5. The comrades show signs of a lack of confidence in themselves and the Party. On the whole, the cadre does not exhibit political growth but rather shows signs of stagnation.

Thus, while the main criticism was leveled at the top leadership (and correctly so), the State Committee was also very self-critical of its own work, both as a collective body and as individuals, and of the work of the whole leading cadre. And while it was clear that the remedying of the serious shortcomings in the Party's work required first of all an earnest effort on the part of the leading comrades to correct their own weaknesses, it was also clear that it required equally a major contribution from the entire cadre toward this end.

Finally, it should be pointed out that these critical discussions were conducted throughout with a full realization of the new difficulties and problems which our Party faces. The burden of the criticism was that the leadership had not met the situation or tackled the problems in a thoroughgoing Bolshevik fashion.

#### IV

The immediate effect of these discussions was a considerable clearing of the air. The frank admission of errors and the objective discussion of weaknesses helped to knock the props out from under the insidious factional tendencies which had plagued the leadership. At the same time, they

laid the basis of a concrete program for liquidating these weaknesses, as well as for putting an end to the behind-the-scenes "unofficial criticism" and gossip which had grown out of the existing situation.

The comrades emerged with a feeling of confidence in their ability to correct themselves and to make substantial improvements in their work. They were able to leave with a definite perspective for building collective leadership, for strengthening the clubs, for ending sectarianism, for developing cadres, and for generally overcoming ideological backwardness and improving methods of work.

One or two of the leading comrades, who had about concluded that the best thing they could do was to leave the district and be transferred to work elsewhere, now changed their minds. It was pointed out to them that if they went elsewhere they would only be attempting to run away from their weaknesses by going to a new district where it might be possible to hide these weaknesses for a time, and that, in the end, this would solve nothing. On the contrary, the State Committee felt, there was no better place to correct one's weaknesses than the district where the State Committee and one's comrades generally were familiar with them and could help to overcome them.

While the holding of such a self-critical discussion was clearly an accomplishment of major importance, it is also necessary to recognize its

limitations. Thus, it must be borne in mind that such a discussion cannot *in itself* solve the problems in question; it can only help to provide a better basis for their solution.

The present discussion, by helping the comrades to see their weaknesses more clearly, enabled them more readily to correct them. In this way, it laid the groundwork for making a marked turn in the work of the Party in Ohio. But this is only a beginning. After such a discussion is ended, the necessary changes and corrections still remain to be made.

In fact, what is actually accomplished by the discussion must be judged ultimately in terms of the subsequent struggle to eradicate the weaknesses it disclosed. These cannot be done away with overnight; the process of correction is usually a slow one. But for such a struggle to materialize at all, it is essential that the comrades fully grasp and accept the criticisms directed at them. And we well know that there is a long way between verbal agreement and real understanding. Certainly where comrades, months afterward, still show no serious signs of change, it is questionable whether they really got much out of the discussion or whether they really understand the criticisms.

But we must also see that criticism does not consist in laying down ultimatum, in telling comrades to "change, or else—." Quite the contrary, criticism is a means of collectively helping comrades to grow, a



*mutual* responsibility. It is a process which requires of comrades not only an understanding of one another's strong points and weaknesses, but also a realization of the special difficulties and obstacles which each faces. This approach is absolutely essential in general, but it is especially vital in connection with Negro comrades or women comrades who, in addition to other difficulties, are confronted with such problems as white chauvinism or male supremacy.

Criticism and self-criticism must be seen as playing a fundamental role in the building of cadres. Today the fight for cadres is of exceptional importance in our Party. Today, more than ever, we must take to heart Stalin's statement that "of all the valuable capital the world possesses, the most valuable and most decisive is people, cadres."\*

It is therefore clear that a single or at most very occasional review, no

matter how immediately fruitful, is by itself inadequate. We must strive for frequent and regular evaluations of our work and of our progress in remedying weaknesses and strengthening our leadership. Correcting political weaknesses is not a simple, mechanical process like correcting mistakes in arithmetic; it is a process of constant political growth. Hence, even further, criticism and self-criticism must not be reserved for special occasions. We must learn to make them an intimate part of all our work and all our discussions.

It is particularly important that such discussions as the present ones should not be confined to top bodies like the State Committee. They must be extended to involve the entire active Party corps, so that all may profit from them.

The discussions in Ohio represent a major initial step in the struggle for real criticism and self-criticism—a step which the Party in Ohio now has the obligation to follow up and build upon.

\* J. Stalin, *The Soviets and the Individual*, International Publishers, New York, 1935. p. 12.

# The Meeting of the American Foreign Ministers

By Rob F. Hall

PARADOXICALLY, both the successes and the failures of the United States State Department in the recent Fourth Meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the American States flowed largely from the same single source: a profound fear of their own people by the corrupt and reactionary governments of most of the Latin-American countries.

Because of that fear, they need loans and the arms to bolster their unpopular rule. From this fact, Secretary of State Dean Acheson profited to the extent of getting their signatures to a batch of fifty resolutions incorporated in the "Final Act" of the conference.

But because of this fear, the governments found it necessary to make a show of independence of the Northern Colossus. They felt compelled to put forward demands, especially economic demands, which embarrassed the United States and which had to be recognized, although not granted, in the Final Act.

In the end Acheson secured his diplomatic victory which enabled him to proclaim that the governments of the hemisphere were united on a program of military coopera-

tion against "Communism," measures for internal suppression of "Communism," and economic cooperation to aid Wall Street's war preparations.

The agreement, however, represents nothing more than a measure of the economic and military power of the United States vis à vis the Latin-American governments prevailing in the early spring of 1951. There is nothing of permanence in the agreement, and the documents are, as one newspaper correspondent noted in a private conversation with the writer, "so much paper."

A change in any of the governments to the south as a result of a popular democratic upheaval could result in removing that government from the scope of the agreement. And even where there is no change in the personnel of the present rulers, it is doubtful whether their observance of the agreement to provide the United States with strategic raw materials will continue beyond the point where the United States offers the best prices.

Acheson, of course, is not unaware of this fact. It is for this reason that, while seeking to keep as low as pos-

sible the prices which the United States will pay the Latin Americans for their raw products, he has held aloft the promise of \$80,000,000 in arms. Obviously this is not large enough a sum to finance their participation in a war. But to Acheson's thinking it might conceivably be enough to provide the small arms and armored cars with which an army could suppress a restive population.

Just how restive the people south of the Rio Grande are was attested to by almost all of the foreign ministers and their aides who spoke during the two-week conference. While most of the sessions were closed to the press, some of the most revealing remarks were made at a session which, by a freak event, was opened to newsmen. That was when Charles E. Wilson, Director of Defense Mobilization, came to deliver a prepared address on United States war preparations. His design was to assure the Latin-American countries a profitable market for their raw materials for the next three years, and for a much longer period if the war breaks out in the interim; while, at the same time, warning them that during such a period there would be a scarcity of consumer and producer goods for export.

#### HAGGLING FOR WAR PROFITS

Wilson revealed just how ignorant

it is possible for a leading imperialist to be about the state of mind of his agents. The questions and comments that followed his address brought into high relief the contradictions between the imperialist metropolis and the semi-colonial governments.

These are not identical, of course, with the contradictions between the imperialist metropolis and the interests of the semi-colonial peoples. But the latter are reflected, even in a distorted way, by the former. For, obviously, if the native agents of American imperialism are to retain their jobs, they can do so only to the extent that they hold the peoples in check by force or trickery. It is to their interest to stress the difficulties of their "stewardship," the complexity of their problems, and as a result they are sometimes fairly candid. Moreover, they represent a stratum of the native bourgeoisie which, while having pretty completely sold out to Wall Street, has certain economic interests which do not entirely coincide with those of Wall Street.

But it must be understood that their haggling with the United States monopolist war-makers does not in any way denote disagreement with the criminal drive to war. The representatives of the Latin-American landlords and capitalists are also thirsty for war profits, for bigger crumbs from Wall Street's war drive. It is this that explains their role in the U.N. which was succinctly

summarized by Stalin, as follows:

Not only the United States and Canada are striving to unleash a new war, the same stand has also been taken by 20 Latin-American countries, the landowners and merchants of which are craving for a new war somewhere in Europe or Asia, in order to sell commodities to the belligerent countries at excessively high prices and to gain millions from that sanguinary business. It is no secret to anyone that 20 representatives of twenty Latin-American countries are now the most solid and obedient army of the United States of America in the United Nations organization.\*

The Latin-American foreign ministers were willing to sell their raw products and strategic materials to the United States for its war effort, they told Wilson. They were even willing to maintain some sort of control on the prices of these commodities for the benefit of the U.S. monopolist importer. But in return, they insisted that they should not be compensated in dollars, the value of which would be constantly declining under conditions of inflation within the United States.

In other words, they wanted to be paid in the first place in manufactured articles, such as automobiles, washing machines, machinery, and light consumer goods. They were not satisfied with Wilson's excuse of scarcity. They reminded Wilson that

during World War II, they had provided the United States with raw materials and had been recompensed in dollars in lieu of manufactured articles which from 1940 to 1945 were admittedly scarce. But in 1946, the United States abolished price controls, they pointed out, and prices soared. The dollars they had accumulated during those five years lost half their value at the very moment the market for their own raw materials collapsed.

Thus they wanted assurance of continued price controls as well as supplies of manufactured articles. Furthermore, they wanted a market for their raw materials guaranteed for a long term of years.

In addition, they wanted to increase their capital goods and they demanded both loans and technical assistance to this end. Why, asked the Bolivian Minister, should his country increase only its production of raw natural rubber? Why shouldn't Bolivia profit also by engaging in the manufacture of rubber goods?

Other foreign ministers stressed the need for mining machinery, for highways, railroads and port developments. One, upon hearing Wilson contend that an important factor in the scarcity of manufactured goods would be a shortage of labor, pointed out that in his country there was a large number of unemployed. Come and build your factories there, he said, or lend us the money and pro-

\* Interview of J. V. Stalin with a *Pravda* Correspondent, *Political Affairs*, April 1951, p. 13.

vide the technical assistance and we will build the factories.

#### BACKGROUND OF MASS MISERY AND STRUGGLE

There was a note of desperation in these demands. They were made against a background of the most dire poverty on the part of the Latin-American masses, which the Wall Street stooges could not entirely hide. According to figures recently issued by the United Nations, 70 leading countries had a total income in 1949 of \$515 billion. Of this total, 152,198,000 Latin Americans received \$23,099,000,000, or \$145 each on the average. Per capita income ranged from \$40 in Haiti to \$346 in Argentina. Edward Tomlinson, writing in the *Washington Sunday Star*, said:

Top officials of the U.S. do not seem to appreciate the fact that in rural Mexico, the mountain and jungle areas of Peru and Ecuador, as well as in northern Brazil and others, there are hundreds of thousands of people who have never had enough to eat, never lived in a house, never worn a factory-made shoe.

It is extreme naiveté to believe that "top officials" of the State Department are unaware of these conditions when they insist on their stooges depressing still lower the living standards of the Latin-American masses.

A little more than a month before the conference was held in Washington, and while the United Nations Economic and Social Council was meeting in Santiago, Chile, the dissatisfaction of the Chilean workers with conditions reached a climax. There was a 24-hour general strike protesting the minimum wage of about \$50 a month.

President Gonzalez Videla, as was to be expected, screamed "Communism," but he felt compelled to follow that up shortly with a sharp attack on the International Bank for its refusal to grant loans to Chilean enterprises. The bank "merely considers the profits to American bankers," he said. Significantly, even this outright tool of Wall Street, fearful of the wrath of the people at home, cannot avoid giving expression to Chile's "indisputable right to trade with all the countries of the world."

Strikes and other working-class economic actions in the Latin-American countries, as direct reactions to the inhuman conditions under which the masses live, have immediate political repercussions. Hence, the economic demands of the Latin-American foreign ministers were an important measure of the ferment among the workers.

When the resolution on economic development was finally adopted, it was significant that note was taken of these demands. They were accepted in principle as desirable,

but they were all made subordinate to the "defense program," meaning the world conquest ambitions of Wall Street.

As for the ferment of the workers, the Latin-American governments have invariably ascribed this to the Communists, both because this seemed politically wise and because the Communist Parties are extremely active in fighting for the economic needs of the masses.

Fifteen of the 20 governments south of the Rio Grande have, largely at the instigation of the State Department, already outlawed the Communist Parties. The further step demanded by the State Department—an agreement to forbid the entry into any Latin-American country of radical leaders in flight from a neighboring country—easily secured approval from most of the ministers.

But the resolution which contained this monstrous departure from the ancient democratic principle of the right of political asylum stressed that it was "international" Communism, not native revolutionism which it was seeking to oppose. This is a familiar and not very effective figleaf, but the Latin-American foreign ministers clutched at it eagerly.

They consented to a Washington proposal that a commission be set up to work out a model anti-Communist law, presumably something similar to the McCarran Act. But they also demanded a paragraph de-

claring that "the rights of the individual" and "basic democratic institutions" be protected. Another figleaf!

The delegates made it abundantly clear—a fact that stood in no need of proof—that they stood in no fear of invasion by the Soviet Union, which was the "peril" spokesmen for the Truman Administration's bipartisan war policy constantly hawked.

The Latin-American governments were very happy to reap whatever benefits they could from the "emergency" which seemingly disturbed Acheson and President Truman. Undoubtedly they realized that as a result of Wall Street's plans for war, their bargaining powers had increased with the expectation of war profits.

This was a very important factor in understanding the maneuvers of the various elements at the conference. Thus, they complained that Washington was mistakenly putting disproportionate stress on the military as against the economic, contending correctly that the only "danger" they faced was overthrow by their own people.

But, to guarantee themselves a share of the \$80 million in arms and the war boom market for their raw materials, they did not hesitate to go along with Acheson on "military cooperation."

They voted for a declaration which called for a "reaffirmation of inter-

American solidarity" in view of the "common danger" lyingly described as the "aggressive activities of international Communism." They agreed to "recommend" to the Latin-American republics the development of their military forces in such a way that they might be "integrated" into a Latin-American armed force under Wall Street's control and in its service, similar to that which Eisenhower is seeking to set up in Western Europe. Echoing the "stop thief" demagoguery of the Pentagon, they denounced "aggression in Korea"; in this, they were consistent with their governments' subservience in the U.N. to their war-mongering State Department masters.

But the crucial military resolution was far from what Acheson and the Pentagon had hoped for.

It permitted each of the American republics:

1. To "examine" its resources and "determine" for itself what it could do to contribute to the defense of the hemisphere; and

2. To "give particular attention to the development and maintenance of elements within its national armed forces so trained, organized and equipped that they could, in accordance with its constitutional norms . . . promptly be made available (1) for the defense of the hemisphere and (2), for service as United Nations unit or units. . . ."

