

govt

Political Affairs

DECEMBER 1951 • 25 CENTS

PETER H. RAVEN
WALTER DUBOIS
JAMES EARL RAY
FREDERICK
HARRY YOUNG

- [1] Negro Representation—A Step Towards Negro Freedom
- [16] Stalin on the War Danger and the Possibility of Averting It
- [33] On Independent Political Action
- [42] "We Charge Genocide!"
- [53] 1952 and Labor's Political Course
- [63] Index 1951

New International Titles

For Peaceful Coexistence

By **JOSEPH STALIN**

Interviews and statements propounding the view that the peaceful coexistence of the socialist Soviet Union and the capitalist United States of America is not only possible but necessary in the interests of both nations and the peace of the world. \$20

The Right of Nations To Self-Determination

By **V. I. LENIN**

This long-awaited volume of Lenin's basic theoretical essays on the national question includes his views on national oppression, colonialism, social chauvinism, and opportunism on the national question. It points up the tasks of the working class within both the oppressed and oppressing nations in the struggle for self-determination.

Paper \$0.90; cloth \$1.50

The National Question and Leninism

By **JOSEPH STALIN**

Recently translated into English, this important work of Marxist theory was written in 1929, in answer to a number of letters raising specific points with reference to the national question. It discusses the concept of "nation," the rise and development of nations, the future of nations and the correct Marxist-Leninist policy on the national question. \$20

Order from your bookshop or:

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.

at the
and the
le but
ace of
\$1.20

essays
al op-
unism
work-
ations
\$1.50

ork of
umber
ational
se and
correct
\$1.20

York, N. Y.
New Center
payments on
months; foreign



Vol.



By

THE
State
and
in
ren
the
in
and
Ha
ties
cle
mo
hal
ag
Th
tha
the
the

St
ci
pl
to
ju

A Theoretical and Political Magazine of Scientific Socialism

Editor: V. J. Jerome

Negro Representation—A Step Towards Negro Freedom

By Pettis Perry

THE END OF 1951 finds the United States closer to the brink of fascism and war than at any previous time in its history. This is seen in the current huge armaments program, in the application of the Smith Act, in the passage of the McCarran Act, and in the increased use of the Taft-Hartley Act (the Act that both parties pledged to repeal in their 1948 election promises). It is seen even more graphically in the year and a half of genocidal warfare conducted against the colored peoples of Asia. The war in Korea explodes the myth that U.S. imperialism desires peace; the myth that the United States is the world leader of democracy.

The pro-fascist drive of United States imperialism is seen in its genocidal warfare against the Negro people documented at length in the historic volume, *We Charge Genocide*, just published by the Civil Rights

Congress. Here we need but recall a few of the most recent atrocities: the murder of Robert Mallard for attempting to exercise his right to vote in the state of Georgia; the police murder of Henry Fields and John Derrick in the City of New York; the outrage in Cicero against Mr. and Mrs. Clark simply because they attempted to cross the boundaries of the ghetto; the murder of Willie McGee and of Edward Honeycutt, and the mass killing of the Martinsville Seven, while all law enforcement officers and all executive branches of the Federal government were discreetly silent, despite the appeals from the whole world to the President of the United States to halt this barbarism. And what of the brutal killing of Samuel Shepard in Florida and the serious wounding of Walter Lee Irwin, his companion, while they were being transferred,

in handcuffs, to another jail—a cold-blooded murder perpetrated by Dixiecrat Sheriff McCall at the moment that President Truman was leisurely basking in the sunshine of the Florida beaches! Truman had not one word to say about this. Oh, no. He was too busy mapping further military adventures to bring about world domination by U.S. imperialism.

How is all this to be explained? It is to be explained by the simple fact that the bourgeoisie, in its drive to fascism and war, must at all costs attempt to smash the growing Negro liberation movement. It must at all costs maintain the separation between the Negro masses and the white workers, it must keep alive and spread the poison of white chauvinism.

The working class cannot function as a democratic force in this country, it cannot move to improve its own well-being, without the most forthright struggle against these heinous crimes. The war economy is eating away the living standards of the broad masses. Fascism and war would mean unrestrained violence against, and intensified exploitation of the workers and the Negro people. Fascism and war would mean further enslavement and impoverishment of the poor farmers who are already being robbed by the war economy. Fascism and war would spell the total destruction of the democratic rights of all. There are alarming and dangerous signs of advancing fascism which urgently demand unity of action on the part of the masses—Ne-

gro and white—against every encroachment of fascism and every further move of the war-makers.

The promotion of Negro-white unity is a major and key task in the general nation-wide fight to defeat the fascists and the war-mongers. This vitally needed unity is a *concrete* issue, in terms of the existing relation of forces and the existing favorable factors for its realization.

The signal post-war advance of the Negro people, whose fight is outstanding in scope and militancy in the entire camp of struggle for peace and democracy in the United States, has placed on the order of the day the major political issue of Negro representation in all areas of political and social life, including the leadership of the mass organizations of the working class, general people's organizations, the peace movement, youth and women's organizations, cultural organizations, etc. The test of the sincerity to fight for Negro rights and against chauvinist restrictions of any kind lies in the readiness of white workers and progressives to take up the fight for the long-retarded right of Negro men and women to take their place on a basis of full equality in positions of leadership. This paramount issue requires to be unfolded in a complete and vital discussion for clarification within the entire labor and progressive movement. It is my purpose in this article to deal solely with a major area of this question, namely, the right of Negroes to representation in the executive, legislative and ju-

dicial
municipal
being
ple in
especi

LESS

To
of the
people
nation
to loc
quarte
stage
within
the U

It w
sion re
tion p
tion b
bons
financ
in the
that h
geois
Recon

The
fess to
ruption
ernme
poor v
ments
derers
facts a
tion g
honest
govern
coloss
Admi
the B
City.

judicial bodies on federal, state and municipal levels. This issue is today being pressed for by the Negro people in all sections of the country, especially in the South.

LESSONS FROM HISTORY

To get a proper historical picture of the basic problems of the Negro people and the fundamental base of national oppression, it is vital for us to look back over the past three-quarters of a century, which set the stage for the enchaining of a people within the geographical confines of the United States.

It would be helpful to our discussion to refer back to the Reconstruction period, particularly its destruction by a coalition of Southern Bourbons and Northern industrial and financial interests. There is no period in the history of the United States that has been more distorted by bourgeois historians than the period of Reconstruction.

These reactionary historians profess to express horror at alleged "corruption" of the Reconstruction governments and slander the Negro and poor white members of these governments as "incompetents" and "squanderers." But what are the facts? The facts are that the Radical Reconstruction governments were examples of honesty in the entire range of the governments of their era—the era of colossal graft, as typified by the Grant Administration in Washington and the Boss Tweed Ring in New York City. The facts are that the planters'

governments of pre-Civil War vintage had been notoriously corrupt from the days of the Yazoo Land scandals in early Georgia to the Mississippi bank repudiation scandals of the 1850's.

And when these racist historians point to rising state indebtedness during Reconstruction as proof of alleged colossal "squandering," they "forget" to tell their readers that the real reason for the increase in indebtedness was the fact that the Reconstruction governments were faced with the task of rebuilding a devastated South, of establishing a universal school system, of introducing a vast social-welfare program, and that all this had to be done in the face of hostility from the rich planters, many of whom refused to pay taxes to these Radical governments.

A further demagogic contention which these racist historians raise against Reconstruction is that the achievement of democratic rights "swamped" the white population and reduced them to nought. In the first place, it is clear from the whole pattern of this reasoning that this argument is but one of many designs to disrupt the movement for Negro-white unity and to perpetuate a cleavage where the fullest unity is the guarantee for the common advance on the road of democratic victories. Secondly, as to the facts. What history reveals is that in the Radical Reconstruction legislatures the number of Negro and white representatives reflected fairly accurately the actual population mak-

up, in which, usually, Negroes did not constitute a majority. What these reactionary historians hide is the essential truth that for the first time in the history of our country, a degree of democratic advance was attained through the Reconstruction program which benefitted the Negro and white population, and that this was made possible by the very fact that the Negro slave of yesterday entered the stage of history as a free man with democratic guarantees. Concretely, this meant that the Negro people, emancipated by a social revolution, became a leading and decisive force in the Reconstruction governments of the South. The welfare promoted by those governments was a general one in the interests of the entire population, Negro and white, on economic, social and political levels. This encompassed the establishment of universal, free education, the development of industry, communications and transportation, the building of a great social welfare system of hospitals, homes for the aged and the orphaned, and asylums for the mentally ill. These governments wiped out anti-Semitic laws. They sought to fulfill the land hunger of the dispossessed tillers of the soil by the confiscation and equitable division of the Bourbons' plantations. Their legislation moved boldly and swiftly to eradicate the whole cancer of anti-Negro policy and Jim Crow practices—a decisive, historic step, charged with profound democratic meaning for the entire country, which was ham-

pered and subsequently defeated by the counter-revolutionary terror launched by the combination of Bourbons and Northern industrialists.

It is clear that from Johnson to Grant the plans were very well laid for a complete betrayal of the Reconstruction governments, thus leaving the Negro people to the tender mercies of the plantation owners, the Southern prop of developing monopoly capitalism. The doom of Reconstruction was culminated in the seli-out by the Republican Presidential candidate, Rutherford B. Hayes, in 1877.

Hayes was given the election, in return for which he agreed to withdraw the last Federal troops from South Carolina, thus sealing the undisturbed sway in the South of the Bourbons. This marks the beginning of the alliance between the Southern Bourbons and the Northern Republicans.

I have not been able to find any period since 1877 where there has been any break in the alliance between the Southern Bourbons and the Northern Republicans. It should be said in addition, that the Southern Democrats always did exercise tremendous influence over the national setup of the Democratic Party, with the exception of a brief period during the presidency of Franklin D. Roosevelt. Today this influence is at a peak.

So this so-called "new discovery" of such an alliance turns out to be nothing new. The only new thing in

the F
nation
"Dixie
the pla
were
the pl
of a c
Trum
ally e
The
meant
ple's
the la
with
insidi
ideolo
chapte
task o
day a
high
build
strugg
protoc
constr

NEGRO
AND
"DE

The
of the
of Ne
elected
them
grab
standi
numb
gress,
which
show.

Jam
litical

the picture—aside from the international situation — is the name "Dixiecrat." But the social forces, the plantation owners and the K.K.K., were and are the same. And all of the pleading about the impossibility of a civil rights program which the Truman Administration demagogically engages in is sheer hogwash.

The defeat of Reconstruction meant a colossal setback to the people's democratic forces throughout the land, the evil effects of which are with us to this day. As against the insidious attempts of reaction and its ideologists to besmirch that glorious chapter in American history, it is the task of all democratic Americans, today as never before, to reclaim that high democratic heritage and to build upon it in the present vital struggles to defeat the fascist-minded prototypes of the destroyers of Reconstruction.

NEGRO DISFRANCHISEMENT AND AMERICAN "DEMOCRACY"

The Southern Bourbons, because of their disfranchisement of millions of Negro and white voters, are re-elected year after year. This gives them top seniority and thus they grab the chairmanships of most standing committees and of a whole number of sub-committees in Congress, and it is those committees which really run the congressional show.

James Jackson, in an article in *Political Affairs* for August, 1950, de-

scribed the situation in the following manner: "From thirteen Southern states, with a combined total voting electorate of just a million more than New York State alone, the South has 122 Congressmen and 26 Senators in the United States Congress. What is more, these plantation Democrats are chairmen of eleven of the nineteen standing House Committees and eight of the fifteen standing Senate Committees."

The question of Negro representation, must be approached from the standpoint of its importance for the country as a whole—namely, as a major step to extend democracy in the United States. As long as the South remains as it is in its political setup and economic construction, it will ever remain as a cesspool of reaction which is allied with dominant Wall Street finance capital. The Dixiecrats in that area are but the spokesmen of Wall Street.

Hence, the fight for Negro representation, elective and appointive, looms as a great anti-fascist struggle in the United States. It is a sad commentary that throughout the history of this country, there has been only one Negro elected to a high judicial post—J. J. Wright, elected during Reconstruction to the State Supreme Court of South Carolina. No administration of any state in the United States has ever appointed a Negro to such office. Not since the Reconstruction period has there been a single Negro elected to the Senate of the United States, nor has there been a Negro elected to Congress from any

Southern state since George H. White, of North Carolina, left Congress fifty years ago. Yet, the South is the area where over 10,000,000 Negroes live. It is the area of the greatest poverty for both Negro and white of any part of the United States. From here comes that gang of reactionaries who year after year are among the most aggressive fighters for all types of anti-labor legislation. And with them now are allied, not only the Republicans of the North, but the Truman Democrats as well. It is from these areas that the greatest amount of terror and violation of civil rights of the Negro people comes.