Argentina filed a formal reserva-

tion stating that its government would send no troops anywhere outside its borders except in consultation with its people. The Guatemalan government did not file a formal objection, but its foreign minister made the same point. And it was generally recognized that, except for the escape clause, which permitted each government to decide for itself whether or not it would provide such troops, the State Department could not have mustered a majority for the resolution.

Unquestionably Acheson hoped not only to secure a resolution binding upon the Latin-American republics to send troops to Korea but also to support future United States imperialist aggressions perpetrated under the guise of United Nations actions. The fact that no country to the south of the Rio Grande had provided a solitary soldier for the Korean adventure was a sore point even before the conference opened.

The *Christian Science Monitor* observed that the Latin-American governments had "shown less than the expected vigor in supporting United Nations action in Korea." Others had commented even more caustically.

But the truth is that it is one thing to vote "Ja" in the U.N. General Assembly at the command of the United States delegate, and it is another to raise a unit of troops to fight 5,000 miles away for a cause which their peoples vehemently oppose.

### PEOPLE'S OPPOSITION PREVENTS SENDING TROOPS TO KOREA

Despite the Washington frenzy and the promises of their national traitors, the millions of Latin Americans know their friends from their enemies. They know that Yankee imperialism is their deadly enemy; and that the Korean people, the people of liberated China, and the Socialist Soviet Union are their best friends.

There is therefore not only a reluctance but—on the part of the people—a fierce determination to prevent sending troops to Korea or elsewhere in support of Wall Street aggression. In Cuba a public opinion poll showed 70 percent of the people against sending troops to Korea. In many South American capitals there have been demonstrations for peace. The peace sentiment of the Latin-American peoples, as distinct from the policies of the ruling classes, is reflected in the position of the Arbenz government of Guatemala. President Arbenz gave the following three reasons why his government would provide no troops for such purposes:

1. "It would violate the principle of non-intervention that has guided and will continue to guide the democratic regime of Guatemala. . . ."

2. "It would encroach upon the U.N. Charter."

3. "Guatemala cannot divert a

single man or the nation's limited budget from the broad program of production" of the next six years of his administration.

"Peaceful co-existence of nations is absolutely essential for Guatemala."

There is no question but that the statement of President Arbenz reflected public sentiment not only in Guatemala but throughout the southern part of the hemisphere.

Acheson will probably have little difficulty in getting the 140,000 Latin-American troops the Pentagon wants to man Wall Street bases in the Caribbean and to patrol the hemisphere's southern littoral, to enable the release of an equal amount of United States troops for service elsewhere. He will in all likelihood continue to get the supplies of raw materials for United States war industry, although not always at the price the United States first offers.

But the tensions and contradictions within the hemisphere republics are basic. United States war preparations will accentuate rather than resolve these contradictions. The ferment among the people will grow, and strikes, both economic and political, will be more numerous.

Some of the more oppressive regimes are bound to go and the outlook for the next period is one of rising struggles.

If the United States government should succeed in igniting a world war, as it is determined to do, these



contradictions may very well explode, thus canceling out very effectively the paper agreements signed at Washington.

U.S. imperialist domination of Latin America which began at the turn of the century has become more and more absolute, reaching its climax at the beginning of World War II. But Latin America is a very vulnerable sphere for American imperialism.

After fifty years of "benefit" from the "brotherhood" with Wall Street, Latin America's millions are unemployed, millions are poverty-stricken, millions are hungry. These millions will not allow themselves to be used as colonial slaves and cannon fodder for Wall Street. They will take advantage of every contradiction and difficulty of United States imperialism to break their shackles. Their freedom will greatly weaken the Wall Street monopolists and enormously aid the working class and toiling people of the United States. The very interests of the people of the United States hence require that they extend all possible aid to the

awakening masses of Latin America. It is first of all the duty of the working class of the United States to fulfill its proletarian internationalist obligations toward the Latin-American masses, its allies in the struggle against the mutual enemy—the Wall Street monopolists. This requires that organized labor in the United States repudiate the reformists and labor-imperialists, those who seek to corrupt and stifle the Latin-American labor movements. It requires defeat of their aim to paralyze the resistance of the Latin-American peoples to the intensified semi-colonial oppression and the criminal war plans of Yankee imperialism. The times call for concrete actions and expressions of support to every demand for the freedom of Latin America from the yoke of the Wall Street trusts. The sharpened war danger places before our working class the urgent task of rallying the peace forces in the land to anti-imperialist solidarity with the peace- and freedom-striving peoples of Latin America.

# Tear Down the Walls of the Negro Ghetto

By Esther Cantor

IN NEW YORK CITY, where the Negro ghetto system is solidly entrenched, segregation in housing is one of the main expressions of discrimination against the Negro people. Segregation in housing allows full sway to police brutality; to discrimination in hospitals; to segregation in the public school system; to the higher prices imposed by shopkeepers; to the City's refusal to guarantee equal sanitation facilities for the Negro communities; to Jim Crow in restaurants; to discrimination in relief and its administration; to the overcrowded, rat- and roach-infested, higher-rental dwellings in Harlem. All this stems in good measure from the policy of maintenance of the ghetto system for Negroes in New York.

Segregation in housing acts as a perpetual breeder of white chauvinist ideology. Segregation creates a reservoir of labor to be used by monopoly capital in Jim-Crow fashion. Segregation operates to disfranchise the Negro people through gerrymandering. The State Senate is lily-white; there has never been a single Negro State Senator in New York. Segregation guarantees super-profits

for the capitalists, big and little.

The ghetto system of housing is a political, economic and social instrument of oppression of the Negro people. In the North today it is a basic challenge that must be faced and smashed. It can be smashed by the sum total of the labor and progressive movements in alliance with the Negro people.

## THE SITUATION IN HARLEM

The impact of the war program has intensified to a tremendous degree the overcrowding in the Negro ghetto. Thus, in Harlem, 600,000 individuals are jam-packed in a very small area. Whatever small aspects of rent control still exist in other communities, there is essentially no rent control in Harlem. The overcrowding, caused by segregation, has resulted in a situation where hotels and furnished rooms, which were taken out of the area of rent control, are a dominant form of housing in the Harlem community. Landlords have turned apartment or tenement houses into hotels, and small apartments have become rooms in a hotel,

while rents for single rooms of \$15, \$17 and \$25 a week occupied by whole families have become the pattern.

There has been a brazen callousness by the City Administration and its Department of Housing and Buildings toward safety, sanitary and fire violations, to the point where only a token effort is being made by the City on fireproofing or rat control or sanitary measures.

While it is true generally that more houses are coming down than are being built in today's housing crisis, especially in the working-class communities, this situation is a veritable tragedy in the Harlem community. The ghetto crowding is tremendously accentuated by decreasing dwelling units for increasing numbers of families. Some new houses are, however, being built daily; but to Negro families that means little, for segregation traps them in crowded Harlem.

Evictions without any legal safeguards are a standard practice. And while evictions in a white community usually proceed with a notice of dispossession, in Harlem it is just a lock on the door and you're out on the streets. While in white communities a tenant has several days in which to answer an eviction notice, in Harlem one has to spend three days in court just trying to take that lock off the door which was put there illegally in the first place.

The Administration, the landlords and professional agencies continually

issue false statements piously echoed by Social-Democrats and reformists seeking to create an impression that Government is really intervening to end segregation. Any examination of the facts reveals the intensification of the attack against the Negro communities and the attempt of the Negro citizens to tear down the walls of their ghettos to live in any place of their choice as free men and women.

#### CHALLENGING STUYVESANT TOWN DISCRIMINATION

Against this background, there is a tremendous ferment brewing among the Negro people in the first place, but involving increasing sections of the white population, particularly sections of the working class, against segregation in housing.

The challenge to the ghetto system of housing started back in the days of the great economic crisis, when the Unemployed Councils and then the Workers Alliance, with Communist Party leadership an important factor, demanded low-rent, non-segregated public housing projects.

The success of the battle for non-segregated public housing laid the groundwork for a mass battle against Jim Crow in Stuyvesant Town at the beginning of World War II. This struggle, in which Benjamin J. Davis played a decisive role, was an important factor in uniting the Negro people and the masses of the

white progressives. It was part of the movement resulting in the election of Comrade Davis to the City Council and led to the enactment of the Davis-Isaacs law banning future Stuyvesant Towns by forbidding segregation in housing constructed with government funds.

Stuyvesant Town is a giant project of more than 11,000 families on Manhattan's Lower East Side, built by Metropolitan Life Insurance Company with the aid of fabulous tax and other financial concessions by the city.

Metropolitan is the largest single land-owner in the South and the largest single landlord in the United States. Its hiring policies, as an employer, are notoriously discriminatory, as is its system of issuing insurance policies.

This giant corporation, backed by every landlord interest, announced its racist policy with the approval and complicity of the City Administration, but was met with mass resistance by the people of the city. With the end of World War II, and under the impact of the new aggressive designs of American imperialism, the unity of all people's organizations against Stuyvesant Town—the symbol of segregation in housing—was seriously impaired by the move to the Right of reformist-led organizations. For a few years, every effort was made by the reformists to confine the struggle to court action, unbacked by mass movements.

But by 1948, the mass movement was able to regroup itself, gaining renewed initiative from the struggle begun by the tenants in Stuyvesant Town itself who formed the all-inclusive Committee to End Discrimination.

The tenants first took a poll of the families in Stuyvesant Town, proving that the overwhelming majority were not opposed to Negro tenants and puncturing the white supremacy lies spread by Metropolitan and other racist groups and organizations.

Then, following a conference which united additional forces for further struggle, Mr. and Mrs. Hardine Hendrix and their young son, a Negro family, were invited into the project by their fellow trade unionists of District 65 of the Distributive, Processing and Office Workers of America, Mr. and Mrs. Jesse Kessler, for the summer, and then by the family of Prof. Lee Lorch, now of Fiske University.

This was the first breach of Jim Crow in Stuyvesant Town. It was accomplished by mass support inside and outside the project and prevented the corporation from acting against the Hendrixes, Kesslers, or Lorches.

The following winter an imposing and significant incident occurred. The tenants in Stuyvesant Town invited a number of Negro families, victims of a fire in Harlem stemming directly from the ghetto system of housing, into Stuyvesant Town, as

their  
their  
Crow  
against  
reache  
through  
Fina  
backin  
tions,  
three  
Town  
stem  
its dis  
The  
unity  
segreg  
in the  
mittee  
ing, w  
of nu  
concer  
proach  
gradu  
within  
which  
lar ac  
the co  
action  
theles  
which  
issue,  
anothe  
action  
ing.  
The  
the en  
Austin  
crimin  
ing. I  
tancy

their guests, thereby manifesting their opinion of Metropolitan's Jim-Crow policy and inspiring activity against Jim Crow in housing which reached out into all major projects throughout the city.

Finally, the company, without backing down on its public declarations, was forced officially to admit three Negro families into Stuyvesant Town—a concession designed to stem the mounting pressure against its discrimination policy.

The ferment and the growing unity of Negroes and whites against segregation in housing were reflected in the formation of the State Committee on Discrimination in Housing, which is a top level committee of numerous organizations. It is concerned mainly with legalistic approaches and confined to a policy of gradualism by the Social-Democrats within its leadership. This policy, which fears mass pressure and popular action, proved bankrupt when the courts refused to act in the legal action against Metropolitan. Nevertheless, the committee includes forces which, because of the impact of the issue, are prepared, in one form or another, to unite with all groups in action against segregation in housing.

The movement has already forced the enactment of the State Wicks-Austin Bill, which bans future discrimination in publicly assisted housing. It was only the disgraceful hesitancy of certain forces in the anti-

discrimination movement which prevented the passage of the Moritt-Baker Amendment, which would also have banned Jim Crow in Stuyvesant Town, Knickerbocker Village, etc.—that is, in existing publicly assisted housing.

More recently, the movement forced the passage of the Brown-Isaacs Bill in the New York City Council, despite the previous protestations of reformist leaders that "retroactive" legislation was impossible. For the first time, New York City makes punishable discrimination in any publicly assisted housing, present or future.

The movement forced the issue of Stuyvesant Town and the question of segregation in housing into the center of the 1949 election campaign. The issue of ending all segregation in housing will undoubtedly be a major plank in the 1951 election campaign in New York, under the slogan that the Negro ghetto must go.

#### STATUS OF THE STRUGGLE

Most significant of all, a struggle exists today against the token observance of the Isaacs Bill by admitting only three Negro families to Stuyvesant Town. This struggle also seeks to break down lily-white communities elsewhere throughout the city. They are still isolated struggles, but they are beginning to move at a pace where a decisive breakthrough can be won. There is a re-

newed movement in Parkchester, Metropolitan Life Insurance project in the Bronx. The impact of the struggle around Levittown resulted in the Amityville project, a Negro and white community of small-home owners. For the first time, state legislation has been introduced to ban all discrimination in all housing, private or public.

The impact of the struggle in Stuyvesant Town is to be seen in a private project in Brooklyn, where the landlord corporation, fearful of popular pressure, has sought to forestall it by renting one apartment to one Negro family in each of its 35 buildings. This gesture will, however, not suffice. Landlords can no longer stem the tide of struggle for equality in housing by disguised discrimination. The ghetto system in housing is not to be replaced by the quota system.

Unable to check the mass popular movement, Metropolitan struck back at the time of the aggressive United States intervention in Korea, by seeking to behead the movement inside Stuyvesant Town. It has eviction cases pending against 31 white families who were active in the anti-discrimination committee. The corporation thereby seeks to isolate the three Negro families in the project of 11,000 families and to prevent Negro-white unity in common struggle. It warns of punitive measures against all who fight discrimination in housing.

While certain reformist leaders have sought to create the impression

that the struggle was over with the leasing of apartments to three Negro families and the passage of the Brown-Isaacs Bill, they have not been successful.

The fight to make the Brown-Isaacs Law a reality is engaging the energies of the local N.A.A.C.P. for mass applications by Negro families for apartments in Stuyvesant Town. Major Negro organizations in Harlem have united on this issue, as well as on the evictions. The awareness of the relation between Metropolitan's eviction threat and its practice of segregation is a sign of the progress of the efforts to end the ghetto system in New York.

The demands on the city to halt the evictions, coupled with the fight to extend the victory in Stuyvesant Town and for a mass assault on lily-white housing, has broadened considerably with this stage in the struggle, and is resulting in broad unity movements in Harlem.

The conclusion that has to be drawn is that the conditions are ripe for a breakthrough, with possibilities for a major onslaught on segregation in housing, for forging Negro-white unity in this struggle, and for advancing the whole struggle for equal rights.

There are five basic factors that have contributed to this situation: One is the rising mood of militancy among the Negro people, marked by constant challenges to segregation in housing, reported in every major city throughout the country.

including the South. Every Negro newspaper throughout the country describes what is happening in cities where Negro people are challenging the system of segregation in housing, paying with their lives, if necessary, being bombed out, stoned and attacked, but constantly seeking to breach the walls of the ghetto.

Second is the significance of Stuyvesant Town, the symbol of Jim Crow in housing. It is the central struggle for New York City, with national import, and represents the united struggle of Negro and white. The Negro press features this as the major struggle, reporting it nationally, and every step is hailed from coast to coast. The significance of Negro-Jewish cooperation, as it has been reflected in Stuyvesant Town, has also been noted in the Negro press.

The third factor in the present status of the struggle is the role of our Party in the struggle for Negro rights and against white chauvinism. This has been the mainspring to date and it is decisive for opening up the struggle in all lily-white communities. Without the constant struggle against white-chauvinist ideology, as waged by our Party, there can be no unity created to oppose the monopoly-imposed, government-backed segregation in housing. Today particularly, with the increasing chauvinism due to the war-mongering character of the bi-parti-

san Administration, the fight against racism, white chauvinism and "Anglo-Saxon supremacy" is cardinal in creating the possibilities for further struggles and greater victories.

The fourth factor is the increasing alertness of the tenants' organizations in opening up on the whole question of Negro rights in housing. At their last convention, for the first time the New York City tenants undertook in a serious manner to fight against segregation in housing.

The final and most decisive factor is the role labor has played in the struggle, particularly District 65. It is important to note that Mr. Hendrix and Mr. Kessler are members of District 65; that Prof. Lorch is a member of the Teachers Union; that of the 31 families facing eviction, seven are members of District 65, one a member of the United Public Workers, and one a member of the United Electrical. In addition, a number of other trade-union members are active in the Committee to End Discrimination in Stuyvesant Town. The backing these tenants received from their organizations contributed in no small measure to their confidence in struggle. And the Brown-Isaacs Bill was passed with the pressure of picket lines, post-cards and demonstrations by District 65 members.

The major need in the struggle to date is both a quantitative and a qualitative change in the relationship of labor to this front of struggle.

The fight for job opportunities and upgrading of Negro workers does not end the responsibility of the labor movement. A Negro worker earning the same wage as a white worker, but paying two and three times as much rent for inferior, fire-trap, rat-ridden housing, and paying higher prices, faces police brutality in a ghetto community, and is still economically, socially and politically more oppressed than his white fellow-worker.

*If any union would come to the defense of its Negro brothers and sisters in its membership by selecting any lily-white area and fighting for equal housing in that area for Negro families, it would provide the strength and militancy for victory, and also cement the Negro-labor alliance in the most direct way.*

#### OUR TASKS IN THE STRUGGLE

How does the problem of Jim-Crow in lily-white communities present itself?

In the field of public housing Negro and white tenants do live together throughout the city, although the situation is far from satisfactory and a quota system pattern is apparent. But there is a constant political threat by the bi-partisans, as a part of their war program, to end this—to end, not only low-rent public housing, but the Negro-white character of the housing projects.

Now, there is greater emphasis on middle-income developments,

which excludes, because of income levels, increasing sections of the Negro people, and because of that, also seeks to establish so-called public housing of a lily-white character.

In addition, government policy in backing segregation, results in slower building in Harlem, since the city refuses to relocate in "white communities" Negro tenants facing eviction due to new building.

In the field of semi-public housing large private developments built with public funds or tax exemptions, sum-total lily-white conditions prevail. That is true in Levittown, in Knickerbocker Village, in Parkchester, etc. Even though the State Housing Commissioner told a delegation from Knickerbocker Village that it is against public policy, Knickerbocker Village has been up for 13 years or so and there has never been a Negro tenant, despite the fact that public funds of all kinds are involved.

It becomes a major responsibility to open up these projects to Negro families. There is no other way of approaching the problem than to create an arena of struggle which makes possible the breaking of the lily-white character of these houses.

The third field of housing is in residential hotels. The discrimination practiced in hotels is uniform and constant, despite the existence of the civil rights law, and that is one field where relatively little has been done. In a city like New York with a large transient population,



Negro and white, the discrimination pattern which exists in hotels is another reflection of the ghetto segregation.

Then there is the vast field of furnished rooming houses and furnished room apartments which is noted during every election campaign and then forgotten. The rigid Jim Crow in furnished rooms, plus lack of any safeguards to protect tenants, has resulted in mass crowding and exploitation of Negro families.

It should be observed that there is a state civil rights law prohibiting discrimination against Negroes in practically every field, though it is rarely invoked. But in one field discrimination can be practiced with impunity, with—in fact—the blessings of the State, and that is in the field of housing (with the noted exception of public and semi-public housing which, however, in upstate New York is all lily-white).

Finally, and fundamentally, there is the mass of housing in the city, that is, private housing, in every "white community." Limited experiences already prove:

1. That even in isolated cases, without even a real mass offensive victories are possible. This was true in the Darrell case in the Bronx; it was true in the Yates case in Manhattan, where leases were signed, sealed and delivered.

2. That the people are ready to join in any struggle involving this basic right of housing for Negro people

and that the broadest area of unity, cutting through all attempts at division, has been and can be created in the struggle against segregation in housing.

The appreciation of the character and the extent of the united front that is possible in the struggle against segregation in housing, once this becomes the common understanding, will be a powerful factor in advancing the struggle. This is particularly important in Negro and white areas adjacent to each other, where landlords and racists are constantly seeking to engineer strife, precisely because of the great possibilities for cooperation.

3. The Party's role must focus on four basic tasks:

- a) Unremitting efforts to promote Negro and white unity in struggle against the effects of the ghetto system—high rents, absence of safety and sanitary conditions.

- b) Relentless struggle for uniting the community against lily-white housing and against segregation in housing.

- c) Conscious determination and plan that Negro families will live in every community in the city.

- d) Confidence in the capacity of the movement to win.

To do this, the Party must first, last and always, struggle for Negro rights in practice and against white chauvinism in ideology.

On the ideological struggle, experiences to date show:

1. That the fight against white chauvinism is not an abstract struggle, and that at various times in the struggle against segregation in housing it takes different forms. The ideological struggle which is not simultaneously accompanied by the struggle for Negro rights does not really tackle the question of white chauvinism. There are various aspects of white chauvinism expressed at different levels in the struggle as each advance poses new problems. We cannot tackle the white chauvinism expressed in the failure to struggle against Jim Crow in housing, without taking the most concrete steps to advance general and specific campaigns in "white communities."

2. The second point is that the failure to act against segregation in housing contains within it most of the chauvinist attitudes, including the acceptance of Jim Crow, which prevents the development of mass action to smash segregation in housing.

3. Incompetence can be a form of chauvinism. When those who are able to do many other things seemingly cannot take the most elementary steps against segregation in housing, the conclusion must be drawn that there is refusal to recognize that the Negro question is a special question. The refusal to recognize this results in paralysis of those who, confronted with the

united front which bases itself on a struggle, say they don't know what to do.

4. Consistency and persistence are decisive. Moods of pessimism which create hesitancy in the face of needed action, attempts to end the struggle at inconclusive stages in the battle, refusal to fight for the broadest unity, all stem from the failure to understand the power of the Negro-labor alliance.

The struggle against segregation in housing cannot be pursued unless *each Communist Party club* has a program of struggle for Negro rights in housing and tackles white chauvinism as part of the campaign against lily-white housing.

#### FOR A UNITED FRONT OF STRUGGLE

The struggle against ghetto housing, against segregation, is a basic test of the policy of the united front. No one can afford adventurism or dabbling with this question. Too much is at stake for the Negro people and the working class generally. The fears of a setback are utilized to counsel gradualism, court action and moral education, in opposition to mass struggle. But the direct action in Stuyvesant Town paved the path to victory. The issue has such mass appeal and reflects such mass resentment that the real estate monopoly, the reformists and Social-Democrats have been unable to

prevent anywhere in the city a single principled struggle for equality in housing and on a militant program to that end.

Further, where the united front permeates a community against segregation in housing, more doors are open on other issues. The united front on the Mundt Bill and for the F.E.P.C. was outstanding in Stuyvesant Town. The program in Stuyvesant Town for more schools includes a plan against lily-white schooling.

The Red-baiting attempt to split the unity of the tenants in Stuyvesant Town around the threatened \$4 per room rent increase proposed by Metropolitan was in good measure set back by the reservoir of unity achieved by the tenants themselves in the struggle around the brave pioneer Hendrix family.

Like no other issue, the struggle against discrimination in housing has had the power to forge unity of action, despite all difficulties put in the way by war-mongers and Red-baiters. Objectively the struggle, which

has already demonstrated its capacity to achieve significant victories, is in opposition to the chauvinist imperialist policies of the Wall Street warmongers.

There are *always* vacancies in New York City, despite the housing shortage. People always move in and out. There is no community which cannot open up the struggle against vile discrimination in housing at once. To end the ghetto in Harlem, we must begin in our own community. There should be concentration in working-class communities, where the mass movement can help create a major breakthrough and where real victories can be achieved as a result of the impact of the mass movement on landlord and government agencies.

Such campaigns must result in victory. They will be a major contribution to beating Jim Crow in Stuyvesant Town; to breaking the ghetto in Harlem; to abolishing housing segregation, which stands as a foul symbol of the oppression of the Negro people in New York.

# The Meaning of a Unified, Democratic Germany

By George Lohr

IN HIS FIRST political interview after his release from prison, Comrade Eugene Dennis said that the question of Germany, its democratization, unification and demilitarization "is the crucial question which will determine whether or not the atomaniacs will succeed in their conspiracy to launch World War III."

With this statement, the General Secretary of the Communist Party has also put his finger on a most vital task before the entire peace movement of our country.

The extent to which the peace forces exert their influence to prevent the remilitarization of Germany and are able to bring about its unification and democratization will largely determine whether or not our youth will once again be forced to die on the battlefields of Europe.

- In its evil plot to unleash a third world war, the war camp, headed by the Truman Administration, has assigned Germany a decisive strategic role.

- Its strategy is based on the concept that the United States warmakers can succeed where Hitler failed, if they are successful in welding to-

gether the mighty industrial resources and manpower of the United States and Germany.

Of course, the warmakers in Washington are counting on some assistance, both industrially and in cannon fodder, from the other Atlantic Pact powers. But Germany is decisive for them, because of its tremendous industrial installations and high technique, its large reservoir of skilled manpower, and its favorable geographic location in the very heart of Europe. In reality, the warmakers have for some time taken steps to further their strategy with regard to Germany.

They have already turned Western Germany into a semi-colony, run by Wall Street bankers and generals, together with Nazi politicians. Germans are being enrolled in military formations, called "labor units" and trained by United States officers. At the same time, Hitler's former training grounds are being used to "toughen up" the GI's serving in the Occupation Army for combat duty. Germany has been selected by the Wall Street warmakers as the main future graveyard in Europe of our

youth now being forced into uniforms.

At the same time, as the *New York Herald Tribune* reported on April 13, plans are just about complete for the formation of regular German army units, with airplanes and all. The figure mentioned was 12 divisions, or 144,000 men. But this is just the starter of the huge army of aggression that Eisenhower has been ordered to create, with German-United States units as its backbone and Germany as its base.

The people of our country therefore have a direct and immediate stake in the future of Germany. The American people have a vital interest in the struggle to prevent the remilitarization and to support demands for the unification of Germany on a democratic basis. With the achievement of these two objectives by the world peace camp, the plans to start World War III in Europe will be defeated.

The importance of Germany in the world-wide fight for peace was made clear by Stalin on the occasion of the founding of the German Democratic Republic in October 1949 when he hailed the new republic as the "cornerstone for a united, democratic, and peace-loving Germany."

In his message to the new government, Stalin said then: "The existence of a peace-loving democratic Germany side by side with the existence of the peace-loving Soviet Union excludes the possibility of new wars

in Europe, puts an end to the bloodshed in Europe, and makes impossible the enslaving of European countries by the world imperialists."

#### THE POTSDAM AGREEMENT CARRIED OUT IN EASTERN GERMANY

In the German Democratic Republic the provisions of the Potsdam Agreement, signed in 1945 by President Truman, Premier Stalin and Prime Minister Attlee, have been carried out.

"The purpose of this agreement," says one of the key paragraphs, "is to carry out the Crimea declaration on Germany. German militarization and Nazism will be extirpated and the Allies will take in agreement together, now and in the future, the other measures necessary to assure that Germany never again will threaten her neighbors or the peace of the world."

There is another highly significant paragraph in the Potsdam Agreement which says:

It is not the intention of the Allies to destroy or enslave the German people. It is the intention of the Allies that the German people be given the opportunity to prepare for the eventual reconstruction of their life on a democratic and peaceful basis.

Listed as first among the purposes of the Occupation in this historic document was the "complete disarmament

ment and demilitarization of Germany and the elimination or control of all German industry that could be used for military production."

In Eastern Germany, the spirit as well as the letter of that agreement has been carried out. Former war factories have been turned to peaceful purposes, complete demilitarization has been carried through, and the people are being educated in the spirit of democracy. The German Democratic Republic operates under a democratic and peaceful constitution and only recently the legislature unanimously adopted a law banning war propaganda and providing firm punishment for any violators.

Another significant demonstration of the peaceful intentions of the German Democratic Republic was its recent agreement with Poland in establishing the new eastern borderline of Germany, thereby righting a former wrong and eliminating a source of war.

It is important to note the enthusiastic reception accorded Wilhelm Pieck, President of the German Democratic Republic, on his recent visit to Warsaw, a city whose population suffered death and untold misery at the hands of the German invaders during World War II. The peaceful actions of the German Democratic Republic have proved to the Polish people that the Potsdam Agreement has been carried through and that this part of Germany will "never again threaten her neighbors

or the peace of the world."

The scope of this article does not permit a full examination of the great historic achievements of the working class and its allies in Eastern Germany under the Marxist-Leninist leadership of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany, in uprooting the old social order and forging a new, democratic and peace-loving life. Let us, however, quote in brief from the remarks of Wilhelm Pieck, President of the German Democratic Republic, on the occasion of the fifth anniversary celebration of that party in April 1950:

Because the split [in the German working class] was overcome by the historic founding convention of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany, our third party congress could declare that the working class held decisive positions in the German Democratic Republic. The working class has become the strongest and most decisive political and economic power in the German Democratic Republic. The united working class could accomplish the task to eliminate forever in our German Democratic Republic the forces of monopoly capitalism and the imperialist war policies. In alliance with the peasantry and the intelligentsia, and in working cooperation with artisans and private industry, the working class has created the development of commerce for the peaceful future of our people according to a plan of vast concept. For the first time in Germany, a truly peaceful state has been created in the German Democratic Republic, which, contrary

T  
to the  
with th  
and al  
guarante

THE PE  
VIOL  
WEST

But i  
the Oc  
Washin  
ent. Th  
has long  
States p  
be rem  
scream

ests we  
and Pot  
ing the  
Street i  
the ver  
cially o

The  
Potsdam  
shall P  
both in

Weste  
cluded  
ery in  
intent

atlantic P  
ern Ge  
war pre  
brought  
the fore  
the Uni  
held in  
gave it

Then  
were or

to the past, recognizes in friendship with the great Socialist Soviet Union and all peace-loving peoples the surest guarantee for the maintenance of peace.