It is in the Black Belt area of the South that the Negro nation remains in chains—which nation suffers many of the abuses that are common to colonial and semi-colonial areas. As long as this shameful condition exists, how can the United States be coupled with the term *Democracy*?

To overcome this, the labor movement all over the country, but especially in the North, must play a key role in the whole fight to break down discrimination. Only on the basis of such a fight, in which the labor movement boldly champions the cause of Negro rights among the most backward elements of whites can a true alliance of the Negro people and labor be formed. Without such an alliance, the labor movement will not succeed in attaining many of its major objectives.

This is the framework in which we must see the Negro question to-

day. It is this framework that we must use as a gauge to the much talked of tremendous "progress" that the Negro people are making today.

ON THE NEGRO PEOPLE'S PROGRESS

Far be it from me to deny that the Negro people are making progress. But the history of the Negro people did not begin in 1900 or in 1865. The Negro people's history in this country began over three hundred years ago. And one would have to study seriously the history of slavery and above all the history of the Civil War and Reconstruction. I would strongly urge that such a study take place. I especially would like to urge all readers seriously to examine such important works as *Black Reconstruction* by W. E. B. Du Bois, James S. Allen's *Reconstruction: The Battle For Democracy*, Carter G. Woodson's, *Negro Orators and Their Orations*, and, above all, I would especially urge a serious study of the *Documentary History of the Negro People in the United States* by Herbert Aptheker, as a key to a further and fuller understanding of the whole Negro question and the significance of the fight for Negro representation.

Speaking of the progress that the Negroes have made, it should be stated first of all that since the great battles of Reconstruction and the post-Reconstruction period ending roughly in 1900, the Negro masses sustained very serious setbacks from

which
It was
every
groes
It wa
sippi,
the C
from
Cong
the l
elimi
W
progr
that
sneer
Roos
midd
be dr
positi
ects
and
ward
and
are su
away
the p
to tal
that t
awak
and H
masse
and v
body
Du
the a
coalit
Negro
The
playe
ing to
is thi
began

which they have not yet recovered. It was during this period that, in every legislature of the South, Negroes played a very important role. It was during this period that Mississippi, Alabama, Louisiana, Virginia, the Carolinas, Georgia, and Florida, from time to time, had Negroes in Congress. This ground was lost when the last Negro from the South was eliminated from Congress in 1901.

What happened insofar as the progress of the Negroes is concerned that is so lauded today by some and sneered at by others? During the Roosevelt regime, especially from the middle '30's, when Negroes began to be drawn into various administrative positions, especially on W.P.A. projects and various other relief setups, and certain gestures were made toward eliminating some of the misery and oppression that the Negro people are subjected to, a considerable break-away from the Republican Party on the part of the Negro people began to take place. It was not until then that the Republican Party was really awakened from its idiotic slumber and began to realize that the Negro masses were an independent force and were neither in his nor in anybody else's pocket.

During this period, especially after the advent of the C.I.O., a broad coalition of Roosevelt Democrats, the Negro people and labor was formed. The Left forces, including our Party, played a very important role in helping to bring about that coalition. It is this whole new development that began more and more, and still con-

tinues, to cause the Big Business politicians to note the tremendous upsurge on the part of the Negro masses. This independent upsurge of the Negro forces is frightening United States imperialism. The imperialists are forced, because of this upsurge and militance, to make certain concessions in the form of appointments of Negroes to sundry political posts. But the bourgeoisie hopes thereby to transform these partial victories on the part of the Negro people and their allies into obstacles of the Negro liberation movement.

SMASH JIM CROW IN POLITICAL LIFE!

There is much confusion in the minds of some people—Communists and non-Communists—on the question of Negro representation. Some ask: Suppose a Negro were appointed, let us say, to a judicial office. Aside from attaining a high-paying job for a Negro, would this amount to anything insofar as the Negro people are concerned? Others ask: Would not a fight for Negro representation divert from the main fight—namely, the fight for jobs for Negroes? Finally, it is asked: When we put this forward, aren't we saying that we approve of the role of Dawson, and the role of Edith Sampson?

This latter argument is simply worthless, because it sees individuals and not the Negro liberation movement. It sees individuals and not the

alliance of the Negro liberation movement with the organized labor movement in collaboration with all white progressive forces as a determining factor in pushing forward to a greater height the whole course of Negro liberation. This argument also is based upon a complete lack of confidence in the Negro masses to get rid of their own misleaders.

The question that must be posed is: What is the basis of all these arguments? The basis is a deep lack—if not a complete lack—of understanding of the national question and the approach that the Left and progressive forces—especially Marxists—should have to that movement.

Take the argument that this fight for Negro representation would divert from the fight for jobs. Is it not clear that a basic understanding and an all-out fight on the part of the labor movement to obtain the 100,000 jobs projected by the National Negro Labor Council Convention held in Cincinnati would make more clear to the labor movement the need to fight for complete equality for the Negro people? We Communists stand without reservation for economic, political and social equality for the Negro people and the right of self-determination for the Negro nation in the Black Belt. The first three slogans summarize in basic outline all of the aims and aspirations of the Negro national minority in the North; while all four slogans are the basic aims and aspirations of the Negro nation in the Black Belt. For Communists, therefore, to raise

such arguments as given above, displays the utmost confusion. These comrades fail to see in a Leninist manner that every act of national oppression calls forth resistance on the part of the oppressed. They fail to understand that this resistance is seen graphically in the resistance that Negroes are putting up all over the country and all along the line against oppression—but especially against political oppression; so much so, that election after election witnesses a great upsurge of Negroes aspiring to office.

The fact is that during the last elections, five Negroes were successful in their bid for office in Southern states. They were: Dr. W. P. Devane, physician, Fayetteville, N. C.; Dr. William M. Hampton, physician, Greensboro, N. C.; the Rev. William R. Crawford, Winston-Salem, N. C.; Robert E. Lillard, attorney, Nashville, Tenn., and Z. A. Looby, also a Nashville lawyer—all for City Council or Board of Aldermen. And for the first time in over half a century, Negroes will enter the Louisiana primaries in the Gubernatorial elections.

Take the argument that this fight for representation on the part of the Negro people will only involve the Negro middle class. Here the question must be asked: What is the fundamental thing for Marxists? Is it to boycott those movements that are not led by the workers and support only those that are? No, this is not Marxist. Marxists base their approach to the national movement on

one
tha
mov
impe
peria
Of
for t
over
this
the r
tion
the l
petty
respo
give
same
give
Sta

For
Egyp
tellect
ence
tional
origin
of th
despit
to Se
Britis
to pe
tion i
ary
origin
memb
the fa

Th
clearl
alway
And
one
Are t

* J.
(Intern

one fundamental consideration, and that is: objectively, where is the movement going? Is it going against imperialism or in support of imperialism?

Of course, it is necessary to strive for the leadership of the proletariat over national movements. But when this has not yet been achieved and the revolutionary or national liberation movement is proceeding under the leadership of the bourgeoisie and petty-bourgeoisie, it is the duty and responsibility of Marxists always to give all-out support, while at the same time striving to influence and give leadership to that movement.

Stalin writes:

For the same reason the struggle the Egyptian merchants and bourgeois intellectuals are waging for the independence of Egypt is objectively a *revolutionary* struggle, despite the bourgeois origin and bourgeois title of the leaders of the Egyptian national movement, despite the fact that they are opposed to Socialism; whereas the fight the British Labor Government is waging to perpetuate Egypt's dependent position is for the same reasons a *reactionary* struggle, despite the proletarian origin and the proletarian title of the members of that government, despite the fact that they are "for" Socialism.*

This, of course, puts the question clearly as to how Marxists should always view national movements. And in posing this question, everyone should ponder the following: Are the national liberation potenti-

alities of the Negro bourgeoisie and petty-bourgeoisie exhausted? If not, should the revolutionary movement, the Marxists in the first place, recognize these potentialities in the fight for full liberation of the entire Negro people? Will the fight for national liberation, which is an all-class fight insofar as the Negroes are concerned, serve the cause and interests of the Negro workers and peasants? If so, are we justified in finding a way to make this potentiality a reality?

No one can answer these questions in the negative. Consequently, when we have confusion on this point we have a whole gamut of ideological misconceptions. We have here chauvinism, nationalism, opportunism and "Left" sectarianism.

Can anyone in his right mind imagine that it is possible to carry through in a real sense the fight for Negro representation without at the same time seeking to involve sections of the Negro middle class and the Negro bourgeoisie—and as large a section of it as possible? Can any perspective of encouraging and supporting Negroes for office base itself on only supporting Negro workers and Negro peasants? This does not mean that the progressive movement should not encourage Negro trade unionists to run for a whole number of offices.

An approach to this question must be based on the broadest possible coalition in every Negro community. Ways and means should be found for the whole progressive movement—Negro and white, but especially

* J. Stalin, *Marxism and the National Question* (International, 1942), p. 187.

our Negro cadre—to help the rest of the Negro community seek out the candidates that can achieve the broadest amount of unity in the Negro community. And in cases where such candidates are put forward by the Negro community without our participation, we should examine the possibilities of mustering the broadest support. In other words, we must try to find the minimum program upon which such candidate will run, as well as assess the standing and strength of the given candidate in the Negro community. We must not in any way insist in every case that such candidates carry the entire program of the Left.

It would be incorrect to limit support of Negro candidates to Progressive Party or A.L.P. tickets, or to Communist Party tickets. Of course, these Parties have the right and the obligation under certain conditions, to put forward their own Negro forces. But a broad approach to this would mean in a number of cases that Negroes who are registered Republicans or Democrats might be considered as candidates meriting the support of the Left and progressive movements. The fundamental thing is to smash Jim Crow in the political life of our country.

THE NEGRO PEOPLE RESIST IMPERIALISM

While the bourgeoisie unleashes its racist, terroristic attacks, the Negro people are by no means taking these attacks lying down. They are ad-

ressing themselves in the most forthright manner to all of the ills concerning themselves. The Negroes are fashioning new weapons in their fight for full citizenship. They are more and more allying themselves with the great peace and democratic movements in the country, as witness the Chicago Peace Conference held in July of this year.

The central problem confronting the Negro people today is still first and foremost the fight for jobs and job equality. It is in this light that we have to view one of the new weapons of struggle that the Negroes have fashioned in the last year. I refer to the formation of the National Negro Labor Council that took place in Cincinnati at the end of October. This convention not only outlined a perspective of 100,000 jobs by May 15th (which should encourage and inspire the entire labor movement of this country to throw its full support to this campaign) but also elaborated quite a comprehensive program of day-to-day struggle for jobs in shops, in communities, around stores, and above all, around utilities—such as telephone, telegraph, etc.

The campaign around this question would help in a great measure in unifying the Negro middle class along with the Negro workers, with the Negro workers playing a key role in leading such struggle. It would help more firmly to unify the whole Negro community around all progressive forces in the labor movement as a whole. This program also encompasses a special fight for hiring

Negro women as a particular demand; moving the trade unions to fight specifically and concretely for jobs for Negro women in industry and not just for Negroes in general. We can see the importance of this when we consider that Negro women were the last to enter industry at the end of the Second World War and were the first fired; when we consider also that industry has practically eliminated Negro women production workers and that re-hiring at the present time is non-existent.

This program projects a special campaign for the employment of Negro youth. Negro young men and women leaving high school and college are faced constantly with the fact that the only livelihood open to them involves the bootblack stand, the mop, the broom, porter jobs or domestic and personal service work.

For the Negro people of the South, this struggle has a special significance because, as was reported at the convention, Negro women in a number of Southern states are very often denied their unemployment insurance when they are offered jobs as domestic workers at as little as \$2.00 a week. And this, by the way, is the same wage Negro women domestic workers received fifty and sixty years ago in the South! And when unemployment compensation is paid in Southern states, it is very often as little as \$8 and \$10 a week.

This convention evolved a model contract clause and suggested to unions that this clause be inserted in all contracts, and that special steps be

taken to guarantee that employers live up to such contracts. Further, the program envisages the fight for F.E.P.C. on all government levels—city, state and Federal. To this should be added the following for which progressive forces are duty-bound to fight:

1. City, county, state and Federal governments to deny any loan or contract to any company that refuses to hire on the basis of color, religion or national origin.

2. No public money whatsoever to be granted to any company that refuses to upgrade on the basis of such discrimination.

This program calls for taking steps to involve Jewish organizations, Catholic organizations, Protestant organizations, etc. It is essential also that every effort should be made to involve Puerto Rican and Mexican-American communities in such a fight. These two groups would very often find special reasons for joining in such a fight, since they too are the victims of job discrimination.