#### THE POTSDAM AGREEMENT VIOLATED IN THE WESTERN ZONE

But in Western Germany, where the Occupation orders come from Washington, the situation is different. There the Potsdam Agreement has long been ditched and the United States policy makers do not want to be reminded of it. They cynically scream now that United States interests were "betrayed" at the Crimea and Potsdam conferences. By betraying the Potsdam Agreement, Wall Street is betraying the welfare and the very lives of our people, especially of our youth.

The war camp has replaced the Potsdam Agreement with the Marshall Plan and the Atlantic Pact, both instruments of aggression.

Western Germany has been included in the Marshall Plan from its very inception and is now, to all intents and purposes, part of the Atlantic Pact. The plan to accord Western Germany the key spot in the war preparations by rearming it was brought into the open officially when the foreign ministers' conference of the United States, Britain and France, held in New York last September, gave it its approval.

Then the Atlantic Pact countries were ordered to attend a conference

in Brussels on December 18 and 19, when Secretary of State Dean Acheson laid it on the line—Germany was to be rearmed and made part of the Atlantic Pact.

State Department replies to angry protests against German rearmament try to make it appear as if no such plans were under way. Yet, John J. McCloy, United States High Commissioner in Germany, said in an interview at Frankfurt, on December 27, that, while "Big Four talks might be in the offing, they would not affect the instructions on German arming the All-High Commissioners had received."\*

In fact, there have been a series of meetings between representatives of the High Commissioners and a German military committee which reached agreement on forming 12 German divisions. Among the members of that committee are two leading Nazi Generals, Hans Speidel and Adolf Heusinger.

Nazi industrialists are likewise active, with the blessing of Wall Street, in building up Germany's war industry. The Potsdam Agreement has never been carried out in this regard either.

On April 3, most of the few remaining restrictions on German war production were cancelled at the orders of the High Commissioners. The Ruhr barons can now produce steel in excess of the former limit of 11

\* *New York Times*, December 28, 1950.

million tons "where such production will facilitate a supply of steel for the common defense effort." Controls were lifted on the production of synthetic ammonia, chlorine, aluminum, machine tools, and other items vital to the manufacture of weapons. The letter of the High Commissioners also stated that they might allow, by special decree, the manufacture, export and import of all kinds of weapons, including atomic weapons.

On December 18, a meeting of leaders of Germany's heavy industry took place at Hamburg which created a "European Council of German Industry" which has the function of furthering the incorporation of German industry into the rearmament of Atlantic Pact nations.

Moreover, while details are kept highly secret, it is known that United States investors are pouring large amounts into these German industries, just as they did in the period between World Wars I and II. McCloy himself cynically admitted this fact in his December 27 press conference. As reported in the German press, he urged German rearmament and said that "the western powers have invested so much politically and economically in the Federal Republic that for this reason alone they could not give up western Germany."

Here is a clear admission that Western Germany is not only an important war base for these imperialists but also a highly profitable semi-colony.

Wall Street revived German heavy industry, badly beaten down after World War I, with its Dawes Plan and Young Plan loans and profitable investments. Simultaneously, Germany was permitted to build up a big army, in violation of the Versailles Treaty. The Ruhr magnates, Wall Street's partners in Germany, were the main backers of the Hitler regime and its mad ambition to conquer the world.

Now the same Nazi industrialists, thanks to Washington, are back in power; Wall Street is again making investments and Nazi generals are carrying out the orders of the Pentagon to prepare Germany as a strategic base for a new war aimed at United States imperialist world domination. Once more the mad design will fail. But once more, we face the threat that the soil of Europe will be drenched with the blood of humanity's youth, including our own.

#### WALL STREET—THE REAL OCCUPIER OF THE WESTERN ZONE

It became apparent from the beginning of the Occupation that Washington had no intention of carrying out the Potsdam Agreement, when William Henry Draper, Jr., was chosen as the first chief of the Economic Division of the Control Council for Germany. Draper, who is listed in *Who's Who* as an investment banker and army officer, be-



came the real power of the Occupation. He is a former vice-president of Dillon, Read and Co., the huge Wall Street firm that managed the investment of tremendous sums in German concerns before World War II.

He was in a key position to counteract any efforts to break up the German cartels and monopolies and to assure their future control by their Wall Street-Nazi joint owners.

The present top United States Occupation figure is McCloy, a Wall Street corporation lawyer who has represented the Chase National Bank as well as the notorious German I. G. Farben combine. Before assuming his post in Germany, McCloy was president of the World Bank, a powerful concern that serves Wall Street as an instrumentality for spreading its control over industries in other countries.

McCloy urged the "eventual" re-arming of Western Germany already a year ago and admitted in the same speech that the kind of Germany he was proposing might be "strong enough to be a potential threat to the security of her neighbors." But this is exactly what the Potsdam conference decided never again to permit!

Wall Street has sent some of its best men to protect its interests and to save its Nazi business associates from the fate they deserved as war criminals. But once these German industrialists were back in their plush directors' chairs, they shrewdly ex-

ploited the highly strategic bargaining position into which they had been placed by Washington's war plans.

These Nazis are in full agreement with the plans of U.S. imperialism to start a war of world conquest. They are looking forward to a new round of huge profits and the forcible re-conquest of territories justly restored to Germany's neighbor states after World War II. Their reactionary regime headed by Konrad Adenauer, is thus correctly labeled by the Soviet Union as "revanchist."

The German ruling class, however, wants to make sure that it gets what it wants—a major role for German capitalism in Europe and in the world market—as payment for its role in such a war. It is selling something Washington wants—the blood of the German youth, and it knows that this is a seller's market and makes the best of it.

Washington occasionally voices its anger at this attitude in public, as when Benjamin J. Buettenwieser, McCloy's assistant, told a Bremen gathering on March 4 that the German rulers must stop "their coquetry and playing hard to get."

It would be wrong, however, for the peace movement in our country or elsewhere to see in this haggling the source of a cleavage between Nazi and Wall Street barons. The clue to the reality of the situation, as far as Germany is concerned, must rather be sought in the fear expressed by

Eisenhower in his report to Congress upon his return from his first trip to pressure Western Europe for cannon fodder.

Speaking about Germany, he said:

Certainly I, for one commander, want no unwilling contingents, no soldiers serving in the pattern of the Hessians serving in our revolutionary war, in any army of my command. It would only be a source of weakness.

With these remarks, this Wall Street general admitted publicly that he found no enthusiasm for a new world war among the German people. Recognition of this fact, based upon a true appraisal of the situation, is at the same time a tremendous blow to the warmakers and a positive factor of decisive importance for the peace forces.

#### PRAGUE PROGRAM WINS SUPPORT

The German people are by no means freed from Nazi ideology. The imperialist Occupation masters, hoping to turn this ideology to their own advantage, have sabotaged denazification at every step. But the German people are nevertheless suspicious of plans that would bring about another world war, with them in the forefront and their country serving as the battlefield. They are in growing numbers looking to the kind of perspective for their coun-

try that was advanced in Prague on October 20 by the Conference of Foreign Ministers of the Soviet Union, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Romania, Hungary, Bulgaria, Albania, and the German Democratic Republic.

The program for Germany developed there has the following four points:

No German remilitarization and no war industry.

Development of an unlimited German peace economy.

Conclusion of a peace treaty with Germany and the withdrawal of all Occupation troops.

Creation of an all-German constituent council to prepare for the establishment of an all-German government.

These proposals, which have also been introduced by the Soviet Union at the Paris Big Four Deputy Foreign Ministers' meeting, have thrown the war camp into consternation. The warmakers knew that these proposals would be received favorably by the people of Western Germany. Indeed, the *New York Herald Tribune* columnist, Stewart Alsop, was compelled to admit on March 2 that "a nightmare is beginning to haunt those principally responsible for American foreign policy." The "nightmare" is peace. "It is about as certain as such things can be," Alsop said in the distorting vein of bourgeois journalism, "that the Kremlin will soon formally propose a German

settlement based on the unity of a 'neutralized' Germany."

To add to Washington's agony, a unity proposal has come not only from Prague but also from Berlin. In a letter dated November 30, 1950, Otto Grotewohl, Premier of the German Democratic Republic, made these proposals to Adenauer in Bonn:

1. The creation of an all-German constituent council with equal representation from East and West.

2. This council to be charged with preparing the creation of an all-German sovereign, democratic and peace-loving provisional German government.

3. It shall submit suitable proposals to the governments of the Soviet Union, the United States, Britain and France for confirmation.

4. It shall consult with these governments on plans for a peace treaty until an all-German government is formed.

5. It shall prepare the conditions for conducting free and all-German elections for a national assembly.

In advancing these proposals, Grotewohl pointed out that they would not only be a decisive step toward bringing about German unity, but would also constitute a vital contribution in the struggle for peace in Europe and against remilitarization. Adenauer and his Washington mentors took six weeks in formulating the double talk of their rejection of these proposals.

When the Volkskammer (People's

Chamber) of the German Democratic Republic met in special session on January 30, Grotewohl declared that if there was any doubt as to the attitude of the German people toward his proposals, a referendum could be held. He warned that "the split of Germany will lead to war" and stated that the "democratic unity of Germany means peace and construction." The Volkskammer then voted unanimously to submit the Grotewohl proposals to the Bundesrat (Federal Council) of the Bonn regime.

Answering Adenauer's claim that his regime had taken no military measures and that it sought peace, the Volkskammer of the German Democratic Republic authorized its delegates to an all-German constituent council to issue a declaration, jointly with the West German delegates, outlawing the remilitarization of Germany and banning the creation of military formations of any kind.

The proposals for German unity and against remilitarization found a tremendous response, not only among the people of the German Democratic Republic, but in Western Germany as well. Even Vice-Chancellor Bluecher of the Bonn regime was forced to admit in a speech at Stuttgart that "the world must understand that 99 percent of the German people are against remilitarization."

The list of prominent individuals in Western Germany who see in these proposals the possibility of averting

war includes mayors of large cities, Protestant and Catholic clergy, former high officers of the German army, and newspaper publishers.

#### THE GERMAN WORKING CLASS ACTS FOR PEACE

Especially significant is the response among the German working class. Shop councils of many factories and mines, and in some instances the entire working force, are on record for the Grotewohl proposals. For example, 10,000 workers of the Bosch plant at Stuttgart spoke out against remilitarization and demanded action by their trade-union leaders. A meeting of 700 functionaries of Ruhr mining unions backed the unity proposals, as did also the shop stewards of the Daimler-Benz (Motor) Corporation, speaking on behalf of the entire shop. There are scores of similar examples.

The anti-war sentiment of the miners has aroused the ruling class to demand police terror against them. The Social-Democratic trade-union leaders have made an agreement with the mine owners for special Sunday shifts in order to produce more coal for war production. But the miners themselves, as evidence shows, are offering resistance.

The *Stuttgarter Deutsche Zeitung und Wirtschaftszeitung*, an organ of the employers, complained on January 20 that very little coal was being mined on Sundays and said "the

Communists were successful in their agitation against the so-called 'tank shifts.'" It said further that "women and children were being mobilized" and that "children, catching hold of the men by their jackets, would ask: 'Miner, surely you won't mine coal so that bombs might again fall on our heads.'"

"Are the police really so helpless in the face of this agitation?" the paper demanded.

The movement against remilitarization is gaining strength even among secondary leaders of the Social-Democratic Party, in direct opposition to the party hierarchy. A recent West German peace congress in Essen, in which 1,700 delegates participated, was attended by the editor of a prominent Social-Democratic paper, the chairman of the party's organization in Hamburg, and a number of Social-Democratic trade-union functionaries in mines.

This peace congress, which went on record for a plebiscite on the issue of remilitarization and for the conclusion of a peace treaty with Germany in 1951, marked a new high level for the German peace movement. About the same time, the Communist Party of Germany, in the Western Zone, issued an appeal to the leaders of the Social-Democratic Party, urging joint talks on the issue of the Grotewohl unity proposals and resistance to German remilitarization. The proposal was not accepted; but the refusal helped to

expose the role which Kurt Schumacher and other leaders of the Social-Democratic Party are playing as handmaidens of the warmakers.

The top leaders of German Social-Democracy are faithfully following in the sorry tradition of the great betrayal by their forerunners who supported the German ruling class in the imperialist First World War.

After the end of World War I, Social-Democracy helped to smash the German Revolution of November 1918 and then helped Hitler come to power, refusing all proposals by the Communists for joint action to stop the Nazis. Now Schumacher et al. are in the service, not only of the German ruling class, but of Wall Street as well. Schumacher actually has declared that the "Marshall Plan is the true Magna Carta of the Germans." During recent Laender (state) elections, the Social-Democratic politicians demagogically campaigned "against" German rearmament. They say that they will agree to rearmament only on the basis of "equality." They want a German army that will not be incorporated into a Western European army of aggression, but have its own high command. They also want German rearmament without any conditions of any kind. At the same time, it is significant to note that the increase in the vote of these demagogues in recent elections shows the tremendous, is confused, peace sentiment among the people.

The Communist Party of Germany, while not yet successful in fully exposing these Wall Street agents, is determined to bring about unity of action with the rank-and-file Social-Democratic workers.

In its recent March party congress, the fight against sectarianism and for unity of all workers was one of the key tasks stressed in the main report by Comrade Max Reimann, General Secretary of the Party.

In a message to its members in January the Party exposed the Schumacher "equality" talk as an imperialist, chauvinist demand for an equal share of the war booty. It said that "unity of action against remilitarization, for the preservation of peace, for a peaceful solution of the German question is the need of the hour."

Whether the war plans will be successful or whether they will be defeated, the statement said, is especially up to the people of West Germany. "Without West Germany, without its industries, without its people, the imperialist warmakers dare not begin a war in Europe."

The Communist Party of Germany is insisting that the German people themselves have a voice in determining their destiny. At present, it is encouraging the movement for a plebiscite on remilitarization and the conclusion of a just peace treaty. This movement is making headway, despite the ban imposed by the desperate Adenauer clique and its Wash-

ington masters. Sample polls show that as high as 90 percent of the voters in shops and neighborhoods favor complete disarmament and a just peace treaty.

The warmakers are trying to distort such a defense of German interests by making it appear that this is a revival of German chauvinism. Similar charges have been made, especially by "liberals" in this country, in a conscious effort to confuse the peace forces here as to the role of their allies in Germany.