This National Negro Labor Council convention also raised sharply the need to intensify the fight against police brutality, lynch terror and for the passage of anti-poll tax and anti-lynching laws. This Council is the newest and most potent weapon that the Negro people have to date fashioned in their struggle against reaction. This is a weapon that can insure the unification of Negro labor, irrespective of craft or industry, which would enable it to muster its full force in the fight for full free-

dom. It gives Negro labor greater possibilities to stimulate and unify the white workers in the shops and in the labor movement. It gives it an opportunity to play an influential role in the whole Negro liberation movement, and without such leadership the Negro liberation movement cannot remain consistent and vital.

Another weapon forged in the past period is the Sojourner Truth movement, a movement of Negro women aimed at creating the base for greater unity of Negro women—both from the organized and unorganized sectors of the Negro women. This movement attracted nationwide—indeed, worldwide—attention in its pilgrimage to Washington demanding a halt to the terroristic tactics used by the bourgeoisie against the Negro people. This movement made it known that the Negro women are sick and tired of having their sons, husbands and brothers brutalized by United States imperialism. It made known that they are sick and tired of their husbands, sons and brothers being sent into a Jim Crow army. This movement is already beginning to exert considerable influence among large sections of the Negro people.

In both cases, that is in the case of this Negro women's movement and the case of the National Negro Labor Council, many white progressives seem confused and express great fear of the growth of nationalism among Negroes. What the white progressives fail to see is that these movements, if supported by white

masses, can become quite a factor in building a new kind of unity between Negro and white. This is especially so if the Negro masses can now begin to see more and more white workers and progressives boldly fighting against all aspects of white supremacy. This would help in rallying the entire Negro people on the side of progress, despite all of the Channing Tobiases, the Roy Wilkinsons, and Lester Grangers that United States imperialism may purchase. The white progressives should realize that the only way full confidence on the part of the Negro masses can be won is to forge this confidence on the basis of a readiness on the part of white progressives to smash Jim Crow in all its forms.

The Negro youth, North and South, are beginning to react vigorously to the task of smashing Jim Crow in the educational setup of the country. The Negro youth are showing determination as never before to smash Jim Crow in employment, recreation and the armed forces. These are some of the new weapons that the Negro people are forging, while resisting the terroristic attacks of U.S. imperialism. The progressive forces can render no greater service to the Negro liberation movement than to give these weapons every possible encouragement and support.

Very recently, the progressive forces have shown that victories can be won, despite reactionary attempts. Note the significant victory in winning freedom for four of the Trenton Six. The job ahead in this respect is

to guarantee the victory of the remaining two. The Civil Rights Congress merits the applause and support of all progressives. It made this case a world wide issue, without which no victory in the courtroom would have been possible. The C.R.C. has generally, over the past period, played an outstanding role in the fight for civil and democratic rights for the Negro people. Its book *We Charge Genocide* now before the United Nations should get the widest circulation among the broad masses of the people of this country, and it merits the greatest amount of support to insure that this is taken up at the United Nations now in session. The progressive forces have shown that victories can be won by the fact that the lawyers who defended the Communist Eleven have won a rehearing from the Supreme Court. It was shown in the successful fight to secure bail for the California Fifteen, despite the attitude of the U.S. Department of Justice. It was further shown by the fact that the indictment in these cases was thrown out of court by the judge as "defective," even though the judge gave the prosecution ten days to "cure" the "defect."

The smashing victory in the Du Bois case attests to the growing alertness on the part of the democratic forces of this country to the need to throw back the encroachment of fascism. It shows further that where unity is achieved, such victories are possible.

There can be no rounded approach

to Negro representation without the most serious effort on the part of the progressive forces all over the country to smash all restrictions against voting. That means the passage of an anti-poll tax bill, the enforcement of the 14th Amendment, the fight to outlaw the Klan, the fight to demand the death penalty for lynchers.

THE TASKS BEFORE US

The year 1952 is a presidential election year. Moreover, 1952—unlike 1948—is the first election since the 1950 census. There are a number of new Congressmen and state representatives to be elected in 1952. A key question is the fight for reapportionment on the basis of giving an adequate opportunity for Negroes to be elected in all areas where reapportionment has not been consummated. And where it has been settled, the most intense type of activities among the whites should be put forward as a means of guaranteeing the broadest support from the labor and progressive movements to such efforts on the part of Negroes for representation.

In 1952, between now and the national conventions of the two major parties, a demand should go up from all over the country that those parties keep their 1948 promises by passing some aspects of the much talked of civil rights program. We must especially demand an anti-poll tax law, a real F.E.P.C. law, an anti-lynching bill, and a bill outlawing Jim Crow in the armed forces. The progressive

forces should reject all demagogic contentions that the Dixiecrats keep Congress from passing this kind of legislation. The question must be asked: Has Truman more influence over Italy, India, and other countries than he has over the Dixiecrats of the South? There is no hesitation on the part of the Truman Administration in laying down the law to other countries who flinch in following the dictates of U.S. imperialism. Therefore, it is necessary to demand that Truman say in plain language to these Dixiecrat Senators and Representatives and to all obstructionists to civil rights laws that they either fall in line or all patronage will be taken from them. And, of course, Truman could set up an effective F.E.P.C. without Congress. He can issue an Executive Order outlawing discrimination in employment, because most industries today are running on Federal money. As Commander-in-Chief, he can issue an Executive Order outlawing Jim Crow in the armed forces. It is sheer demagoguery on the part of the Truman Administration to plead helplessness in the face of this situation.

On January 26, 1938, Senator Richard B. Russell of Georgia, in filibustering against the anti-lynching bill, said the following: "Every Senator on the floor of this body knows that if a measure of this kind were passed, there would be one or more states in the United States where there would be Negro governors and there would be Negro senators. There are many states where

two or three or four or five members of the House of Representatives would be Negroes, and no white man would have a chance to be elected. This means that there would be county after county where every officer and every official would be of the Negro race."

Russell, it should be remembered, is Chairman of the Armed Services Committee. He heads the very committee which is supposed to be waging a war for democracy against the Korean people. He is the head of that committee which guides much of our foreign policy.

And his companion, Senator Walter George, is Chairman of the Finance Committee and a member of the Foreign Relations Committee. And what are we told by these Dixiecrats, who are members of Truman's party? We are told that the Ku Klux Klan must be unrestricted to lynch and burn the Negro people, because otherwise they might replace Russell or George in the Senate. Yet, these Dixiecrats admit that the Negroes in certain areas constitute such an overwhelming majority that a whole number of Congressmen would come from them, and that in other areas, every officer and official would be "members of the Negro race."

The question is: What is wrong with that? Democracy, among other things, means majority rule. And what kind of democracy is it that must constantly exclude the majority from office, even to the point of lynching for attempting to exercise their rights to vote? From this, it

should be clear why Macio Snipes, Isaiah Nixon and Robert Mallard were brutally murdered in the home state of these Dixiecrat Senators.

All of this should make crystal clear that the working class as a whole in the United States has a big responsibility in helping to break up the reactionary stronghold that these Bourbons exercise over the Southern part of the United States, while simultaneously influencing the life of our entire country. The C.I.O. perpetrated the greatest mass betrayal upon the Negro people since the Civil War and Reconstruction when it so disgracefully betrayed the Southern organizing drive in 1947. Today there are an estimated 200,000 Negro and white lumber workers in the South unorganized. There are thousands of tobacco workers, thousands of transport workers, and tens of thousands of agricultural workers and sharecroppers who, if organized on a militant non-segregated basis, would be a powerful factor in helping to eliminate the Wall Street-Bourbon-Dixiecrat rule over the Southern part of the United States. Such a step would give powerful impetus to the labor and progressive movements all over the country.

This fight should be tied up with a mass fight for jobs and employment of the Negro people. It should be tied to all-out support to such instruments as the National Negro Labor Council. It should be tied to helping to spread the new publica-

tion, *Freedom*, among literally thousands of Negro and white workers, and the Civil Rights Congress' book, *We Charge Genocide*. All of this should in turn be tied up with a fight in every Northern state for Negro representation in the entire political life of the state.

This is a perspective that would help make firm and lasting the unity between the Negro masses and the labor movement. It would give a tremendous impetus to an alliance between the farmers—North and South, and particularly of the South—and the labor and progressive movement. This step would affect favorably the whole democratic development in this country and would help turn the country from the path of war to the path of peace. It would contribute to that type of coalition which could rid the country of all pro-fascist legislation like the Smith Act, the Taft-Hartley Act, the McCarran Act. Such a step would go a long way in helping to strengthen the cause of a democratic-peace coalition for the elections of 1952.

This is the task set before the labor and progressive movements for the year 1952. A great responsibility rests upon us. We Communists will do everything in our power to bring about a realization of this, because only by fighting for the greatest amount of democracy can the proletariat and its allies march inevitably to Socialism.

Stalin on the War Danger and the Possibility of Averting It

By I. A. Seleznev

[We publish the following article on the occasion of the 72nd birthday of J. V. Stalin, who, as the greatest living master of the theory and practice of Marxism-Leninism, is the foremost scientist, advocate, and champion of the principles and the path for peace among nations, and for achieving peaceful coexistence among states of heterogeneous social structures—Ed.]

THE HYSTERIA FANNED by the American imperialist war incendiaries, the A-bomb psychosis, and the open, adventurist military actions against freedom-loving peoples in Asia and elsewhere cause apprehension among the common people everywhere for the fate of the world. Will the handful of billionaires once again succeed in plunging mankind into a whirlpool of bloody slaughter or will the peoples of the world be able to check the bloody hand of atomic warfare suspended over the world? This question is at present agitating all those who have at heart the interests of peace, freedom and progress.

Note: This article has been translated for *Political Affairs* from the Soviet philosophical magazine, *Voprosi Filosofii* (No. 4, 1951). Pressure of space required a considerable condensation of the text.

Two tendencies reflect the present state of international relations. On the one hand, the undisguised efforts of the American imperialists to enmesh the peoples of the world in lies and draw them into a new destructive war; on the other hand, the mighty counteracting will of hundreds of millions of plain people, resolutely fighting against the aggressive schemes of the monopolists and their puppet governments. What is the real content of these tendencies? Are there in existence objective and subjective conditions to render impossible the unleashing of a new world war and to transform the possibility of averting this war into actuality?

In the interview with a *Pravda* correspondent last February Comrade Stalin indicated, on the basis of a profound Marxist-Leninist analysis of contemporary international relations, that the struggle between the aggressive and the peace-loving forces is becoming ever sharper. Said Stalin:

What will be the outcome of this struggle between the aggressive and peace-loving forces?

Peace will be preserved and consoli-

dated if the peoples will take the cause of preserving peace into their own hands and defend it to the end. War may become inevitable if the warmongers succeed in enmeshing the masses of the people in lies, in deceiving them and drawing them into a new world war.*

• • •

We are living in the epoch of the collapse of the old, capitalist world and the victory of the new world, of Communism. As we know, the old does not voluntarily retire from the historical stage. It clings to the slightest opportunity to delay the day of its demise. Thus, the capitalist world, disintegrating before our eyes, resorts to every possible effort in order to prolong its existence. Included among such efforts is the unleashing of war, in which the imperialists see a possibility of resolving the crisis now holding in its grip the whole system of capitalism (although such a war may bring grievous consequences for them).

Besides, for the shameless clique of monopolists, war is a very profitable business. The American monopolies reaped during the first world war net profits of \$38 billions; in World War II they netted \$53 billions; and in the first three months of the intervention in Korea the profits of the American monopolies increased by 54 percent as against the corresponding period in 1949.

And for the sake of the fabulous

profits of a tiny handful of monopolists tens of millions of plain people are forced to sacrifice their lives. War means death to millions of people and the destruction of vast material resources. War means enormous destruction of productive forces, devastation of cities and countryside, and bestial annihilation of the peaceful population. Everybody knows by what inhuman methods the German fascist invaders carried on the war against the Soviet Union. And now even more perfected and brutal violence and destruction is perpetrated by the American imperialists against the Korean population.

When World War II was approaching its end, when the defeat of Hitlerite Germany and the victory of the freedom-loving peoples was already in sight, the leader of the Soviet people, Comrade Stalin, posed before the peoples of the world the task of making new aggression and a new war impossible. "To win the war against Germany," Stalin said, "is to accomplish a great historical task. But winning the war is not in itself synonymous with insuring for the nations lasting peace and guaranteed security in the future. The thing is not only to win the war but also to render new aggression and new war impossible, if not forever then at least for a long time to come."*

At first glance it may seem that to assert the possibility of averting a new world war is to contradict the

* "Interview of J. V. Stalin," in *Political Affairs*, April, 1951, p. 14.

* J. V. Stalin, *The Great Patriotic War of the Soviet Union*, (International Publishers, 1949), p. 140.

known Marxist position that war is an inevitable concomitant of imperialism. Actually, there is no contradiction.