Such efforts have the objective of playing upon the hatred that all honest people have for the German chauvinism which has been a stock-in-trade of German reaction for centuries. There is chauvinism today in Western Germany; but it is fostered by the Nazi generals and industrialists, Washington's allies and tools, who are trying to arouse public support for their revanchist war plans.

Chauvinism is an instrument of imperialist war propaganda, as shown in the sharp increase of attacks against the Negro people in our country and in the "white supremacy" propaganda spread against the peoples of Asia. Chauvinism betrays the true national interests of a people. German chauvinism, especially its Prusso-fascist brand, has been a weapon used, not only for the subjugation, but for the extermination of other nations in the past. The Marxist-Leninists of Germany

are fighting to root out German chauvinism and to create a democratic and peace-loving national consciousness among the German working class and the people generally. The creation of such a consciousness among the people is the prerequisite for true friendship with other nations, a friendship based on equality and expressing the spirit of proletarian internationalism.

Germany's semi-colonial oppression by Wall Street imperialism is giving rise to a dialectical growth of true patriotism on a mass scale, seeking satisfaction for the real interests of the German people.

Such patriotism is diametrically opposed to the chauvinist nationalism preached by the Hitler gang of Ruhr industrialists and militarists, just as our fight in defense of peace and democracy is diametrically opposed to the false "Americanism" of the warmakers who in reality want to destroy the Constitution and the Bill of Rights.

The Communist Party of Germany is telling the German working class and the German people generally not to let the Adenauers, the Schumachers and the Krupps speak for them and drag them into Wall Street's war. It is saying to them that they must take the cause of peace into their own hands by speaking out against remilitarization, for the conclusion of a just peace treaty, and for the unification of the nation.

Such a democratic and united Ger-

many will be a pillar of peace in the very heart of Europe and will frustrate the war plans of the atomaniacs. The policy of the German Communist Party therefore serves the interests of the German people as well as those of peace-loving peoples everywhere.

### THE WORLD PEACE COUNCIL RESOLUTION

Meeting in Berlin last February, the World Peace Council adopted a resolution giving full support to the struggles of the German peace movement. The resolution said:

The military and industrial rearmament of Germany presents the greatest danger of a new world war.

The World Peace Council is following with interest the development of the peace forces in Germany and registers joyfully the encouraging result of the Essen Congress.\*

It congratulates the friends of peace in Germany for preparing, in unity with peace-loving people of all tendencies, a people's plebiscite, which will express the will of the German people on the question of the remilitarization of their country and the conclusion of a peace treaty, which would put an end

to the present dangerous and insecure situation.

The World Peace Council calls upon all threatened countries to unite in a powerful protest which, supported by millions of men and women, would force their governments to conclude a peace treaty this year with a peace-loving Germany, a Germany which has re-established its unity and whose demilitarization, secured by international agreement, would be the best guarantee for the peace of Europe.

The working class and all peace-loving Americans must demand that Washington stop the remilitarization of Germany and the dispatch of our youth to that country as cannon fodder for imperialist war.

The peace forces of our country must demand acceptance of the Soviet proposals for a Big Four Foreign Ministers' meeting to consider and guarantee the demilitarization of Germany, the implementation of a peace treaty with a united, democratic and peace-loving Germany, and the withdrawal of all Occupation troops. These are the immediate, minimum indispensable objectives to be fought for in order to stave off world war, to preserve world peace.

\* Referred to above.—Ed.

## A New Outstanding Contribution to the Treasury of Leninism\*

By G. Alexandrov

THE POSTWAR development of Soviet society has been marked by new outstanding achievements and discoveries in the sphere of Marxism-Leninism. In his works generalizing the magnificent experience of building Communism in the U.S.S.R. and the experience of the struggle which the peoples of all countries are waging for peace, democracy and Socialism, against imperialist reaction, J. V. Stalin has made a new, world-historic contribution to Marxist-Leninist theory. An outstanding place among these new works by J. V. Stalin is occupied by *Concerning Marxism in Linguistics*, *Concerning Certain Questions of Linguistics*, and *Reply to Comrades*. In these investigations J. V. Stalin poses and solves problems of Marxist-Leninist theory that possess vast and fundamental significance for Soviet cultural upbuilding and for combating bourgeois ideology.

J. V. Stalin's works on problems of linguistics have enriched science with great new discoveries and theses; they have laid a sound theoretical foundation for the Soviet sci-

ence of language, and have effected a radical change in the trend of linguistics. Exposing N. Y. Marr's so-called "new doctrine" of language as a gross distortion of Marxism in the sphere of linguistics, condemning the "immodest, boastful, arrogant tone alien to Marxism and tending toward a bald and off-hand negation of everything done in linguistics prior to N. Y. Marr," and wiping out the Arakcheyev regime in linguistics, J. V. Stalin develops further the Marxist-Leninist theory of language and raises it to a new level. By their creative solution of the basic problems in the science of language, J. V. Stalin's works lay down a fundamental and sharply-defined borderline between the former state of linguistics—when under the Arakcheyev regime set up by Marr's followers idealism and metaphysics were implanted in this branch of science—and the new stage in the development of Soviet linguistics on the basis of Marxism-Leninism. J. V. Stalin's works lead linguistics out onto the highroad of genuine efflorescence. Soviet linguistics has every opportunity "to occupy first place in world linguistics."

\* Reprinted from *Soviet Literature*, No. 11, 1950, Moscow, U.S.S.R.



J. V. Stalin shows that language was created by the whole course of the history of society for many centuries, by the efforts of hundreds of generations to meet the needs of the whole of society, of all its classes. The product of a number of epochs, language gradually takes shape, is enriched, develops and is perfected. Apart from society there is no language. Language and its laws of development, J. V. Stalin emphasizes, can be understood only if studied in inseparable connection with the history of society, with the history of the people to whom the language under study belongs, and who are its creators.

Developing the views of Marx, Engels and Lenin on linguistic problems, J. V. Stalin has presented a classical Marxist definition of language: "Language is a medium, an instrument with the help of which people communicate with one another, exchange thoughts and achieve mutual understanding. Being directly connected with thought, language registers and fixes in words, and in words combined into sentences, the results of thought and man's successes in cognition, and thus makes possible the exchange of ideas in human society." Language serves the whole of society equally. "Precisely for this reason it was created as a single language for the society, common to all members of that society, as the common language of the whole people." J. V. Stalin

demonstrates that language is connected with man's activity in all spheres of his work—from production to the foundation, and from the foundation to the superstructure. Language serves society as a means of intercourse among people, as a medium for the exchange of views in society. It enables people to understand one another and to arrange joint work in the sphere of production, economic relations, politics and culture, in public and in private life. The sphere of action of language is practically unlimited.

Exchange of ideas, J. V. Stalin points out, is a constant and vital necessity, for without it, it is impossible to coordinate the actions of people in the struggle against the forces of nature, in the struggle to produce the necessary material values; it is impossible to ensure the success of society's productive activity, and, hence, the very existence of social production is impossible. "... Without a language understood by a society and common to all its members, that society ceases to produce, disintegrates and ceases to exist as a society. In this sense, language, while it is an instrument of intercourse, is at the same time an instrument of struggle and development of society."

Of exceptional importance in the development of Marxist linguistics are J. V. Stalin's theses concerning the vocabulary of a language, which is, as he vividly and aptly puts it,

the building material of the language, and his theses concerning grammar (morphology, syntax) as the collection of rules governing the inflection of words and their combination into sentences. It is precisely thanks to grammar, J. V. Stalin emphasizes, that language acquires the ability to invest man's thoughts with a material linguistic integument. The grammatical system of a language and its basic word stock constitute its foundation, the essence of its specific nature, and impart to it a great stability and power of resistance to all attempts at the forcible assimilation of peoples and nations, at the suppression of their language.

The Turkish assimilators strove for hundreds of years to mutilate, destroy and wipe out the languages of the Balkan peoples, notes J. V. Stalin. But the Balkan languages held their own and survived. The profound scientific theses presented by J. V. Stalin not only expose the colonizers of the past and the imperialist aggressors of today but also show the entire hopelessness and inevitable failure of this colonization policy. In J. V. Stalin's Marxist analysis, the historical experience of the development of nations and of the languages of various peoples discloses the important law that the policy of all enslavers and assimilators of peoples—whether Turkish or German-fascist, British or American—was and is doomed to failure and defeat. In

substantiating the historical rights of peoples to independent statehood, to their culture, to their national language, J. V. Stalin arms us for the struggle with the Anglo-American aggressors and their misanthropic program of abolishing the national independence, state sovereignty and culture of all peoples.

\* \* \*

J. V. Stalin's theses do not leave a stone standing of the idealistic inventions of the bourgeois philosophers and linguists, of their endeavors to banish materialism from linguistics. The representatives of the modern idealistic, the so-called semantic, philosophy deliberately ignore the fact that language fixes man's successes in cognition. They depict language as a collection of conventional symbols and rules that may be replaced at will by others, inasmuch as the development of languages supposedly does not conform to any objective laws and everything is based upon accident. From this follow the various arbitrary language-reform projects in the bourgeois countries. The English philosopher Whitehead proposes that the existing parts of speech be given up and replaced by new categories of his own invention. This obscurantist rejects nouns, adjectives and verbs, for they reflect the things, phenomena, qualities and connections of the real world which ex-

ist a  
Wh  
the g  
The  
is th  
strac  
thou  
it is  
succe  
man  
mies  
thou  
Th  
basie  
lingu  
Meil  
to an  
bour  
think  
guag  
ciety  
exist  
men  
to S  
sprea  
guag  
its  
spon  
Cou  
expl  
the  
vent  
whic  
and  
spee  
E  
vulg  
at t  
num  
view

ist apart from man's consciousness. Whitehead and his ilk likewise reject the grammatical system of language. The reason is clear, for "grammar is the outcome of a process of abstraction performed by the human thought, over a long period of time; it is an indication of tremendous successes of thought"—and the semanticist obscurants are sworn enemies of scientific cognition, of thought.

The idealistic interpretation of the basic problems of linguistics by such linguists of the West as Saussure, Meillet, Schuhart and others has led to an unprecedented degradation in bourgeois linguistics. Divorcing thinking from language, and language from the development of society, the bourgeois linguists deny the existence of any laws in the development of language. Thus, according to Saussure's view, which is widespread in bourgeois linguistics, "language does not forethink anything; its 'figures' shift, or rather change, spontaneously and accidentally" (*A Course in General Linguistics*). To explain the development of language, the bourgeois linguist Sapir has invented an "ideal linguistic essence" which exists no one knows where and which is supposed to dominate speech habits.

Exposing Marr as a simplifier and vulgarizer of Marxism, J. V. Stalin at the same time shows that on a number of points Marr's erroneous views directly proximate the ideal-

istic theories of bourgeois linguistics. According to the Marxist view, language is the direct reality of thought, and consequently, thoughts, ideas, cannot exist without language. In opposition to Marxist theory and in defiance of fact, Marr "invented" a theory that thinking can be carried on without language. Only idealists, J. V. Stalin points out, can speak of thinking divorced from the "natural matter" of language, of thinking without language; "overestimation of semantics and its misuse led N. Y. Marr to idealism." Marr's praise of Saussure for his "most sensitive perception of the life of language itself" (N. Y. Marr, *Selected Works*), is not fortuitous. This he said about a linguist who divorced language from thought and from the development of society, who endowed language with a spontaneous development and an existence independent of society! Marr also notes—though with reservations, true—the affinity of his views with Kasserer's labored idealistic scheme. ". . . In his system," wrote Marr, "the Japhetic theory receives amazing confirmation for a whole number of its theses, including even similar formulations and identical terms. . . ." And again, this is said of a reactionary neo-Kantian linguist who regards language as the product of spontaneous creation by some sort of spirit, which in language establishes for itself a symbolic form or instrument with the aid of which the spirit subordinates reality.

With exceptional depth and a tremendous insight into the historical process of the formation of languages, J. V. Stalin's works on Soviet linguistics reveal the role played by the masses of the people in the formation and the development of language. His works shatter the erroneous views of Marr and his disciples on the nature, character, causes and effects of the crossing of languages, views which led to a negation of the natural development of language in the course of the history of society, to a negation of the linguistic affinity of peoples. J. V. Stalin gives a sweeping criticism of the theory that language crossing is the single act of a decisive blow which yields results within a few years. In his *Reply to Comrades* he presents a profound Marxist analysis of the process of language crossing prior to the victory of Socialism on a world-wide scale and after the victory of Socialism on a world-wide scale.

J. V. Stalin discloses the laws governing the origin and development of national languages, thereby disproving Marr's erroneous, non-Marxist theory of the "class character" of language. By denying the existence and necessity of a national language, this erroneous theory objectively served the cause of the bourgeois cosmopolitans who are trying to substantiate the policy of the Anglo-American imperialists—these new aspirants to world domination

who are out to enslave all nations and to wipe out their languages and culture. Marxism says that "a common language is one of the cardinal earmarks of a nation, although knowing very well that there are class contradictions within the nation." Language is common to the whole people and lives longer than any foundation or any superstructure in society. In history, the development of language proceeds from clan languages to tribal languages; from the latter to the languages of nationalities, and further to national languages. "History shows that national languages are not class languages, but languages common to the entire people, common to the members of each nation and constituting the single language of that nation." J. V. Stalin proves the fallacy of the views that class languages exist in reality and that national language is a fiction.

J. V. Stalin smashes Marr's erroneous, non-Marxist theory that language is a superstructure, pointing out that the old superstructure changes and is eliminated together with its foundation in the transition from one social-economic system to another, while language is not eliminated but is enriched, retaining its fundamentals, its basic word stock and its system of grammar.

In defending their erroneous theory, Marr and his disciples attempted to prove the class character of language by pointing to the class charac-

ter  
two  
and  
tha  
tha  
lem  
Th  
in  
lan  
and  
thir  
or S  
of i  
con  
can  
ist  
the  
con  
dev  
gua  
thru  
serv  
old.  
T  
Stal  
sub  
van  
form  
ther  
the  
pow  
thos  
diff  
viet  
tem  
and  
as a  
are  
clar  
lang  
new

ter of culture, to the existence of two cultures in society—bourgeois and proletarian. J. V. Stalin shows that such an approach to the problem of language is anti-scientific. The fallacy of these views consists in that they identify and confuse language with culture. "But culture and language are two different things. Culture may be bourgeois or Socialist, but language, as a means of intercourse, is always a language common to the whole people and can serve both bourgeois and Socialist culture." J. V. Stalin emphasizes the point that culture changes in content with each new period in the development of society, whereas language remains basically the same through a number of periods, equally serving both the new culture and the old.

These principles laid down by J. V. Stalin furnish a profound theoretical substantiation of the tasks in advancing Soviet culture, national in form and Socialist in content, to further efflorescence. J. V. Stalin arms the builders of Soviet culture with a powerful ideological weapon against those who fail to see the fundamental difference between the content of Soviet and bourgeois culture, who attempt to transplant bourgeois views and customs into Soviet life, as well as against those who, claiming they are fighting bourgeois culture, declare language to be bourgeois, class language and advocate some sort of new, "proletarian" language, thus ac-

tually undermining the building of Socialist culture.

The historic significance of J. V. Stalin's theses on language as a means of intercourse among people, as a means of exchanging thoughts, and on the importance of language in the development of society is manifest with especial conviction in the example of the tempestuous development of the Socialist culture of the peoples of the U.S.S.R.

Guided by Lenin's and Stalin's theses on the role of language in the development of national culture, beginning with the first years of the October Revolution the Soviet state launched work on a vast scale developing mass education in the native languages and promoting Socialist culture in all the languages of the peoples of the U.S.S.R. Without this the outstanding achievements and victories in building Socialism, advancing culture and raising the material well-being of all the peoples of the U.S.S.R. would have been impossible. The great power of language is revealed, in particular, in the fact that during the years of Soviet power the peoples of the U.S.S.R. have received in their native languages the works of Marx, Engels, Lenin, and Stalin—the highest attainment of world culture.

\* \* \*

Imperialism, on the contrary, oppresses nations and strives in every

way to suppress their development, their language and culture, strives forcibly to assimilate, devour and destroy them. The learned lackeys of imperialism are doing their utmost to prove that national language and culture are superfluous and obsolete, in order thus to make it easier to abolish the sovereignty of nations and transform all countries into colonies of the Anglo-American imperialists. A typical specimen of such activity by bourgeois linguists and philosophers is that of the British semanticists Richards and Ogden, who advocate the domination of the English language throughout the world; for this purpose they propagandize what is known as "Basic English"—a sort of pocket English, the vocabulary of which fits on a single page of a writing pad. The American monopolist Henry Ford barked: "Make everyone speak English," and the bourgeois linguists and philosophers jumped to carry out their boss's order. One of Wall Street's agents, Walpole, in calling for world supremacy for the English language, cynically remarked that this would help to subordinate the other countries to the Anglo-American imperialist bloc.

J. V. Stalin has completely exposed the anti-popular, counter-revolutionary imperialist policy of forcible assimilation of nations and their languages; he has shown the great stability of language and its power of resistance to all attempts at forcible

assimilation, thereby revealing the inevitability of utter failure for the imperialist policy in this question.

In his new works, J. V. Stalin has given a clear, classically precise and profound definition of the nature of language, its inseparable connection with the development of society; he has revealed the law of the development of language and dealt idealism and metaphysics in linguistics a mortal blow. His works have extricated Soviet linguistic science from the state of stagnation into which it had sunk owing to the spread of Marr's erroneous theories and to the Arakcheyev regime established in linguistics by Marr's disciples. J. V. Stalin's works present a Marxist solution of the fundamental theoretical problems in linguistics; they do away with the incredible confusion that prevailed among the linguists who were under the influence of Marr's erroneous ideas.

\* \* \*

The significance of J. V. Stalin's new works extends far beyond the science of language, however. The theoretical principles which his genius expounds in these works enrich Marxist-Leninist theory as a whole; they furnish precepts for the work of philosophers, historians, economists and specialists in law and literature.

J. V. Stalin's works have enriched dialectical and historical materialism

with new theses and conclusions, first and foremost on the Marxist interpretation of the foundation and the superstructure and their dialectical interaction, and on the laws of materialist dialectics and their specific manifestation in different social-economic systems, at various stages in the development of society and especially in the epoch of Socialism.

In formulating the basic principles of historical materialism, Marx pointed out that the sum total of the relations of production into which men enter in the social production of their life constitutes the economic structure of society, the real foundation "on which rises a legal and political superstructure and to which correspond definite forms of social consciousness" (Karl Marx, *Selected Works*).

Marx established the laws of development of the economic foundation of society depending on the growth of the forces of production; he demonstrated the dependence of the superstructure on the economic foundation. He investigated the economic foundation and the superstructure of capitalist society, showed the necessity of the breaking up of the old foundation and the old superstructure by the proletarian revolution, and defined the broad outlines of the future Communist society. Creatively applying and developing the revolutionary Marxist method, Lenin, the continuer of Marx's teachings in a new historical

epoch, gave a comprehensive scientific analysis of the economic system and the political and ideological superstructure of capitalist society in the period of imperialism. Lenin elaborated in concrete form the problem of breaking up the bourgeois state and of establishing the Soviet state—a political superstructure of a new type; he defined the basic paths to be taken in building the foundation of Socialism and its corresponding superstructure.

Developing further the principles of historical materialism, J. V. Stalin has given a comprehensive and integral theoretical analysis of the problem of building the foundation of Socialism and crowning it with a corresponding superstructure, of establishing the economic base of Communism and developing the superstructure in conformity with the tasks of building Communism.

J. V. Stalin concretizes and develops the Marxist concept of the foundation, defining it as the economic structure, which it would be incorrect to identify with production. "The foundation," he says, "is the economic structure of society at the given stage of its development." This definition places special emphasis on the historically transitory character of the foundation, pointing out that it is not a question of the economic structure in general, but of the economic structure of society at the given stage of its development.

Developing the Marxist principle

of historical perspective, J. V. Stalin teaches us to lay bare the distinguishing features of the foundation of each society, whether primitive communal, slave, feudal, bourgeois, or Socialist, when examining their economic structure; he demands that we study the specific features of their development. In describing the superstructure, J. V. Stalin directs attention to the fact that each society has a different foundation and that each foundation has its corresponding superstructure. Revealing the determining and active role of the foundation, he notes its specific feature, its function of serving society economically.

J. V. Stalin points out that the superstructure, as distinguished from language, is the product of one epoch, the epoch in which the given economic foundation exists and operates, and that the superstructure is therefore short-lived; it is eliminated and disappears with the elimination and disappearance of the given foundation. This concrete Marxist approach to the study of superstructures, of their development and their connection with the foundation, deals a blow to the labored scholastic theories about superstructures being extra-historic.

Elucidating the radical distinctions between language and the superstructure, J. V. Stalin notes that language is connected with production directly, whereas the superstructure is not directly connected

with production, with man's productive activity. It is connected with production only indirectly, through the foundation. "The superstructure therefore reflects changes in the level of development of the productive forces not immediately and not directly, but only after changes in the foundation, through the prism of the changes wrought in the foundation by the changes in production."

Thus, as J. V. Stalin has shown, changes in production first act on the foundation; they are seen through the prism of the changes in the foundation. The changes in the foundation of society are then, in their turn, reflected correspondingly in the changing of the superstructure—of the political system of society, of law, philosophy, aesthetic views.

\* \* \*

Of tremendous significance for the theory of historical materialism are J. V. Stalin's theses on the class nature of superstructures in class society.

The political superstructure of contemporary capitalist society consists of all the forms of the bourgeois state, which, as the general crisis of capitalism intensifies, is becoming more and more fascist, coming out as an open terroristic dictatorship of the most predatory and reactionary groups of monopoly capital. The imperialists, headed by the U.S.A., are hatching war, because the prepa-

ration  
out  
lists;  
impe  
isten  
talis  
spec  
to it  
gists  
rialis  
threa  
syste  
it is  
of ca  
terest  
Th  
adva  
work  
Marx  
quest  
it is  
cisel  
the  
in th  
of so  
tingu  
whic  
ture.  
litica  
other  
men  
flict  
twec  
relat  
they  
Deve  
Leni  
know  
— P  
and



rations for war and war itself hold out enormous profits for the monopolists; by unleashing a new war, the imperialists hope to prolong the existence of the decayed edifice of capitalism, but by doing so they are only speeding the whole capitalist system to its doom. The frankest ideologists of aggressive American imperialism openly declare that what threatens the present-day political system of the U.S.A. is peace. Thus it is that the political superstructure of capitalism serves exclusively the interests of the imperialists.

The theses on the superstructure advanced by J. V. Stalin in his new works develop further the theses of Marx, Engels and Lenin on this question. In his day, Marx said that it is possible to determine as precisely as one does in natural science the transformation that takes place in the economic conditions of the life of society, and that it must be distinguished from the transformation which takes place in the superstructure. Marx spoke of the legal, political, religious, philosophical, and other ideological forms in which men become conscious of the conflict that has matured in society between the productive forces and the relations of production, and in which they struggle to resolve this conflict. Developing these principles of Marx, Lenin pointed out that man's social knowledge, his "views and doctrines — philosophical, religious, political, and so forth," reflects the economic

structure of society. "Political institutions," Lenin continued, "are a superstructure on the economic foundation. We see, for example, how the various political forms of the modern European states serve to strengthen the domination of the bourgeoisie over the proletariat."

On the basis of a generalization of the experience of the new epoch, J. V. Stalin comprehensively develops the theses of Marxism-Leninism concerning the superstructure.

The experience of the class struggle in bourgeois society demonstrates that the more acute this struggle grows, the more inflated, militarized and fascist becomes the political and ideological superstructure of the decaying bourgeois society. An enormous state apparatus of police and officials is formed, special military units are trained and drilled to suppress actions by the proletariat. At the service of this imperialist state going fascist are the army, the police, the schools, the press, the church and numerous other organizations and institutions which conduct propaganda for a new world war. In the service of this state are the Right-wing "Socialists" too, those agents of the imperialist bourgeoisie in the labor movement. To consolidate its rule and combat the labor movement, the bourgeoisie forms widely ramified institutions and organizations which have large staffs and all possible material and financial resources at their disposal.

J. V. Stalin's theses on the class character of the ideological superstructure (philosophical, religious, ethical, aesthetic, and other views) provide the key to an understanding of the ideology of imperialism and its role in stupefying the masses. J. V. Stalin teaches us to disclose the real class purpose of the imperialists that is hidden behind the ideological shell and demagoguery of the bourgeoisie; to determine who, which class, finds it advantageous to advance and circulate corresponding ideas and doctrines.

It is not only the experience of the class struggle of the proletariat in bourgeois society that poses the question of the role of institutions which correspond to the political, legal and other views of society. This question has assumed still greater significance during the establishment of the superstructure of the new, Socialist society. This superstructure has been created in conformity with the interests and the needs of the working class, the toiling people, on the basis of the scientific theory and program of the Communist Party.

Socialism does not arise spontaneously, but is built consciously, on the basis of the scientific revolutionary theory of the Communist Party. The dictatorship of the proletariat set up in the process of the Socialist Revolution exercises planned guidance of the development and building of the foundation of Socialist society, because "the proletarian revo-

lution begins when finished forms of the Socialist order are either absent or almost completely absent." (J. V. Stalin, *Problems of Leninism*.)

The Great October Socialist Revolution put an end to the economic structure of capitalism, to its foundation and its political and ideological superstructure. The working class of our country, led by the Bolshevik Party, radically undermined exploitation, abolishing property ownership by the capitalists and landlords, and then eliminated exploitation altogether. It created the foundation of a new, Socialist society, and created and utilized for this work a new superstructure—the Soviet state, law, and political, legal, ethical, aesthetic and philosophical views which correspond to the Socialist foundation and promote the emergence, shaping and strengthening of the Socialist system.

J. V. Stalin says: "In the past thirty years the old, capitalist foundation has been eliminated in Russia and a new, Socialist foundation has been built. Accordingly, the superstructure on the capitalist foundation has been eliminated and a new superstructure created corresponding to the Socialist foundation. The old political, legal and other institutions have been consequently replaced by new, Socialist institutions."

A great master of revolutionary dialectics, J. V. Stalin does not regard the superstructure in isolation, but in connection with the foundation;

he points out its dependence on the foundation and its reciprocal action on the foundation, its active role in the rise, shaping and strengthening of the new foundation. The problem of the development and the role of the foundation and superstructure has assumed special significance in the period of the gradual transition from Socialism to Communism, for it is precisely the level of development of the foundation of Socialist society and its superstructure—the Soviet state, the legal, aesthetic, philosophical views and their corresponding institutions—that is an indication of our country's successful advancement toward Communism.

The interconnection between the foundation and the superstructure, and the active role of the superstructure are questions of exceptional importance for the People's Democracies as well, which, relying on the experience and aid of the U.S.S.R., are building and consolidating the foundation of Socialist society and its corresponding superstructure.

J. V. Stalin has put an end to the vagueness and the confusion that existed concerning the foundation and the superstructure; he has elaborated scientific theses on the essence of superstructures and their dialectical interconnection with the foundation; he has developed and emphasized new sides of this cardinal problem of historical materialism, sides hitherto not illuminated in Marxism.

J. V. Stalin's analysis of the social connection between production, the economic structure (the foundation) and the superstructure has provided an answer to the question of how the conditions of the material life of society are reflected in the superstructure. This analysis deals a devastating blow at all and sundry "theories" of the vulgarizers of Marxism not only in linguistics but also in other fields of science and culture and in problems of philosophy and art. J. V. Stalin's mention of the Proletcultists and the Rappists who vulgarized and distorted Marxism, especially in the complex problems of science, art and culture, is not fortuitous. The Bolshevik Party, Lenin and Stalin, have conducted a constant and merciless struggle both against open idealism and against the vulgarization of Marxist materialism, inevitably leading to the swamp of idealism.

\* \* \*

In his works, J. V. Stalin gives a rebuff to all who endeavor to impoverish the culture of our people, expunge its revolutionary traditions, to all who deny that the Soviet people is the bearer of advanced, Socialist culture which has inherited the best that mankind has created. As we know, it is precisely J. V. Stalin who described the rise of Marxism as a great revolutionary upheaval in philosophy, as a result of which was formed the

proletarian world outlook which is the direct opposite of all former theories. And at the same time, it is precisely J. V. Stalin who pointed out that in creating the new Communist world outlook Marx and Engels based themselves on the entire previous development of philosophy and science.

J. V. Stalin exposes in his works the narrow, sectarian and vulgar interpretation of Marxism as a teaching allegedly divorced from all the achievements of the past and from present-day science. His works teach us to wage a resolute struggle both against those who try to obliterate the qualitative distinction between Marxism and the teachings that preceded it, and against those who depict Marx and Engels as isolated individuals standing aside from the highroad of development of all science and materialist philosophic thought.

J. V. Stalin subjects to shattering criticism the views according to which the technical advancements of previous generations should be cast aside when the economic foundation and the political structure of society change. "At one time there were 'Marxists' in our country," he reminds us, "who asserted that the railways left to us after the October Revolution were bourgeois railways, that it would be unseemly for us Marxists to utilize them, that they should be torn up and new, 'proletarian' railways built. For this they

were nicknamed 'Troglodytes.'" Such opinions he describes as a primitive-anarchist view of society having nothing in common with Marxism.