Dialectical materialism teaches that a correct interpretation of the contradictions in the socio-historical process requires an objective analysis of the whole complex of the social relations, an exact evaluation of the interrelations between the classes. Moreover, in the present international situation it is also necessary to take account of the interrelations between the two different systems existing in the world, between the two camps on the international scene. He who fails to take account of the changes in the conditions of society's development is likely, by clinging to certain positions of Marxism related to a definite historical epoch, to fall into a gross error.

Marxism, Comrade Stalin tells us, cannot be viewed as a collection of dogmas, a catechism, the conclusions and formulas of which are suitable for all epochs and periods. "In the course of its development Marxism cannot but be enriched by new experience, by new knowledge; consequently, its separate formulas and deductions cannot but change in the course of time, cannot but be replaced by new formulas and deductions corresponding to the new historical tasks."^{*}

In the course of the social development in the postwar period, in connection with the victory of democracy

^{*} J. V. Stalin, *Marxism and Linguistics*, (International Publishers, 1951), p. 47.

in World War II, new governing laws have arisen in the relations between countries. A whole system of states has come into existence, for which peaceful development is an historical necessity, an historical law. By virtue of the struggle between these two historical laws, the operation of the former is undergoing a substantial change. To this should be added the growing role of the subjective factor in history. . . .

War is a socio-historical phenomenon effected by men. War is planned and unleashed, not by the whole people of this or that country, but by definite groups of men who have an interest in the war. But war is carried on by the people, they are involved in it directly, on the battlefields, as well as by working to produce for the requirements of the war. But the people have no interest in waging war if the war is of an unjust, predatory character. Hence, in wars of this kind, as in any other social phenomenon in class society, we witness the operation of opposing forces: on the one hand, the efforts of the exploiting classes to unleash and carry on war; on the other hand, resistance to this on the part of the popular masses. In past history such resistance manifested itself in elemental riots and uprisings, which occurred either during the war itself or after it had come to an end.

Of course, wars were not the main and determining cause of the popular uprisings. Underlying them were deep causes of an economic and socio-political character. But unjust wars

hastened their advent. History knows numerous cases when anti-popular wars, arousing profound discontent among the masses, hastened the outbreak of revolutions. It will suffice to recall the Napoleonic wars in the beginning of the 19th century, which brought about resolute actions by the peoples of Europe against Napoleon's France; the Franco-Prussian war of 1870, which hastened the revolutionary battles of the Parisian proletariat; the Russo-Japanese war, which hastened the Russian revolution of 1905-1907; and the first world imperialist war, which hastened the historic victory of the Russian proletariat in 1917.

From the foregoing it can be seen that as soon as the reactionary classes began to mobilize their resources for the purpose of unleashing an anti-people's, aggressive war, there began to mature among the people the possibility of counter-action to the war. But this counter-action to the war by the masses of the people manifested itself in most cases and in the strongest form after the war.

Quite different is the situation in the contemporary conditions. The conscious activity of men holds an ever firmer position in the history of mankind. Today, one-third of mankind, freed from the fetters of capitalist slavery, is building a new life consciously, in conformity with a single plan for each country. In these countries there are no classes who have an interest in waging predatory wars aimed at subjecting alien peoples. The peoples of the democratic

countries are sometimes forced to take up arms, but only in order to defend their liberty and independence against the encroachments of foreign imperialists. In the capitalist world, which still holds in subjection about two-thirds of mankind, there have also occurred shifts in the direction of the conscious activity of men. The broad masses of the people now understand who plans, and who stands to gain from, an aggressive war; they are beginning to grasp the laws of social development.

Under present-day conditions it is difficult for the ruling classes to conceal preparations for war from the masses of the people. The broad laboring masses, led by the working class and its vanguard, the Communist Party, day by day intensify the struggle against the new world war that is being prepared by the imperialists of the United States. But at present the people fight against an unjust, aggressive war in a different way than in the past; for today the possibilities have matured for averting a new world war.

In present-day conditions it is incorrect to speak merely of the inevitability of war in the epoch of imperialism and stop with this. Should we limit ourselves to this position, we would distort the actual, objective course of the development of history and bring great harm to the mighty movement of contemporary times, the movement of the partisans of peace....

WHY WAR IS NOT INEVITABLE

The victory over German fascism

and Japanese imperialism led to a new alignment of the world's economic and political forces. The system of capitalism, the basic source of aggressive wars, suffered a severe defeat as a result of World War II. The principal shock forces of international imperialist reaction — Germany, Italy and Japan—were routed and their armies disbanded. France was very much weakened by the war, and Britain's positions as a world colonial power were considerably undermined. Only one great imperialist nation, the United States, not only suffered no impairment in World War II, but enhanced its economic power at the expense of other nations.

The Soviet Union, the bulwark of peace, democracy and Socialism, emerged from the war more vigorous, solid and strong, and in the postwar years has not only healed the wounds inflicted by the war, but has made progress in reinforcing its power in every way. The successful realization of the postwar Five-Year Plan for the reconstruction and development of the national economy is a considerable forward step towards the realization of the gradual transition from Socialism to Communism in the U.S.S.R. The achievements of the Soviet Union, the growth of its economic power, are a decisive condition for the securing of peace and curbing the incendiaries of a new war.

As a result of World War II, owing to the historic victory of the Soviet Union which played the decisive role in the victorious outcome of the war

of liberation, the imperialist system lost a number of states in central and south-eastern Europe, namely, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Bulgaria, Romania, and Albania. More than 70 million people were freed from capitalism, have erected people's democracies, and are now successfully building Socialism.

Analyzing the postwar international situation, Comrade Stalin declared:

The defeat and liquidation of the principal centers of fascism and world aggression have led to profound changes in the political life of the world's peoples, to a wide upsurge of the democratic movement among the peoples. Taught by the experience of the war, the masses of the people have understood that the fate of the nations must not be entrusted to reactionary governments, which pursue narrow-caste and selfish, anti-people, aims. Because of this, the peoples, unwilling to live any longer in the old way, are taking the fate of their states into their own hands, are establishing democratic regimes and are carrying on an active struggle against the forces of reaction, against the incendiaries of a new war. The peoples of the world do not want a repetition of the afflictions of war. They are fighting in earnest for the enforcement of peace and security.*

One of the most important results of World War II was the historic victory of the Chinese people, 475 million strong, which smashed the Kuomintang reactionaries and overthrew forever the domination of im-

* Order of the Minister of the Armed Forces of the U.S.S.R., of May 1, 1946, published in *Pravda* May 1, 1946.

perialism in China. In 1949, China was proclaimed a People's Republic. The great victory of the Chinese people dealt a new severe blow to international imperialism. It had an exceedingly favorable influence on the development of a mass national liberation movement in the countries of the colonial East. The victory of the Chinese revolution brings nearer the time of the national and political emancipation of the peoples in the colonial and dependent countries. The Chinese people has firmly linked its destiny with the peace-loving peoples of the Soviet Union and the People's Democracies.

The camp of democratic, peace-loving states comprises also the Mongolian People's Republic, the People's Democratic Republic of Germany, the Vietnam Democratic Republic, and the People's Republic of Korea. Numerically, the camp of the democratic countries, headed by the Soviet Union, comprises a population of over 800 million, or more than a third of the population of the globe. Possessing inexhaustible material and human resources, and resting on the planned development of their economy, the nations of the anti-imperialist camp constitute a great bastion, firmly standing guard for peace.

Following the Second World War, a new and higher stage was attained by the national liberation struggle of the peoples of the colonial and dependent countries. The struggle now aims, not at bourgeois democracy, but at people's democracy, and it is led, not by bourgeois-nationalist par-

ties, but by working-class parties (Communists). The national-liberation movement has assumed forms of armed struggle by the people against the foreign imperialists and the native feudal gentry.

After World War II the overwhelming majority of the popular masses lost confidence in the bourgeois and Right socialist parties and turned their eyes towards the Communist parties. In the course of the war the Communist parties acted as the most consistent and courageous fighters in organizing resistance to the fascist invaders. In the postwar years the Communists have shown themselves as the reliable defenders of the national sovereignty of their countries and of the freedom and independence of their peoples from the encroachments of the American imperialists. The Communist parties are the most active fighters for a durable democratic peace and against the imperialist warmongers. A clear indication of the enhanced prestige of the Communist parties is the rapid increase of their membership. Suffice it to mention that during World War II and five postwar years the membership of the Communist parties in all countries (exclusive of the Soviet Union) has reached almost 20 million. The mounting influence of the Communist parties is also evidenced by the fact that they have by now been entrusted with the task of piloting the state power by the peoples of twelve countries, and in some of the capitalist countries the Communists have powerful fractions in

the parliaments.

The victory of the freedom-loving peoples over German fascism and Japanese imperialism imparted a strong stimulus for the unprecedented development of a world-wide democratic movement, expressed in the movement for the complete eradication of fascism, the establishment of democratic liberties, and for a democratic peace.

The peoples of the world have become convinced through their own experience that monopoly capital and its parties betray the national interests of their countries. The working class, the peasantry, the petty bourgeoisie and the intelligentsia have lost confidence in "their" big bourgeoisie, and the bourgeois and Right socialist parties. The peoples of the world are now beginning to understand that American imperialism, driven by the mad ambition to attain world dominion, is prepared, in order to achieve this aim, to plunge mankind into a new world war. In some parts of the world American imperialism has already established new centers of war. The American aggressive venture in Korea is today a direct threat to world peace.

That is why all men of good will, regardless of their political and religious views, irrespective of party affiliation, have decided to unite their efforts and to take the cause of peace into their own hands. The world-wide movement in defense of peace, the first of its kind in history, has united in its ranks hundreds of millions of men and women. The work-

ing class plays a decisive role in the movement of the defenders of peace. Participating in the movement in defense of peace are broad sections of the peasantry, millions of people in intellectual professions, and the flower of world culture.

A mighty, organized peace front has crystallized, and its forces are growing and getting stronger day by day.

The warmongers, vainly seeking to split the movement of the defenders of peace, denounce it as a Communist plot. The Communists can but take pride in the fact that their active, self-sacrificing struggle for peace is causing new fits of rage among the warmongers. The role of the Communists in the movement of the defenders of peace is additional evidence of the fact that the Communists have no more honorable task than to fight for the vital interests of the people, and at the present stage the most vital interest of the people is the struggle for peace.

The struggle for Communism and the struggle for peace organically complement each other. The broad laboring masses and all progressive, democratic forces see that capitalism carries within it the danger of war and that Socialism means peace, they see that all the bourgeois parties act against the defenders of peace and carry on unbridled propaganda and preparations for a new world war, while the Communist parties are the most active fighters for peace.

With every new year of postwar development a further change is tak-

ing place in the correlation of forces between the camp of the defenders of peace and the camp of the war incendiaries, in favor of the peace camp. That is why, under the present historical conditions, it is incorrect to assert categorically that the coming of a new world war is inevitable. The Marxist-Leninist position of the inevitability of wars in the epoch of imperialism, which was correct for certain historical conditions, cannot be applied without reservations to the new historical conditions.

In the interview with the *Pravda* correspondent Comrade Stalin also defined the conditions under which the possibility of preventing a new world war may develop into and become a reality. To assure this, the peoples must take into their hands the cause of safeguarding peace and defend it to the end.

A possibility, Stalin teaches, can never automatically become an actuality; we must bear in mind that there exist several possibilities of a contradictory character; the decisive role in transforming the possibility of averting the war into an actuality belongs to the party of the working class, which must lead the struggle of the masses for the preservation of peace.

The first period of struggle to prevent a new world war commenced already in the course of World War II. In his address on the 27th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution Stalin referred to the means and measures with the aid of which it would be possible to pre-

vent aggression. "There is only one means to this end," he said, "in addition to the complete disarmament of the aggressor nations: that is, to establish a special organization made up of representatives of the peace-loving nations to uphold peace and safeguard security. . . ."*

After the conclusion of World War II the aggressor nations were disarmed. To be sure, the American-British bloc did everything possible to sabotage the complete disarmament of the aggressor nations, both with regard to the liquidation of their industrial war potential and with regard to the dissolution of their military formations.

But in place of the defeated Germany and Japan, new aspirants to world domination appeared, the imperialists of the United States. The center of world reaction moved to the U.S.A. In the course of the entire postwar period the United States has pursued a policy of rejecting international democratic collaboration, of creating a tense international situation, of fanning a war psychosis. Increasingly subjecting to its influence the ruling circles of Britain and France as well as the *revanche* forces of West Germany and Japan, the United States is striving to forge powerful armies under its command within the framework of the aggressive North Atlantic Organization and other aggressive blocs with the view of unleashing war against the camp of peace, democracy and socialism.

* J. V. Stalin, *The Great Patriotic War of the Soviet Union*, p. 142.