Of great significance is J. V. Stalin's thesis concerning leaps that are not accompanied by explosions in the process of transition from an old quality to a new quality. This is a new contribution to Marxist dialectics and is of special importance for an understanding of the laws of transition from Socialism to Communism. J. V. Stalin points out that not every leap in development takes place in the form of an explosion. The law of transition from an old quality to a new through an explosion is imperative for a society divided into hostile classes, but is by no means imperative for a society which has no hostile classes, for Socialist society.

Under the conditions of Socialism and the transition to a Communist society there are and will be in the future numerous leap-like transitions in the development of society, especially in the development of technology, revolutions in production. Already now we can see the outlines of the not too distant future when an extensive use of atomic energy in the U.S.S.R. for peaceful purposes will accomplish a veritable revolution in the national economy. That will be a tremendous leap in the development of technology. It is being prepared consciously and successfully by Soviet power and it will still further consolidate the Soviet

soci  
of th  
Comm  
Unio  
cil of  
the P  
that  
Stalin  
devel

social and state system. The decree of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (Bolsheviks) and the Council of Ministers of the U.S.S.R. on the planting of shelter belts states that the accomplishments of this Stalin plan will ensure a leap in the development of agriculture and stock

breeding. This stupendous leap in the development of the national economy is already being made—not through an explosion, however, but through a steady consolidation of the Socialist social structure.

[*To be concluded in the next issue.*  
—Ed.]

# Wages in the Society of Socialist Construction\*

By Istvan Friss

SPEAKING of our achievements, we must mention first of all that we have put into effect the principle of "equal wages for equal work." We have put this principle into effect in areas even where its realization in the capitalist countries comes up against the greatest resistance: with regard to equal payment for men and women. In capitalist Hungary women received generally 20 to 30 percent less wages than men for the same work. This is still the case today in the capitalist countries. The members of the Hungarian delegation visiting England after the war saw with amazement the wage scales posted on the gates of English factories. The payment for a definite job was listed, but in two versions. The amount received by a man and the amount received by a woman for the same job were listed separately. There was a considerable disparity between the two. In 1947, the average weekly earnings of women in England were 55 percent that of men; in the United States the average hourly rates for women in

25 branches of industry were 60 percent of that of men. The Negroes in America, the natives of South Africa and generally in the British, Dutch, French, Belgian, etc., colonies are even much worse off as compared with the whites. In our country this barbaric discrimination according to sex and race is extinct since the annihilation of fascism.

We have likewise applied the principle arising out of distribution according to work; that is, we pay more than the average wage for particularly heavy or dirty work or work dangerous to the health. In capitalist society it is rather the other way around: the heavier, the dirtier, the more unhealthful the work, the lower is the payment. The early theoretical champions of capitalism made a virtue of this principle. Marx quotes a writer of the eighteenth century, the Protestant minister Townsend, according to whom "hunger . . . is the most natural motive of industry and labor evoking the mightiest efforts" and "it seems to be a natural law that the poor are to a certain extent improvident, so that there always may

\* This installment concludes the article begun, under the same title, in the May issue.—Ed.

be some performing the most servile, the dirtiest and most menial functions of the community. The fund of human happiness is thereby that much enhanced, the more delicate are freed from drudgery and can devote themselves undisturbed to their higher occupations." (Marx, *Capital*, German edition, Vol. I. p. 681 passim.) The latter day apostles of the alleged superiority of the capitalist mode of production, of course, no longer give their opinion so openly, in this time of class antagonism between capitalists and workers becoming more acute. This, however, does not change the fact that, for instance, miners in Hungary before liberation belonged among the worst paid workers. Even though, as already stated, the miners wages are lagging behind, they have increased also relatively to a great extent as compared with former times. The People's Democracy has brought about a radical change in this field, too.

Of course, capitalist economies are also forced to pay higher than average wages for certain jobs requiring higher skill. But even where they actually do so, the higher payment for higher skills is tied up with other demands exacted from the workers. From among the more highly paid workers they try to rear the labor aristocracy, which is devoted to capitalist society and defends it to the death against all revolutionary movements. These labor

aristocrats—we too have some of them left—are in cahoots with their capitalist masters and are sworn enemies of everything that is progressive and revolutionary in the working class, of everything that serves the interests of the working class. As against this, in our country, the most highly paid workers, the shock-brigaders, the Stakhanovites, are at the same time the most progressive, the leading elements of the working class in whose labor the changed new relationship of the workers toward work is reflected for the first time, who are living examples of the fact that in our country labor today is a matter of honor.

The principle of socialist wage payment is also being realized in the way we reward the innovations and inventions of the workers. As is known, anybody who increases in any way the productivity of his labor to a considerable degree receives, apart from the reward for the innovation, also the advantage that his wages are paid for the next six months still on the old basis, that during this period his norms remain unchanged. This is meant as an added incentive for the workers to devise innovations and more rational processes of labor.

Nevertheless, while we take credit for these changes, results and achievements, we must, at the same time, admit that we have still much to do to introduce the socialist forms of wage payments.

### PAYMENT ACCORDING TO PERFORMANCE

First of all, we must apply on a much broader scale than at present payment according to work performed. Payment according to work performed itself arises from the fundamental principle of socialist wage payment: to everybody according to his work. It is obvious that to pay everybody according to his work means to pay more for a higher or better performance than for a lower or less qualified performance. It is likewise obvious that payment according to performance is possible only by weighing and checking the different performances and making them the basis of payments. After liberation and particularly since stabilization we have tried to extend the system of payment according to work performed. However, we cannot be satisfied with our accomplishments up to now. A few months ago it was mentioned repeatedly that seventy and even seventy-five percent of our factory workers are being paid according to work performed. This would have been a very nice accomplishment but the whole thing was based on a misunderstanding. For even those whose wages are determined by the so-called index numbers were counted among those being paid according to work performed. It is, however, generally known that in these cases the payments are not according to individual performance but according to index numbers com-

puted on the basis of the results of the whole shop or plant. If we deduct those being paid according to index numbers then the number of those being actually paid according to work performed did not surpass fifty percent of the factory workers, even at its highest. With the introduction of piece-rates it became clear that a part even of these workers have been working on the basis of norms so uncontrolled or even uncontrollable that it was impossible to change them over to the system of piece rates. Thus, that part of the factory workers being paid according to work performed fell, at least provisionally, on the basis of incomplete data, below fifty percent of the total.

As a comparison we may mention that in the Soviet Union 57.5 percent of all workers worked on the basis of piece-rates in 1928; at the end of the first Five-Year Plan this figure rose to 63.7 percent, by the end of the second Five-Year Plan it reached almost 75 percent.

Piece-rates are, of course, not unknown in capitalist society either. There, however, as with wages generally, piece-rates have an entirely different character and content from that in a socialist society or in a society building socialism. In the capitalist economic system the piece-rate form of wages does not change in the least the fact that the capitalist buys, for the duration of the labor day, the worker himself, his labor power and that he computes piece-rates on the basis of the market price



of labor power. Withal, as Marx explains, this category of piece-rates "becomes the most lucrative source of wage deductions and capitalist frauds," "facilitates for the capitalist the raising of the normal degree of intensity" and the lengthening of the labor day. And just because of this, piece-rates are, again according to Marx, "that form of wages which is most adequate to the capitalist mode of production." (*Capital*, Vol. I.) In our economic system, piece-rates make it possible to pay labor effectively according to its quantity and quality, to pay equal wages for equal work in actual fact, to pay higher wages for more or better skilled work. It has, at the same time, the advantage that it can be easily computed and checked by the worker himself. It contributes thus palpably and directly to our objective of giving the worker an incentive to increase production and productivity.

These advantages of piece-rates make it desirable to apply them on as broad a scale as possible. In certain cases, moreover, wherever we have to deal with bottlenecks mentioned above, it may be necessary to apply progressive piece-rates instead of simple piece-rates. This means to raise, beyond a certain fixed number of pieces, the wage per piece by a definite percentage. Undoubtedly, we are deviating here to a certain extent from the principle of "equal wages for equal work," in order to encourage higher production and the raising of productivity. That is precisely

why progressive piece-rates are justified only where the greatest possible increase of production is imperatively required by the interest of the national economy. And even there only if piece-rates themselves are based on exact technical norms.

We must confine, wherever possible, time-rates to those fields where we are unable to measure performance adequately, *i.e.*, where we cannot set up norms of work performance. This is a much smaller range than the prevalent range of application of time-rates. Where we nevertheless have to retain time-rates, we must, of course, make up, at least partially, for the incentive to bigger and better production provided by piece-rates, by premium payments, rewards for the achievement of certain fixed objectives. This system of time-rates coupled with premium payments corresponds to our index wage system. Within certain limits—that have to be kept, however, narrower than at present—this mode of payment is thus also justified, even though here, too, matters have to be simplified, as well as made more accessible to supervision.

Our second important task in the field of applying the principles of socialist wage payment is working out the correct wage proportions between different crafts and branches of industry. Obviously, the disparities mentioned by Comrade Gerö at the meeting of the Central Committee must be eliminated as soon as possible. If we pay higher wages in

the rubber and leather industry than in the iron, metal and machine industries, if the miners' wages lag behind seven other branches of industry, then it may well happen that we will come up against labor shortage precisely in the branches of industry most important for us. Considering the requirements of our national economy the wages of workers employed in the iron, metal and machine industries must be on top and within these categories first place is due to the foundry workers. Without a doubt, the miners must also be placed high on the list.

#### DIFFERENTIALS STIMULATE TECHNICAL SKILL

Our third serious task is to increase the differentials within the different crafts and branches of industry as between the lower and higher categories. In the capitalist countries skilled workers are more and more squeezed out by semi-skilled workers. The decisive consideration for the capitalists is that semi-skilled workers are cheaper than skilled workers. To us, however, the decisive consideration is that it is precisely the highly skilled workers, masters of their craft, of whom the increase of production and productivity through innovations and rationalization may be expected. Hence we are interested in having more and more and technically better versed skilled workers. We are promoting this also by increasing the

differentials between the higher and the less qualified work and thus inducing the workers to raise their skill and knowledge. For comparison's sake let us mention that while in our country the difference between the lowest and highest wages in different branches is at the outside 50—60—70 per cent in favor of the higher paid workers, in the Soviet Union this differential is generally much greater in the machine industry, for instance, 150 at piece-rates on cold jobs, 160 per cent on hot jobs. Of course, we cannot achieve these differentials at one stroke and considering the many undeveloped features of our wage system as well as the erratic nature of our norms, this would not even be justified. Nonetheless, we will have to increase the differentials somewhat.

Our fourth task is to promote and perfect the planning of the wage fund and to insist on strict planning discipline in this field, too. Only by realizing this, can we make sure that the increase of wages will not surpass the increase of productivity and that wages rushing ahead will not cause disturbances in provisioning the population or in other fields of the national economy.

In the Soviet Union great stress is laid on the planning of the wage fund, on the strict maintenance of the limits set for it. "With regard to the national economy the wage fund is a very important element in the balance of money receipts and expenditures of the population; it

decre  
wor  
signif  
the s  
why  
sionin  
wage  
plans  
tion o  
canno  
its of  
respo  
ductio  
plan.  
for t  
the li  
keepi  
the p  
numb  
insist  
discip  
settin  
wage  
We  
Evide  
stage  
the  
norm  
with  
Sovie  
see to  
not b  
sial s  
recen  
by th  
tain  
dited  
be no  
proce

\* V.  
Soviets

determines the buying power of workers and employees; it is of great significance from the standpoint of the stability of the ruble. That is why the socialist state, while envisioning the regular increase of the wage fund in the national economic plans, cannot acquiesce in any violation of the plans as laid down and cannot permit transcending the limits of the wage fund without a corresponding overfulfillment of the production tasks as prescribed by the plan. The most important measures for the prevention of transcending the limits of the wage fund are: strict keeping of the rules with regard to the productivity of labor and the number of employed workers; strict insistence on the obligatory state discipline in the field of both the setting of technical norms and the wage scales.\*

We, too, must keep this in mind. Evidently, we cannot, in the present stage of our planning and mainly in the present stage of setting our norms, as yet plan the wage fund with the same exactitude as in the Soviet Union. But at least we can see to it that the wage fund should not be easily overdrawn. Certain initial steps have already been taken recently, such as introducing control by the National Bank, within certain limits, of all expenditures credited to the wage fund. There can be no doubt, however, that we must proceed further on this road lest the

unpleasant situation of this Spring be repeated.

#### PROPER SETTING OF NORMS— MAIN TASK

Our fifth task—and this is today our most pressing task in the field of wages requiring at the same time the greatest effort and circumspection: to create order in the setting of norms. Our present norms are inadequate, and everybody who had anything to do with the question knows it. If he didn't know it, it would suffice for him to cast a glance over the factory or industry statistics. We have big factories where the average norm fulfillment of all the workers is 200 per cent and we have branches of industry where average norm fulfillment is 150-160 per cent. These big figures do not testify to vast masses of outstanding shock-workers—outstanding shock-workers we have, but not in such numbers; they are a testimony rather of the prevalent laxity of norms.

"Without technical standards, planned economy is impossible," said Comrade Stalin. Our norms, however, obviously cannot serve as a basis of planning, at least not of any serious planning.

"Technical standards," said Comrade Stalin in the same speech, "are, moreover necessary in order to help the masses who have fallen behind to catch up with the more advanced. Technical standards are a great regulating force which organizes the

\* V. A. Markus: Trud (Labor), *Bolshaya Sovetskaya Entsiklopediya*.

masses of the workers in the factories around the advanced elements of the working class."\* It goes without saying that our norms do not measure up to these requirements. On the contrary. These completely loose norms are not only not apt to organize the broad masses of the workers around the advanced, but they rather drag back even those out front. Our present norms are seriously retarding our progress, and hamper the increase of production and productivity. They are not apt to remind the laggard that he is falling off, rather, they reassure him. They hamper the introduction of new and correct norms even with jobs where up till now there did not exist any norms at all, for earnings in accordance with the correct norms would differ much too greatly from earnings achieved with the incorrect norms.

In capitalist countries the purpose of setting norms is generally to increase the intensity of labor, to increase the degree of exploitation of the worker. "The 'Scientific Method of Sweating'"—under this title forty years ago Lenin dealt with the pseudo-scientific method of Frederic Taylor, with the notorious Taylor system well-known in our country, too. "What is the essence of this 'scientific method'?" wrote Lenin. "It is to squeeze out of the worker three times as much work in the same labor day. They make the strongest and most efficient worker do the

work; they measure the time—in seconds and fractions of seconds—required for every operation, for every move. . . . And the result is that they squeeze three times as much work out of the worker, they ruthlessly exhaust all his strength, they syphon with a threefold rapidity every drop of nervous and muscular strength out of the wage slave. He is going to die that much sooner. Many more are waiting at the gates to be let in."\*

And Lenin quotes chapter and verse from Taylor's book how the capitalist is able to press down the wage for a certain job to less than half.\*\*

Where there is no exploitation, there, naturally, the possibility of the "scientific method of sweating" is excluded. In socialist society everything serves, in the final analysis, the needs of the working people. The burden of the heaviest, dirtiest, most unhealthy work must be taken over

\* Lenin, *Collected Works*, fourth ed., Vol. 18, p. 556. Russian.