THE U.N. AND THE PEACE STRUGGLE

A special body had been created to safeguard peace and security, the United Nations Organization. The UNO was given great powers to prevent aggression and, in the event that it should occur, to liquidate it at its inception and to punish the perpetrators of aggression. The basic condition to assure proper functioning and effective action by the UNO was the principle of the unanimity of the great powers which carried the main burden of the war with Hitlerite Germany.

But from the very first days of the work of the UNO the ruling circles of the United States began to pursue a policy aimed at undermining this basic principle. Under the leadership of the United States, an aggressor core was formed in the UNO comprising the countries participating in the North Atlantic Organization, and twenty-five Latin-American countries. As Stalin pointed out in the previously quoted interview, "It is the representatives of these countries that now decide the fate of war and peace in the United Nations."

The United Nations has not only failed to take decisive steps to curb the aggressive actions of the United States and other imperialist powers which have taken place since the end of World War II. It has helped the American and British interventionists to stifle the freedom-loving people of Greece, it helped to strangle the Indonesian republic, and in 1950

adopted the shameful resolution which sanctioned the American intervention against the Korean people and named as an aggressor the peace-loving Chinese People's Republic.

All of this is evidence of the fact that, again quoting Stalin: "The United Nations Organization, created as the bulwark for preserving peace, is being turned into an instrument of war, into a means for unleashing a new world war."

THE SOVIET UNION AND THE U.N.

Only the Soviet Union and the People's Democracies have carried on from the first day of the creation of the UNO and are still carrying on a consistent and self-sacrificing struggle for peace.

In the first postwar year, when some imperialist nations continued to maintain vast armies, when "atomic diplomacy" was initiated, the Soviet Union, in the interests of preserving world peace and of easing the burdens of the people resulting from the large military expenditures, made a proposal at the First Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations calling for a general reduction of armaments and a ban on the production and use of atomic energy for military purposes.

These proposals met with stubborn opposition on the part of the aggressor bloc headed by the United States. They could not, however, unceremoniously reject these peace loving

proposals of the Soviet Union. The General Assembly therefore decided to establish a commission to examine the problems which have arisen as a result of the discovery of atomic energy, and it also recommended that the Security Council should formulate measures for armaments reduction. But these decisions have remained only on paper. In 1946-47 the reactionary circles in the United States and other countries began to carry on propaganda in favor of a new world war. With the view of curbing the propaganda for war, the Soviet Union offered at the Second Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations, held in September 1947, a resolution which called for: condemnation of the propaganda for a new war carried on in a number of countries, particularly in the United States, Greece and Turkey; declaring propaganda in favor of war incompatible with membership in the United Nations; and outlawing of war propaganda as a criminal offense. The United States and its subservient majority opposed the proposals of the Soviet Union for the condemnation of the war instigators. However, under pressure of public opinion the General Assembly was compelled to adopt this proposal. This was a great political victory for the Soviet Union.

But even after the adoption of these proposals the imperialists of the United States continued to carry on preparations for war, they began to increase the armed forces and gradually to shift the economy to war pro-

duction. With a view to removing the threat of a new war, the Soviet Union, at the third session of the General Assembly, in September, 1948, made the following proposals:

1) To recommend to the permanent members of the Security Council to reduce their armaments and armed forces by one-third within one year;

2) To outlaw atomic weapons as weapons of aggression;

3) To establish within the framework of the Security Council an organ of international control to check the effectuation of these proposals.

But the Anglo-American imperialist bloc, using its obedient majority, rejected the Soviet proposals.

In 1949, faced with the threat of an imminent economic crisis, the American imperialists passed from war propaganda to direct preparations for a third world war. They launched an intense armaments drive in the United States and Great Britain. With a view to preserving peace and security, the Soviet Union, at the fourth session of the General Assembly, in September, 1949, made the following proposals:

1) To condemn the preparations for a new war which are carried on in a number of countries, particularly in the United States and Great Britain;

2) To outlaw the use of atomic weapons and other means of mass slaughter;

3) To recommend that the five great powers — the United States, Britain, France, the U.S.S.R. and

China—join efforts to come to an understanding with a view to eliminating the threat of a new war and that they conclude a five-power pact implementing peace.

But again the peace-seeking proposals of the Soviet Union were rejected. The peoples of the world saw additional evidence of the fact that the United Nations is not fulfilling its function as an international organization for preserving peace and security, and is becoming an instrument of the instigators of a war of aggression.

In 1950 the American imperialists passed to open acts of aggression against the peoples of south-eastern Asia and above all against the peoples of Korea and China. At the fifth session of the General Assembly of the United Nations the Soviet Union presented for adoption a "Declaration for the Removal of the Threat of a New War and Strengthening of Peace and the Security of Nations," which contained demands for the outlawing of atomic weapons, for the reduction of the armaments and armed forces of the five great powers by one-third, discontinuance of the propaganda for a new war, and the conclusion of a Peace Pact by the five powers. The Soviet Union also made a proposal calling for a definition of aggression. But despite the evident need for the adoption of these proposals they were rejected by the same aggressor core of the UNO. By a majority vote of the delegations, which did not at all represent a majority of the world's population,

the fifth session of the General Assembly adopted a most shameful resolution, approving the aggression of the United States in Korea and naming as aggressor the Chinese People's Republic.

Appraising the activity of the United Nations, Stalin pointed out that "being turned into a tool of aggressive war, the United Nations Organization is at the same time ceasing to be a world organization of nations with equal rights. As a matter of fact, the United Nations Organization is now not so much a world organization as an organization for the Americans, an organization acting in the interests of the American aggressors. . . . The United Nations Organization is therefore taking the inglorious road of the League of Nations. In this way it is burying its moral prestige and dooming itself to disintegration."*

The peoples of the world have understood that they cannot expect peace to be secured by the United Nations. They have decided to take the fate of world peace into their own hands. A new stage has commenced in the great battle of the peoples against the danger of a new world war.

At present the struggle for peace which is being waged by the states of the democratic and anti-imperialist camp headed by the Soviet Union is supported in all countries by hundreds of millions of common people, who have joined hands in a common effort to prevent the handful of bil-

* *Political Affairs*, April, 1951, p. 13.

lionaires from plunging humanity into a new bloody slaughter.

THE WORLD-WIDE PEACE MOVEMENT

The world-wide movement for peace has arisen as the inevitable result of the historical development of society, as the reaction of the masses of the people to the aggressive schemes of the imperialists of the American-British bloc. Essentially, the instigators of a new war themselves, by their actions which go counter to the interests of the people, have brought into life this unprecedented movement of hundreds of millions.

In 1946 and 1947 an intensified campaign of war propaganda was launched by the warmongers, headed by Churchill and Truman. The United States in its foreign policy turned to an open expansionist line, the clearest expressions of which were the "Truman doctrine" and the "Marshall plan" enunciated in 1947. Essentially, the aim of these measures was, by tying the European countries to the United States through economic obligations, to force them to surrender their economic and political independence, and thus hammer together a bloc of states as a means for attaining world domination. This created a threat to the national independence of the European peoples and doomed them to the role of cannon fodder for the American imperialists. The Truman Doctrine and Marshall Plan aroused a strong

wave of protest by the masses of the people. The protests grew particularly intense in connection with the formation of the aggressive Western and North Atlantic alliances.

From the very beginning, the movement of the European peoples against the American plans to unleash a new war assumed militant forms: mass protest demonstrations, strikes, collection of signatures on petitions in defense of peace, and so on. The movement for peace was growing, embracing broad laboring masses, and began to reach out beyond Europe. But it had also a weak side: it did not yet have organizational forms and clearly outlined programmatic principles. Some detachments of the fighters for peace were headed by powerful organizations, the World Federation of Trade Unions, the International Federation of Democratic Women, the World Federation of Democratic Youth, and others. But a vast part of the peasantry, intelligentsia, the small and middle bourgeoisie, who were interested in the preservation of peace and were fighting against a new war, were without a leading organization.

Through the initiative of the international democratic organizations, particularly the World Federation of Trade Unions, the first World Congress of the partisans of peace was convened in Paris in April, 1949, under the slogan "the defense of peace is the concern of all the peoples of the world." The congress elected a "Permanent Committee of the World Congress of the Partisans

of Peace," which has played a great role in strengthening the movement for peace. During 1949 and 1950 national congresses of partisans of peace were held in all countries of the world, and national committees were elected to carry on the struggle for peace. In order to strengthen the movement of the partisans of peace organizationally, local peace committees were organized in cities and villages, in factories, etc.

The movement of the partisans of peace has united people of the most diverse views and convictions, and of different classes and groups, vitally interested in the preservation of peace and security.

In the first stage of the movement of the partisans of peace it was necessary to work out a platform, the struggle for the realization of which could unite all peoples, all sections of the laboring masses, regardless of ethnic origin and nationality, of political views and religious convictions. Such a common platform for the struggle for peace was formulated in the Appeal adopted at the Stockholm meeting of the Permanent Committee, which called for the outlawing of atomic weapons and condemning as a war criminal the government which would first resort to such weapons. To carry this measure into effect, it was decided to organize a world-wide petition campaign. This roused all sections of the population throughout the world. Within a short time the Stockholm appeal was signed by more than 500 million people. The campaign for the collection of signa-

tures to the Stockholm resolution resulted, among other things, in an expanded base for the movement of the partisans of peace.

At its meeting held in Prague in August, 1950, the Permanent Committee adopted a new, more comprehensive decision, calling for a struggle for a general reduction of armaments, condemnation of aggression and military intervention in the internal affairs of other nations, an end to the war in Korea, and prohibition of all forms of war propaganda. These decisions were the basis for the preparation of the Second World Peace Congress, and showed the greater maturity of the movement of the partisans of peace. The Prague meeting of the Permanent Committee ushered in a new, higher stage of the movement of the partisans of peace.

The Second World Peace Congress, held in November, 1950 at Warsaw, worked under the slogan "We cannot wait for peace—peace must be won!" The Congress voiced the demand for peace in behalf of all humanity, and adopted a number of very important decisions of a programmatic and organizational character.

The program for the further struggle for peace now took the direction of fighting for an end to the war in Korea, against rearming West Germany and Japan, for general disarmament and a ban on atomic weapons. The Congress called upon the peoples of the world to demand that their governments and parlia-

ments pass laws to safeguard peace and to insist that the five great powers conclude a Peace Pact.

To direct the struggle for these demands, the Congress elected a World Council of Peace. At its first meeting, at the end of February, 1951, the World Council of Peace adopted a number of practical decisions aimed at carrying into effect the program for the preservation of peace. Taking into account that the main responsibility for the maintenance of peace and security rests with the five great powers, and that the fate of the world depends largely on the settlement of their differences, the World Council of Peace adopted an Appeal which calls upon the five great powers—the United States, the Soviet Union, the Chinese People's Republic, Great Britain and France—to conclude a Pact of Peace. The refusal by the government of any of these great powers to confer with the others for the purpose of concluding a Peace Pact, the Appeal states, is to be considered as evidence of aggressive designs on the part of this government. The World Council of Peace called upon all men of good will to add their signatures to the appeal.

As is known, the broad masses of the people have responded wholeheartedly to this appeal of the World Council of Peace. At this writing the Appeal has already been signed by hundreds of millions of men and women of good will.

The World Council of Peace further decided to convene a conference

of the peoples of the European countries to consider the question of a struggle against the remilitarization of Germany and of a peaceful settlement of the German problem; to convene a conference of the countries of Asia and the Pacific to consider the question of fighting against the rearming of Japan, the peaceful settlement of the conflicts taking place in the Far East and the conclusion of a peace treaty with Japan this year; and also to organize a number of regional conferences. It also decided to convene an international economic conference to be held in the Soviet Union, to consider questions relating to the establishment of economic ties between various countries and raising the standard of living of the masses; to convene a conference of physicians, and also an international conference of writers, artists, scientists, film industry workers, teachers, journalists, sportsmen, etc.

Of exceptional importance is the recently held conference of the European peoples on the question of fighting against the remilitarization of Germany. The overwhelming mass of the people of Europe is definitely opposed to the restoration of Germany's war potential, to the revival of the German armed forces and their utilization for aggressive purposes.

As Stalin said, in order to transform a possibility into an actuality it is necessary that the broad laboring masses understand the correct policy and actively support it. We know that the aggressor forces, while they carry on feverish preparations

for a new world war, are at the same time apprehensive of their own peoples, who do not want war and stand for the preservation of peace. Hence, the aggressors, before they plunge the people into the whirlpool of a sanguinary war, are trying "to depict the new war as of a defensive character and the peaceful policy of the peace-loving countries as an aggressive policy. They are trying to deceive their peoples in order to impose on them their aggressive plans and to draw them into a new war."

CONCLUSION

It is therefore necessary to open the eyes of all the common people to the threat of a new war, to explain to them the meaning and significance of the struggle, now being carried on the world over, to prevent the war and to preserve peace. The World Council of Peace adopted at its first meeting a number of resolutions aimed at enabling the broad masses to understand the essence and significance of the decisions of the Second World Peace Congress and actively to support them.

A very important condition for transforming the possibility into an actuality is the unity of action both within the guiding organization and among the broad masses of the people. The Second World Peace Congress marked great progress in this respect. While the Paris congress was composed predominantly of Communists and workers in the sciences, arts, and literature, at the Warsaw congress there were present, along

with Communists, Liberals and Conservatives, Laborites and Catholics, Social-Democrats and Radicals, as well as farmers and even industrialists. At the Warsaw Congress there was broad representation from the peoples of the colonial and dependent countries.

Of great significance from the point of view of extending the base of the peace movement is the decision of the Second World Peace Congress concerning the defense of the peoples fighting for their national liberation. The Congress declared that the movement of the peoples in the colonial and dependent countries for their liberation is inseparably connected with the movement for peace. Therefore, any forcible attempts by the imperialists to keep these peoples in a state of dependence and colonial subjection is a threat to the cause of peace.

The Congress also adopted a decision in favor of establishing contact with the many associations and groups which, though not affiliated with the international organization of the partisans of peace, in some measure act in opposition to war, whether consistently or not. Accordingly, the World Council of Peace decided to take steps for negotiations and conferences with supporters of the "One World" movement, with the Quakers, church organizations, the "neutralist" movement and other pacifist groups, for the purpose of working out conditions for joint actions in the struggle for the preservation of peace.

A decisive condition for the preservation of peace is unity of action by the leading force in the peace movement, the working class.

It is no secret that the imperialists cannot wage war without the working class. Hence, they resort to every measure in order to force the working class to work for the war and to serve as cannon fodder for the sake of carrying out the aggressive plans of the American imperialists. To this end they try to enmesh the working class in lies, and resort to intimidation and provocation, slander and open terrorist acts against the working class and the Communist parties. In their efforts to win the support of the working class the imperialists make use of its worst enemies, the Right socialists. Under the present conditions, the Right socialists are not only (and not even so much) henchmen of the bourgeoisie of their country as the henchmen of American imperialism. These traitors see their main task as justifying the expansionist policy of the American billionaires, and they resort for this purpose to the most dishonest and vile methods of struggle. But under the present conditions it is not so easy to justify the overtly aggressive policy of American imperialism. The peoples are organizing to fight this policy. The Right socialists therefore strive by all possible means to split the united front of the peoples that are fighting for peace, and first of all to break the unity of the working class. They split the trade unions, enter into agreements with

the reactionary parties to fight against the democratic forces, and once again, as they did prior to World War II, they clear the path for fascism. This vile, frenzied campaign of the Right socialist splitters meets with resistance on the part of the working class, solidifying it still more and rousing it to fortify the unity of its ranks. The proponents of peace must take full account of the fact that without unity in the ranks of the working class there can be no unity of all the laboring masses in the fight for peace and democracy, and against the danger of a new world war.

The movement of the partisans of peace, especially at its inception, suffered from two incorrect points of view on the question of the danger of a new war. Some were of the opinion that a new war was absolutely inevitable, that nothing could prevent it. They proposed to discontinue all resistance to the aggressors, to submit to fate and thus to doom millions of people to annihilation. Others believed that the contemporary international situation had changed so much that there was no basis for a new war. This would have meant inaction on the part of the masses of the people, creating favorable conditions for the aggressor forces in their criminal drive for a new war. Both of these viewpoints are unscientific and therefore harmful.

In order to transform the possibility of averting a new war into an actuality and preserve peace it is vital to strengthen and expand the movement of the partisans of peace.

In the final analysis, the fate of the world depends on the activity of the masses of the people. ". . . a widespread campaign for the maintenance of peace, as a means of exposing the machinations of the warmongers," Stalin points out, "is now of primary importance."

One of the most important conditions for the prevention of a new world war and securing the preservation of peace is enhancement of the power of the Soviet Union which heads the mighty front of the fighters for peace, the multiplication of its economic successes and the strengthening of its defensive capacity. In World War II the Soviet people, displaying miracles of heroism, courage and steadfastness in the

struggle against fascist Germany and imperialist Japan, smashed with its armed forces the shock forces of international imperialism and aggression, thereby saving mankind from fascist enslavement. In the present conditions, when over mankind is again suspended the danger of a new world war and aggression by the imperialists of the United States, the eyes of all peace-loving people are turned towards the Soviet Union, the bulwark of peace and security for all peoples.

The peoples fighting for peace may rest assured, as Stalin stated, that the Soviet Union "will continue in the future, as well, unswervingly to pursue a policy of averting war and preserving peace."

On Independent Political Action

By Gus Hall

[The following selection is from the political report rendered by Comrade Gus Hall to the 15th National Convention of the Communist Party, in December, 1950. We publish this section of the report because it continues, with undiminished freshness and vigor, to offer our Party and the labor and progressive movements a basic orientation toward independent political action in the impending elections of 1952.

Gus Hall, now in a Federal prison, has just been found "guilty" on an additional frameup charge of "contempt of court." This is a further outrageous act of vindictive persecution against our beloved Comrade Hall, ardent champion of the cause of Peace, Freedom, and Socialism—Ed.]

ONE OF THE POLITICAL tasks set by our 1948 Convention Resolution in connection with the presidential election was "to break once and for all time the reactionary two-party system of the monopolies." The Resolution went further. It said: "The formation of this new party (The Progressive Party) is of paramount historic significance. It marks the beginning of the end of the two-party system."

I do not bring up these quotations from our 1948 Resolution only to underline the obvious. It is hardly necessary to say now that life has not to date brought about the fulfillment of this task. But we do have to look into why this was so. What has changed? What is there new and rising on which to base our policies today?

Before we go into that, it seems we must again answer the question: Was our policy of support to the founding of the Progressive Party correct? Even more important—did developments justify our support for a presidential ticket outside of the two old parties?

Hindsight does not provide any reason for revising the estimate that our position was basically correct. Surely there is no one here who will argue that it was possible to give any kind of support to either Truman or Dewey. There was ample evidence that broad masses were moving away from the two old parties, and that the base of the coalition around F.D.R. was going to reform its ranks outside of the two old parties.

Hindsight says it might have been wiser for the broad third party forces

to find a less rigid and crystallized form than a political party, such as a presidential ticket for that particular election. But the policy was basically correct.

NO MASS BREAKAWAY

However, we now know that the masses who were moving away from the two old parties, and large sections of those who supported the Progressive Party program, had not shed their illusions to the extent of voting for a third party when the showdown came. This was largely because wide sections continued to be influenced by the "lesser evil" myth, a tendency which was fostered by the unprecedented demagoguery of the Truman campaign.

The masses had not yet learned from experience to see through the two-party farce, and to recognize the need for an independent political movement based on the working class. The masses did not see the Progressive Party as a practical alternative, and its ticket as one that could possibly win the election. "Protest voting" is not understood or practiced by the American electorate. Most Americans do not like to cast what they consider a "wasted vote." When they go to the polls, they "play to win."

So, the mass breakaway from the two old parties did not take place in 1948—nor in 1949 or 1950. Today we find the two old parties betraying

their mass following, while the breakaway is made more difficult by the more frenzied efforts of the Social-Democrats and trade-union bureaucrats who still peddle the "lesser evil" myth.

The working class, the Negro people and the American people generally have moved forward on most of the important fronts since 1948. But this movement has not yet expressed itself on the electoral front, through a breakaway from the two old parties.

Peace sentiment and the peace movements have grown. But they have not yet effected a political realignment of forces.

The national liberation movement of the Negro people has matured and is entering a new period of militant struggle. But it has not yet won full suffrage rights and has not dissociated itself from the two old parties. If there were a broad third party in America, there is no question that the Negro people would actively support it.

The workers have continued to develop militant economic struggles in defense of their living standards and working conditions. But the Social-Democrats and labor reformists are still able to keep the masses of the workers shut up in the two-party corral.

The farmers too have been developing some inspiring and militant struggles. But they have not yet got wise to the two old parties and have

not mo
litical
workin

Ther
cal un
class. B
yet fou
ing of
monop
movem
strings
system.

Let r
tration
election
leader

cities r
sive Pa
not on

but als
Negro
district

tion. I
from t
union

worker
worker
confide

ership
strugg
many

when
candid
be wit
have t

the sit
basical

1950 F

Agar

not moved toward independent political action in alliance with the working class and the Negro people.

There has been a growth of political understanding in the working class. But the working class has not yet found ways to lead in the building of a people's anti-war, anti-monopoly coalition and a political movement free from the apron strings of Big Business' two-party system.

Let me give you a very good illustration of this situation. In the 1950 elections, a very popular trade-union leader in one of our major industrial cities ran for office on the Progressive Party slate. This candidate was not only a well-liked union leader, but also a recognized leader of the Negro people in his community. His district has a large Negro population. It also includes 10,000 workers from the industry in which he is a union leader, plus thousands of auto workers, steel workers, etc. The workers have repeatedly shown their confidence in this candidate's leadership in economic struggle, in the struggle for Negro rights, and in many other kinds of activity. But when the votes were counted, this candidate had only 1,000 votes. Maybe with a better campaign he could have tripled his thousand votes. But the situation would not have been basically changed.

1950 ELECTION RESULTS

Against that background, let us

take a look at the results of the 1950 elections. What are some of the general conclusions to be drawn?

1) In a general sense, the elections were a victory for reaction. They reflect the advanced stage of the war preparations and of Wall Street's war drive. They also reflect the continued slow development of an organized people's coalition for peace and democracy.

2) They reflect the slowness of the working class to become conscious of its historic responsibilities, and to understand that these can be advanced only if it breaks out of the camp of the two-party system which is policed by the Social-Democrats and other misleaders of labor.

3) The elections further confirmed that the Progressive Party, while capable of putting up a great fight, a very important and necessary fight, is not the mass third party that must emerge. This is clear from the following votes:

The New York vote was 450,000 in 1948. In 1950 it was 215,000.

The Pennsylvania vote was 55,000 in 1948. In 1950 it was 6,000.

The Washington vote was 31,000 in 1948. In 1950 it was 2,000.

The only exception to this trend was in California, where the vote was 190,000 in 1948 and the estimated 1950 vote is 325,000.

It would be wrong to conclude from these figures that the masses that followed the third-party movement in 1948 have come back into

the fold of the two old parties. Instead, we must see that even the masses who want a third party do not at this time see the Progressive Party serving this purpose in any practical sense.

There is general agreement that the 1950 election was a victory for reaction. But when we get down to the exact reasons for this estimate, there is some confusion. We get the confused answer that reaction won because the Republicans won, and they are the most war-like and reactionary. Equally confused is the notion that a Democratic victory would somehow have been a defeat for reaction, and a victory for progress. To make confusion worse confounded, we hear that there is no difference between candidates who ran on either ticket—they're all alike, let's forget them both.

For the sake of clarity, let us set down a few basic facts.

1) Both old parties are parties of reaction. They are war parties, dedicated to the service of their masters, the ruling class. But even at this moment, and although only in very rare instances, it is possible to differentiate some major party candidates from others. There are some who frequently respond to mass pressure, and still have some respect for the United States Constitution. They take a position against lynching, favor poll-tax repeal and an F.E.P.C. They go along with the Truman war policies and, therefore, could

not be supported by the peace forces; but the pressure of the growing strength of the peace movements would produce favorable changes in their attitudes. As a rule, these candidates are against Taft-Hartley, the McCarran Act, and the Smith Act.

So in the first place the 1950 elections were a victory for reaction because almost without exception candidates of this type were defeated. But in a more basic sense the elections were a victory for reaction because they did not result in a break-away from the two old parties. Reaction won the elections in the early stages of the campaign, because the working class failed to find ways to express itself independently, and to organize effective alternatives to a vote for the candidates of reaction.

2) The elections were a victory for reaction because a coalition based on the working class and the Negro people did not emerge from the campaign. And because, in consequence, large sections of the Negro people especially stayed away from the polls on election day.

3) The elections were a victory for reaction because the ruling class was craftily able to capitalize on the honest and sincere peace sentiments of the people, to take partisan advantage of this sentiment and divert it to a large vote for Republican candidates.

4) The elections were a victory for reaction because of the gang-up against Congressman Marcantonio,

who
avoi

5
beca
broa
dema
tions
expo
the

NO

A
the v
that
a str
tion,
the v
adult

It
mass
lions
votin

It wa
the g
and
lican
Trun
centr
able
ings

W
secti
for p
rect
if the
must
pract
see p
outs
alter

whose defeat thus was almost unavoidable.

5) Finally, reaction won a victory because the fact that no crystallized broad people's coalition for peace and democracy emerged from the elections now makes it more difficult to expose effectively the demagoguery of the reactionaries who were elected.