\*\* How little the changes that have transpired in the wage question in our national economy are reflected even in learned heads, how much even these typically capitalist thoughts and ideas are still alive, is shown in an excellent way in the textbook on mining, written by university professor Peter Eszto. We quote:

"The wage must be computed on the basis of work opportunity in such a way that the average earnings covering the minimum of existence should correspond to the average work effort in the particular region.

"The conscious will to work depends on the claims and desires the worker strives to satisfy. However, in the case of high earnings the will to work often diminishes in workers with modest desires.

"Extraneous political and trade union motives often lead to a deliberate curtailment of the will to work which results in practices of slowdowns.

"Lately the usage of collective bargaining also gained currency, particularly among highly organized workers."

Eszto's work was published in 1950 in Sopron

\* Stalin, *Selected Writings*, International Publishers, N. Y., 1942, p. 375.

as soon as possible by machines and work must generally be rendered easier, cleaner, more healthful for everybody. However, under these conditions, too, norms are needed, nay, this is where they are needed most, for here they are serving not the purpose of intensified exploitation but of planning and progress.

What kind of norms should we have?

Article 79 of the 1949 collective master agreement of miners and factory workers states: "The basis of the system of payment according to work performed is the work that an employee of good experience and of average skill is able to perform with the required diligence, with the application of correct working methods, without the deterioration of his labor power, keeping himself to the requirements as fixed with regard to quality and economy. It is this performance that we call 100 per cent or normal performance (subsequently called: norm)."

Golden words. The trouble is only that judged by them the norms at present in vogue—are no norms. For it must be said that employees of average skill could achieve, without deterioration of their working power, consistently much more than the norms at present in effect.

Article 82 of the collective master agreement states: "The norms must be set by exact work analysis, time-measurements and time study, taking into account also pay for losses and fatigue. This is what we call exact

norms." Again, the trouble is that we have no such, or scarcely any, exact norms in practice. Generally, our norms are those set last year in January, classifying the average work performance in the 41st to 48th week of the year 1948 as 105 percent. Of course, these norms were inadequate already last year in January. Since then, however, they have become even more out of date, and have been partially loosened. They have not changed even where the conditions of work have changed radically in the meantime through introduction of new machines or new tools—such as for instance toolbits of the latest design—or through perfection of machine parts, the installation of conveyor belts or through improvement of the raw material. Thus today these norms have become already entirely useless for measuring work performance.

#### NORMS IN THE SOVIET UNION

In the Soviet Union so-called empirical-statistical norms were used up till 1935, resembling more or less our norms set last year. The plenum of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (Bolshevik) gave, however, in December 1935 a new direction for setting norms. First of all, the plenum prescribed the setting of technically based norms, *i.e.*, norms based on a close knowledge of the technical and technological development of the fac-

tory as well as of its workers. Furthermore, the plenum also prescribed that the norms should not be set simply according to the average level reached but should deviate from this average upward in the direction of the performance of the most advanced workers, that they should be progressive norms.

As we have seen, in our country, too, the situation is ripe for a general settlement of norms. Withal, we can scarcely go as far as was the case in the Soviet Union in 1935.

We cannot go as far as that, firstly because we have as yet no technically based norms in sufficient numbers. Likewise, the number of those experts who would be sufficiently equipped to fix norms correctly is—at least relatively—very small. Already the collective agreement concluded last year tried to get around setting exact norms by saying that “working out the exact new norms based on time measurements requires a longer period.”

Today the situation is similar. The one and a half years that have elapsed since the conclusion of the collective agreement have not been utilized for working out adequately exact norms, and if we wanted to make up for our omission in order to go over to the application of exact norms everywhere, we could settle matters for quite a while only in particular fields. Therefore, it would be only with a great delay that we could remedy the situation. Considering the obsolete, lax, retarding nature of the present

norms, such a delay would entail greater harm than that which we would shoulder by the more rapid introduction of less perfect norms.

Hence, with the norm settlement we again have to choose a compromise solution and must for the time being—at least in the great majority of cases—introduce empirical-statistical norms. At the same time, however, we must not be oblivious of the fact of having chosen a less satisfactory, compromise solution; we must strive to replace the empirical-statistical norms applied at present with technically based norms as fast as possible.

Nor can we follow as yet the example of the Soviet Union in applying progressive norms. There can be no doubt that it is the progressive norms, *i.e.*, average efforts oriented toward the performance of the top workers, of the Stakhanovites that correspond best to the above mentioned requirements of socialist wage payments. These provide the greatest incentive toward the increase of production and productivity. As Comrade Stalin said: “Stakhanov exceeded the existing standard of output ten times or even more, I believe. To declare this achievement the new technical standard for all pneumatic drill operators would be unwise. Obviously, a standard must be set somewhere between the existing technical standard and that achieved by Comrade Stakhanov.”\* In our country, however, in spite of promising

\* Stalin, *Selected Writings*, p. 376.

beginnings, outstanding results are as yet much too rare, the Stakhanov movement is as yet not sufficiently rooted for being able to change over to the application of such progressive norms. Under our present conditions we can realistically take only the actual average performance of a longer or shorter period as the base of norm settlement.

The introduction of progressive norms in the given situation would be unjustified also because we do not stand as yet on the requisite organizational-technical level. In the Soviet Union factory management has the right and the duty to revise certain out-of-date norms that do not correspond any longer to the technical conditions of production. The trade union committee of the factory must be simultaneously informed about such revision. A general revision of norms can be carried through only on the basis of a decision of the Soviet government. The setting of new, higher norms, however, is in every case preceded by working out those organizational and technical measures that make the fulfillment of the new norms possible for each and every worker. For us, however, it is as yet not in the least possible to secure the carrying out of these necessary organizational and technical measures.

The interests of developing our national economy require imperatively the settlement of norms. As we have seen, the basis of the settlement can only be, at least in the majority

of cases, the actual average performance. This serves as our point of departure.

There is, however, a further important consideration. In view of the fact that our objective is the settlement of norms and not a considerable diminution of earnings, we must in parts or in its entirety give back to the workers that which the settlement of norms might mean to them in the way of reduced earnings. This we can only do by coupling the settlement of norms with an increase of basic wage rates.

With the increase of the basic wage rates we must, however, consider the following. If carried through mechanically, in other words, if the worker gets back via the increase of the basic wage rate exactly as much as would otherwise be taken away from the earnings by the settlement of norms, then, of course, nobody would be the worse off for it. But neither would anything be changed in the present harmful disparity of wages between the different crafts to which our Central Committee took exception. As before, the workers of seven branches of industry would keep on earning more than the miners, the leather or rubber workers earning more than the skilled lathe operator in the metal industry. If we want to change that—and we must—then the raise in basic wages must be higher for the miners than in the garment industry, higher for the metal workers than for the rubber workers.

In other words, we must utilize the settlement of norms also for creating, as far as possible, a scale of wages, as between the different branches of industry, corresponding to their relative importance from the standpoint of the national economy. Likewise, we must try to utilize the settlement of norms for increasing somewhat, within the single branches of industry, the differentials between the wages of the highest and lowest paid workers, changing accordingly the differentials also between the intervening categories.

If we carry through the raise of basic wage rates in this way, then, of course, wages will not remain unchanged. There will be workers earning more, and there will be some earning less than today at unchanged output. For that matter, however, our whole system of wage payments will measure up to a much greater extent to the requirements of a socialist system of wages, it shall be more just than at present, it shall provide a greater incentive for raising productivity, it shall serve the great cause of building socialism more effectively.

One more remark. All our experiences gained up till now, yes, even the experiences of the Soviet Union and of the other People's Democracies teach us that the diminution of earnings brought about by the settlement of norms is merely transitional while the increase of earnings has a constant character and serves as a base for further increases.

With the higher basic wage rates even the relatively small increase of the norm-fulfillment percentages will soon raise wages above the former level and in short order, both the level of wages and the level of production is going to surpass considerably the present level; all of which corresponds entirely to the laws of development of socialist production.

A large-scale measure touching the direct material interests of the broad masses, like a general settlement of norms, is, of course, no simple task. It requires serious efforts in the first place from those organs on whom the direct execution of the measure evolves, that is, from the ministries, from the National Wage Setting Commission and from the managers of our enterprises. The experiences of the past months have shown that in the question of wages as in many other questions our leading economic functionaries have demonstrated a criminal negligence. It is their fault, to a great extent, that the norms have been loosened to such a degree. It is precisely because of this that the last meeting of our Central Committee has laid such emphasis on the importance of personal leadership and individual responsibility. We shall be able to solve the task before us successfully only if the leaders of the organs concerned both in high and low places, if the ministers and department chiefs, the managers of the enterprises and the directors of the shops will work fully conscious of their responsibility. Still, it would be



a grave error to think that even the best and most strenuous work of these organs could by itself guarantee success. Where such great masses are involved only the broadest, most far reaching and most active participation of all concerned can make the successful completion of the job certain. And where the masses of the workers are, there the Party of the working class must be, too, representing and asserting to the best of its ability and with all its power the great interests of the whole working class, of the building of socialism. The broadest mass organizations of the workers, the trade unions involved must also participate in the correct solution of the norm settlement to the best of their knowledge and ability. The best workers, the top workers and Stakhanovites, must be drawn deeply into the preparation and the carrying through of the settlement.

#### RIGHT SOCIAL-DEMOCRATS BEHIND LAXITY AND FRAUD

Let us not deceive ourselves with the idea that we can solve the task of the settlement of norms without any difficulties and struggle. Our People's Democracy attained all its successes by struggle against difficulties and against the enemy. Our cadres have grown and have been tempered in the struggle against difficulties and against the enemy; it is in that struggle that they became sufficiently mature for the solution

of even greater tasks. We had struggles in which we were faced with objective difficulties mainly, where the adversary appeared in the form of such difficulties as blasted bridges, railroads, factories, or drought. We also had struggles that we fought out against all sorts of leaders and mercenaries of reaction, against the foreign or domestic lackeys of the American imperialists, against clerical reaction and against the Right-wing Social-Democrats. Our reactionary, imperialist, clerical, Right-wing Social-Democratic enemies never missed the trick of utilizing our objective difficulties against us.

When recently we became aware of the mass phenomena of norm laxity and wage frauds we discovered the Right-wing Social-Democrats as the main inciters of these abuses. On closer examination it turned out that what we were up against here was not something spontaneous but well-organized enemy activities, that the Right-wing Social-Democrats acted at the behest of foreign imperialists and in alliance with them, and that they were, moreover, allied also with the other servants of the imperialists, *e.g.*, with the Catholic clerics. Nevertheless, the Right-wing Social-Democrats were in the forefront, for they are past masters in wage demagoguery and hence this field of struggle was up their alley. We must be prepared to meet this enemy also in connection with the settlement of norms, though it stands to reason that, more wise because of his recent

experiences, he will be less open and less impudent than in the past months.

However, we must also be prepared to meet an even more dangerous enemy. Wherever we look we can see the capitalist past still stirring, making its influence felt in the thinking of the people. We have broken the power of the gentry, the bankers, the bosses; their wealth squeezed out of the sweat of the people has been taken over by the people. However, we did not as yet break their hold on the thinking of the people. Even in the thinking of a part of the working class the remnants of the capitalist past are still amply represented. Only these remnants can explain why norm loosening and wage frauds could become a mass phenomenon. These remnants were the breeding place in which the wage demagogy of the Right-wing Social-Democrats could take root. After having defeated the material power of the past, we must also annihilate the spiritual power of the past, its influence. The last meeting of our Central Committee bids us to do just that; Comrade Rákosi, in his speech at the founding Congress of the League of

Working Youth calls upon us to cope with this task.

In connection with the settlement of norms we must take up the struggle also against this enemy. The Communists will lead this struggle to victory by making the workers conscious of their changed position in the state and in production, by teaching, convincing, by the force of their own example. We know that the settlement of norms serves the building of socialism in our homeland and thereby increases the power of the mighty peace camp led by the Soviet Union. This consciousness gives us particular strength today when blood is flowing in yet another country, in a new war provoked by the American imperialists, when the American robbers, pursuing their aggressive ends against the people did not shrink from armed aggression against a small country of People's Democracy. Today it is obvious to every decent man that there is no more important task than that of strengthening the power of the peace camp, that power which defies the threats and attacks of the imperialist aggressors, and which will save mankind.

us to  
tlement  
e strug-  
y. The  
struggle  
workers  
position  
tion, by  
force of  
ow that  
rves the  
r home-  
e power  
d by the  
iousness  
h today  
another  
oked by  
hen the  
g their  
e people  
aggres-  
of Peo-  
obvious  
ere is no  
that of  
of the  
ch defies  
the im-  
ich will

**OUT THIS MONTH!**

# **IRON CITY**

by **LLOYD L. BROWN**

THIS EAGERLY AWAITED NOVEL  
IS BEING PUBLISHED JUNE 15

•  
POPULAR EDITION, \$1.50; CLOTH, \$3.00

•  
Get your copy from your local book store,  
literature center, or organization; or by mail from:

**NEW CENTURY PUBLISHERS**

832 Broadway • New York City 3

LIPDAR  
JUN 21 1951

*A vital contribution!*

# AMERICAN IMPERIALISM

By VICTOR PERLO

In this brilliant extension and application of the main thesis put forward in Lenin's classic, *Imperialism—the Highest Stage of Capitalism*, Victor Perlo has made a contribution of lasting importance to the study of American political economy.

With impressive documentation, buttressing each proposition with facts and figures from government, United Nations, and similar sources, *American Imperialism* traces the worldwide expansion of United States corporate interests, the unlimited objectives of this expansion, and the use of the U.S. government to make possible this growth of Wall Street's empire in such fields as oil, metals, food, and in industry and trade generally.

This new International book analyzes concretely the present division of the world's economic resources among the great Wall Street trusts, and builds up irrefutable evidence of the systematic U.S. penetration of Asia, Africa, Latin America, and western Europe. It describes the vast profits obtained from intervention abroad and from the special exploitation of the colonial peoples, including the Negro people in the South. It is against this frame of reference that the author discusses the Marshall Plan and Point Four.

In sum, this is a magnificent study of U.S. imperialism's grand strategy of political, economic, and military domination of the world, and its consequences on the standard of living, the peace and freedom of the people of the United States.

Price \$2.25

**NEW CENTURY PUBLISHERS**

832 Broadway • New York City 3

BAR

21 195

# SM

sis put  
*italism*,  
e study

n with  
ources,  
States  
nd the  
f Wall  
ry and

lvision  
trusts,  
tion of  
he vast  
xploita-  
South.  
es the

grand  
world,  
freedom

\$2.25