NO REACTIONARY SWING

A second source of confusion is the view expressed by those who say that the large total vote indicates a strong popular swing toward reaction, a mass swing of support for the war drive. Of course, this is unadulterated nonsense.

It is a serious weakness that the masses fell for demagoguery. But millions of them thought they were voting for peace, as best they could. It was in Korea that the masses saw the greatest danger of a world war, and a war with China. The Republicans very cleverly identified the Truman Administration with this central danger point, and thus were able to capitalize on the peace feelings of the masses.

We must conclude that, yes, large sections were misled. But they are for peace. They will follow the correct road in the struggle for peace if they get the right leadership. We must be able to offer the masses a practical alternative, one which they see provides a real chance to win outside of the two old parties. This alternative must correspond to their

present level of understanding in the arena of political action.

Some say the elections were a defeat for the trade-union bureaucracy, for Social-Democracy. One of our district board resolutions declared: "Everywhere the workers delivered a sharp and bitter rebuke to their Right-wing labor leaders. They defeated all the candidates of the United Labor Committee in the working-class wards. The workers had their say on election day."

Many sins flow from that muddle-headed approach—including some basic weaknesses in our united-front work. When we see that the elections represent a gain for reaction, how can we reconcile this fact with such statements as "the workers had their say on election day?" We cannot rejoice that the working class took a misguided step. We cannot hail the fact that the workers voted for the candidates of reaction because they were boxed in by the misleaders of labor. On the contrary, we have to show the workers that they cannot expect to win by following the road of Murray, Reuther, and Green.

PEOPLE NEED LEADERSHIP

Large sections of the working class are beginning to draw some very important lessons from the last election campaign. The big lesson is not that the trade-union leaders took a licking. The lesson is that there must

be some road that does not lead into the blind alley to which the workers have been brought by the labor officialdom. This is the outlook on which we must build, and which we must help to expand.

The working class was not an active participant in the 1950 elections. There was no leadership capable of moving the workers into the campaign. Having completely identified themselves with the war aims of **American imperialism** and sold themselves to the worst enemies of the working class, the top labor leaders could hardly be expected to lead the workers into political struggle against reaction.

Because of long-standing weaknesses in the field of political action, the leaders of the Left-led unions did not give effective leadership to the working class even in the cities where there was a real alternative to the candidates of reaction. The labor bureaucracy limited itself to bombastic statements, competing with reaction in Red-baiting and warmongering.

Now all the forces of reaction in the labor movement, and anti-labor politicians like Taft, are trying to make hay out of the election results. In states like Ohio and Michigan, they are claiming that this election proves that the American workers will not vote as a class, that labor is not and never will be an effective political force.

But what the election results really

prove is that the working class cannot be an effective political force unless and until it has a mind and will of its own, gets itself politically organized, and develops honest working-class leadership.

PARTY'S ELECTORAL WORK

Now let us turn for a moment to the electoral policies and activities of our own Party. We have passed through a very difficult period. Until a broad peace coalition emerges, until there is a mass breakaway from the two old parties, until a new political alignment and mass people's party crystallizes—until then we are bound to face extremely complicated electoral problems.

I do not think there is any doubt that our 1950 election line and general policies were correct. But when we say this, we must add that we suffered from certain elements of rigidity in applying our policies, and in some places from sectarianism as well as from Right opportunism. Where we were unable to help provide an alternative to the candidates of the two old parties, our Party sometimes failed to find ways to influence the masses and to clarify the issues. In certain states, because of this, we showed symptoms of paralysis.

In practice, we were not always able to bridge the gap between the more advanced sections of the masses and those that still have deep-seated illusions about this or that candi-

date o
this w
of Leh
las in
states
dencie
this ga
suppor
date.
backs
way.
Befo
we w
projec
prog
nist P

PERS

WH
must
weak
mass
pende
gle to
tion a

No
a bol
system
party
old,
party
of w
poor
lessor
1950
with
An
off a
thir

date of the two old parties. I think this was the case in the campaigns of Lehman in New York and Douglas in California. In both those states there were two wrong tendencies. One said, we can bridge this gap only if we give some kind of support to the "Fair Deal" candidate. The other said, let's turn our backs on this mess, and go our merry way.

Before and during the primaries, we were altogether too timid about projecting independent candidates, progressive candidates, and Communist Party candidates.

PERSPECTIVES

What are some of the steps we must now take to overcome these weaknesses, and give more effective mass leadership in the field of independent political action, in the struggle to build a broad people's coalition and broad mass third party?

Now we need a new initiative, a bold, broad approach to unfold a systematic campaign for a mass third party. We must get away from all old, narrow concepts of how this party is going to emerge. Millions of workers, the Negro people, the poor farmers, are now drawing basic lessons from their experience in the 1950 elections. We must fire them with enthusiasm for a third party.

At the same time, we must throw off all notions that America needs a third party simply because three par-

ties are better than two. America needs a third party whose main base is the working class, the poor farmers, the Negro people. It needs a third party that champions the rights of these groups in the broadest sense—that fights for peace, democracy, and economic security. Such a party cannot be created in a smoke-filled room. The initiative must come from the broad ranks of the workers in the Right-led unions, from organizations like the N.A.A.C.P., the Farmers Union, and other similar groups.

We must be ready to work with coalitions that will launch broad independent tickets and candidates. In the first place, such tickets should be projected around the issues of peace and democratic rights. Events of the recent past have made it plain that, as the peace movement grows, possibilities for broad tickets and candidates will increase tremendously. Peace tickets and peace candidates can become an important medium for new realignments in our country's political life.

But peace, while being the key and decisive issue, is not necessarily the only starting point for coalitions that will put forward independent tickets and candidates. In some cities the issue may be "clean government," housing or schools. Widespread disgust with crime and corruption can provide the base around which such coalitions can be built.

We must help build and join

united electoral fronts on these and similar issues even where they are not yet ready to support a peace policy. At the same time, we must seek to lead these movements to the struggle for peace and must combat all efforts to make these united fronts support war policies, or war candidates, or both.

In this situation, we must put new meaning into the idea of labor candidates. There is a new ferment in the ranks of the working class, a new sentiment for putting forward broad labor coalition candidates. We must break with all ideas that only a candidate from one of the professions can win wide support.

Some, but not enough, headway has been made in nominating and electing Negro candidates to office. The election of Negro candidates must measure up to the new level of the Negro people's liberation struggle. In most of our country's basic industrial cities, independent tickets of labor, the Negro people and the national groups make a winning combination.

In the same sense, we must more boldly project the idea of youth and women candidates.

The Draft Resolution calls for work in P.A.C. and L.L.P.E. We must help these organizations take up struggles around specific issues in the shops, in the fight for peace and against the effects of the war economy. We must help them become the political voice of the rank-and-

file workers, and to take their first steps on the road to independent political action, toward the building of a third party.

ELECTORAL COALITIONS

We must overcome the state of affairs that finds us working in united-front movements and coalitions, getting along fine until we get to the point of political action. Then comes election time—and usually the parting of the ways. We must find the programs, candidates, forms and avenues of electoral expression that will enable these united front coalitions and movements to continue and grow through election campaigns. It is with this in mind that we must shape our policy toward candidates running on major party tickets. Whatever the level of electoral understanding in a coalition of which we are a part, we must not cut ourselves off from the masses simply because they are not yet ready to give advanced electoral expression to their aspirations. Equally, we must under no circumstances allow ourselves to be drawn into direct or indirect support of war policies and candidates, but must always strive to lead these movements and organizations in the direction of struggle for peace. We must remember that the struggle for peace has become the major force working for political and electoral realignments favorable to the camp of peace and democracy in

the United States.

The Progressive Party has not developed into a mass third party. But that obvious fact must not give rise to any idea that it has outlived its usefulness, and that we need not worry about helping to build it. Even in the last elections, the Progressive Party broke through in many places where all other avenues were closed. The Progressive Party can grow, and it should grow. Despite its small numerical size, it has a very important role to play in our country's political life. This is especially true in states like New York and California, where it has substantial mass support.

In this situation, we shall be able to apply our policy with less hesitation and more skill if we learn to see that electoral activities are not something special and separate. On the contrary,

they are an expression of the united front, of coalition struggle for peace, democratic rights, and the defense of the workers' living standards. Candidates and tickets must reflect these year-round struggles, and come forward as a result of their contribution to mass activities. It is these struggles, and the level on which they are waged, which must determine the forms of electoral expression.

Yes, comrades, we face many tough problems, But we would not be Marxists if we saw only the difficulties. We must also see that the great and growing possibilities for building a broad mass people's anti-war and anti-monopoly coalition will very quickly reflect themselves in the electoral field. An independent peace ticket in 1952 is definitely in the cards.

"We Charge Genocide!"

By William L. Patterson

[We present the text of the important address delivered at a public meeting held at the Riverside Plaza Hotel in New York City on November 12, 1951, by William L. Patterson, National Executive Secretary of the Civil Rights Congress, on the occasion of the publication of the book, We Charge Genocide—The Crime of Government Against the Negro People. William L. Patterson, stalwart fighter for Negro rights and the democratic liberties of the entire American people, himself has been marked out for victimization by the Dixiecratic-minded Un-American Committee, and faces trial in January on the frame-up charge of "contempt" of Congress—Ed.]

We Charge Genocide!

We speak here tonight conscious of a tremendous responsibility to our country and progressive mankind, as we give to the world a record of the crimes of the government of the United States of America against its own nationals, the 15,000,000 of Negro Americans. This is a matter of supreme importance, both insofar as our domestic affairs and our foreign relations are concerned. Our charge

assumes monumental significance, in view of the fact that the diplomatic representatives of those who are guilty of the murder of thousands of innocent Negro men and women, and of the merciless exploitation of millions more, are now most vigorously arguing their right to moral leadership of the world. We are satisfied that if this petition, which we have thoroughly documented, reaches the eyes of the progressive peoples of the world, it will help to change the course of history. The course of genocide in the United States must, if continued, lead inevitably to fascism at home, for its reaction upon the constitutional guarantees of white Americans is fatal; and it must lead to World War III, for the internal relations of a government toward its own citizens determines the direction of its foreign policies.

GENOCIDE'S DEADLY PARALLEL

In this book we cite crimes committed by this government. We prove the commission of these crimes. We charge that these monstrous crimes contain the germs of fascism and war no less than did the genocidal

crim
ish p
ern I
in th
paral
Germ
that
again
we r
who
Act
stroy
all o
peopl
Time
prog
thos
prov
racy.
Th
tion
tating
ler p
Worl
pres
U.S.A
befell
Th
the U
into t
have
zens
tred
Germ
again
limits
the "c
and o
conten
ment

crimes of the Nazis against the Jewish people of Germany and of Eastern Europe. We reveal the fact that, in the U.S.A., genocide has a deadly parallel in the history of Hitler's Germany. We realize all too well that if this book is to be a weapon against war and American fascism, we must issue it now, before those who use the unconstitutional Smith Act and the McCarran Law to destroy the Bill of Rights, can block all open channels to the American people and the progressive world. Time at this moment runs against progressive Americans, for there are those here who plot a monstrous provocation against peace and democracy.

The world cannot survive a repetition of that malignant and devastating anti-Semitism by which Hitler paved the way to the Second World War. Yet inherent in the present status of the Negro in the U.S.A. are all of the horrors that befell world Jewry and mankind.

Those men are still in power in the U.S.A. who helped lift Hitler into the Germany Chancellory. They have turned against American citizens as their Hitler turned his hatred against Germans—the Jewish Germans. Their mounting terror against the Negro people knows no limits. It is an inseparable part of the "cold war" they have launched and of the Third World War they contemplate. Officials of government and such national magazines

as *Collier's* already brag with awful bravado of this war to come. We contend that the wanton murder of Negroes has been a dress rehearsal for the murder of Koreans and Chinese.

The gasoline-jellied bombs dropped in Korea, the ever-present threat to use the atomic bomb there, prove that racism is an export commodity to be forced upon colored peoples. Long have Negro Americans understood this truism. Now they call upon progressive white Americans to heed their warning, for the consequences otherwise are too terrible to contemplate.

A BILL OF PARTICULARS

This bill of particulars, *We Charge GENOCIDE*, is the documented story of the frame-up of thousands of innocent Negroes; of the attempt to stamp the brand of criminality on Negro youth; of packed lily-white juries; of the intimidation of lawyers and witnesses; of police brutality and murder, legal lynching, Ku Klux Klan and mob violence; of racist laws enforced by city, state and Federal officials and courts; of denial of the vote, Jim-Crow in employment, the ghetto system, premature death and malnutrition and preventable diseases; of the imposition of colonial-like relations in the Black Belt, segregation in and denial of education, and of Jim-Crow in departments of government and the

armed forces. But this remarkable document is also the true story of a terrible attack upon the moral and religious sensibilities of white Americans.

This is genocide. It was condemned by the General Assembly of the United Nations in its Convention on Genocide in 1948. But genocide is an American way of life—the way of the master-class, of the so-called “respectable people.”

Is it any wonder that the U.S. Government has not ratified the Convention on Genocide? The rulers of the U.S. use the U.N.'s name to sanction their bloody deeds in Korea; yet they will not endorse the U.N.'s Convention on Genocide. But since the Convention has already been ratified by the required number of nations, the U.S. is legally bound to observe its provisions—even without signing. That is why we will carry this record of genocide by the U.S. Government to Paris and to the General Assembly of the United Nations.

THE BLOODY ROAD

Follow the road of terror, lynching, Jim-Crow discrimination that runs from Scottsboro, Alabama, and the attempted murder of Haywood Patterson and eight other innocent black youths, to Cicero, Illinois, and the crime of that Northern state against Harvey Clark, a Negro seeking to free his family from the evils of ghetto life. You will find it strewn

with the maimed, tortured, and dead bodies of innumerable innocent Negro victims. The old Southern lynching-bees have now given place to new forms of violence that can be introduced everywhere. These forms of legal lynching conceal both the intensification of the terror against the Negro people, the desperation of those who incite and sanction it, and the moral degeneracy of those who passively condone these horrors.

I ask you to consider these new acts of terror committed in the past few years. Ask yourself what is the political significance of this? Where is its profit? What is its moral content? There are:

The savage pogroms of Columbia, Tennessee; Monroe, Georgia; Groveland, Florida; Peekskill, New York; the cases of the Martinsville Seven, Willie McGee, Edward Honeycutt, Milton Lewis Wilson, Rosa Lee Ingram, and her two courageous sons, the Trenton Six, Robert Mallard, Maceo Spines, Isaac Woodward, John Derrick, Robert Kelly and his mother, Clyde Brown, the Groveland Two—one of them foully murdered and one shot by a lynch-crazed sheriff—Wesley Robert Wells, Jerry Newson, Theodore Jordan, Fletcher Bills, Bayard Jenkins, George Claybon; the case of that great champion of peace, Dr. William E. B. Du Bois won by the people's will to peace; my own case, the arrest and imprisonment of Benjamin J. Davis Jr., the projected frame-

ups of Pettis Perry and Claudia Jones; the insults thrown into the face of that great Negro artist, Josephine Baker, in a club frequented by J. Edgar Hoover of the F.B.I.; the attempt to murder Paul Robeson at Peekskill, and the State Department's cancellation of his passport so that the world might not hear from his lips the story of the crimes of government against his people in his native land. What a commentary on the morality of the rulers of these United States!

HOME-GROWN
"OPERATION-KILLER"

The crimes recorded in *We Charge GENOCIDE* warn of a future of untold greater horrors. We must seriously study this situation. Here is the home-grown "Operation Killer." We must challenge this Operation Killer with deathless courage, if it is not to lead direct to fascism. This picture presents monopoly's way of life—and death. It is called "American," but has no relation to the interests, aspirations or the demands of the people. Those who by their terrible deeds have drawn this picture, daily speak of a "free world" and declare their worthiness for moral and political leadership. We say to the American people as a whole that *a people which oppress another cannot itself be free!* The rulers of the U.S.A. operate against the national interest and against the people. Op-

eration Killer cannot be reconciled with Operation Freedom. *Which side are you on?*

We speak of the crimes of men controlling the administrative, judicial and legislative branches of city, state and Federal governments. These men possess great power. How do they use it? Deliberately, and in concert, they use it today in such a manner as to threaten the security of progressive mankind.

GENOCIDE—NURTURED
IN SLAVERY

Lynch intriguers are not new among the rulers of America. They are the logical product of the bipartisan betrayal in 1877 of our Civil War waged to end slavery, and the theories of white superiority with which the master class sought morally to justify slave-economy. Lynch intriguers are seekers of easy profits. Their racist theories are remnants of slavery, now grown and cultivated by the monopolists in their schools and churches. Swollen, like a giant octopus, these vicious theories have reached national proportions. The bedraggled flag of the Confederate slave oligarchy is now flown North, East, and West, as well as South. It heralds the victory of racist thought through the leadership of today's finance oligarchy. And those who fly it today are worse than those who first made this flag the symbol of their racist program.

Rampant chauvinism and atomic militarism are now added to racism. This way of life dictates and determines that the dominant clique in the U.S.A. shall attempt in the Far East the task they assigned to Hitler. These men have so taken over Hitler's philosophy, his language, his program of murder and rapine, that the myths he spewed of the glories of war and the sureness of victory are now being peddled by them and their spokesmen. These men fear and hate the people. They hear the freedom cries of the exploited and oppressed masses of the world and they are afraid. Thus alone can we account for their Smith Act and their McCarran Law and this Korean war.

They fear an end in the Near and Far East of the evils of landlordism, poverty, disease and ignorance they have caused to persist at home. For the Eastern peoples are heroically rising everywhere, moved by the spirit of free nationalism that is circling the globe. There are untold billions to be gained through Jim-Crowism and segregation enforced by lynch justice at home. But there are added billions to be drained from the blood of the more than a billion dominated colored people in the East. War, for the rulers of the U.S.A., is but an enlargement of legal and illegal lynching. There are untold sums of money in both. The men who rule America are trying to sell war as the only means of protecting and extending their "American way

of life." But the people want peace. What a glorious victory the people have won in the freeing of Dr. William E. B. Du Bois and his colleagues!

HOW WILL THE U.N. ACT?

This record of crimes we now submit to the United Nations. It has declared against genocide. How will it act? We believe that the responsibility to end the misery of ghetto life and the inhuman practices of the white supremacists does not lie with progressive Americans alone. Its malignant and dehumanizing effects extend beyond this country. *No people* can afford to compromise with those social forces that follow the course of Hitler—not even the people of Western Europe—and not even for the dollars of the Marshall Plan and the threats of an American boycott. The American people will not be a party to that blackmail threat. The U.N. Convention on Genocide opens the door for us to appeal for this international solidarity which can and must be achieved. It opens the door for progressive Americans to express their willingness to form a partnership with progressive Europeans and Asians, based on mutual respect and devotion to the cause of democracy and peace.

We have read the words with which Nazism was repudiated in the treaties that were written after the crushing of Hitler. We read them

again
Un
will
will
those
the U
the U
then
stand

"GRA

We
who
er arg
theory
swer
mand
The n
down
tomle
and
serve
theory

The
people
worse
Its so
for p
has i
labell
Herei
correc
evil u
must
Amer
and a
and ac

The
end of

again in every provision of the United Nations Charter. If the U.N. will not entertain our petition, that will be proof of its domination by those whose deeds we protest here. If the United Nations will not judge the U.S. Government by this record, then by this record the U.N. must stand adjudged.

"GRADUALISM" AND DEATH

We believe that white Americans who claim to be liberals can no longer argue the bankrupt and immoral theory of gradualism. It is no answer to the petitions of Negroes demanding their constitutional rights. The road marked "gradualism" leads down a blind alley ending in a bottomless pit, a well of moral infamy and death. The Dixiecrats openly serve to expose the falseness of the theory of gradualism.

The present status of the Negro people in this country could be little worse. It is branded with indignity. Its sons and daughters are marked for premature death. This people has in the halls of Congress been labelled "black sons-of-bitches." Herein lies undeniable proof of the correctness of our conclusion: *this evil way of life, spawned in slavery, must end now*—if fascism in its American form is to be destroyed and a people's democracy accepted and achieved.

The Negro people has reached the end of its endurance. It neither can

nor is it willing longer to accept this brutality that leads to utter annihilation. But it well knows that it cannot go far alone.

The Negro people has responsibilities to itself, to the America with which it is identified by blood and sweat and tears, and responsibilities to all progressive mankind. These it will not waive. It was not false to them in 1776. Its role was decisive in 1865 when the Confederate flag went down. It will be as true today when the slavocrat Confederate flag is flaunted again while the banners of world democracy fly higher and higher. Already, the Negro people is rallying its sons and daughters in the ranks of labor for leadership in the struggles ahead. The National Negro Labor Council is the organized expression of the basic core of the Negro people. It has issued a call to white labor to join in this struggle for the Bill of Rights and the 14th and 15th Amendments to the United States Constitution.

WHO IS DISLOYAL?

We have said that each branch of this government acts in concert with the others to maintain a frightful, genocidal way of life. Are we disloyal when we say this and offer irrefutable proof? If so, to whom are we disloyal? When has there been a moment since Reconstruction when the Administrative branch of Government could not have ended

Jim-Crow and segregation in its various departments and in the armed forces, if it so desired? There has never been a time when a President of the United States could not have directed the Department of Justice, so-called, to move for the outlawing of the Ku Klux Klan and other terrorist organizations. Who can deny this? Is it disloyal to our country to state this?

The Legislative branch of Government which created the un-American Activities Committee and uses it illegally as a weapon of terror against the progressives of this land, could long ago have created and legally used a Committee against the violators of the 14th and 15th Amendments and the Bill of Rights. But for most of the legislators, these 14th and 15th Amendments have long since become a scrap of paper.

An Attorney-General recently sought to excuse the failure of the Department of Justice to defend the lives and property of Negroes, with the lie that the Department of Justice had no power to act. It, of course, has that power in the Federal Civil Rights Law of 1873. But the Legislative branch of Government could have thrust the words down his throat by passing constitutionally sound, enabling acts to enforce the 14th and 15th Amendments. Instead, it passed the unconstitutional Smith Act, the McCarran Law, and the infamous Taft-Hartley measure in the

interest of reaction and of curbing the people and defeating their desire to protect democracy.

THE COURT EVADES

Time after time the Supreme Court has had before it issues that touched upon the fundamental rights of Negroes and of labor, thus showing their inseparable relationship. In tearful expectancy, Negro mothers, fathers, wives and children waited in vain for the judgment that should have returned their innocent young men to their homes. The court *always* evades basic issues of the people. When the frame-up of black men was obvious and the court could have saved them from legal lynching with a word of dismissal, if it entertained the appeal at all, the United States Supreme Court has *always* remanded such cases for retrial before the lynchers' tribunal of death. This was true of Scottsboro, more fatally true of the Martinsville Seven and Willie McGee, and now of the Groveland victims.

What a terrible crime is this murder of an innocent man by a sheriff who had his victim handed back to him by a pliant and subservient U.S. Supreme Court! How deep the cancer of moral degeneracy when that sheriff is freed by a jury of his peers because he only killed a Negro!

No branch of government has ever sought to check another's violation

of th
alica
And
Dem
our
their
Neg
have
exce
moci
of N

BIP

Bi
featu
again
thro
the
ernin
prod
were
gove
peop
coun
wou
truth
struc
But
the
Sout
olig
since
them
exerc
poll
ende
bein
gogu
ever

of the constitutional liberties and inalienable rights of a black citizen. And since 1877 both Republican and Democratic parties have controlled our government. The differences in their treatment of the petitions of Negroes for a redress of grievances have been only in degree, and these exceedingly slight. Both have made mockery of the fundamental rights of Negro citizens.

BIPARTISAN GUILT

Bipartisanship has been a major feature of the crimes of government against the Negro people. It was through a bipartisan compromise that the democratic Reconstruction governments of the once rebel states, a product of a revolution for freedom, were destroyed. They were the only governments "of the people, by the people and for the people" that this country has ever known. Lincoln would have appreciated this historic truth and seen in them an indestructible safeguard for democracy. But this compromise of 1877 restored the slave landlords to power in the South. The remnants of the slave oligarchy in power in Dixie have since secured permanent places for themselves in Congress through the exercise of terror and that infamous poll-tax system which both parties endorse and could end—monopoly being willing. These Dixie demagogues use the filibuster to strangle every measure intended to extend

democratic procedure or guarantee respect for human dignity. Their subversive actions have bipartisan acceptance.

Now, the center of direction and control of racist reaction has shifted from the South to the North. The South still leads in the commission of acts of legal terror and mob violence, but only by a slender margin. The battle flag of the Confederacy flies wherever the agents of American reaction dominate, even over hills captured by Americans, called "U.N. forces," fighting in Korea, where the Chinese and the Koreans are referred to by racist epithets, as are the Negro troops themselves, fighting under Confederate Jim-Crow ideology, if not a Dixie flag.

CRIME OF THE ECONOMIC ROYALISTS

The petition we present in behalf of the Negro people and progressive Americans exposes and indicts the owners of the economic wealth of the United States, and the corrupt politicians they and their Costello and Pendergast-like gangsters have placed in power in government. It weakens the drive of these men toward war. *However, this petition while addressed to the United Nations, does not absolve progressive Americans of the great responsibility to themselves and mankind to raise the fight here against genocide to levels never reached before.* It does not excuse

passivity and indifference. Perhaps what we can do will spare us neither war nor fascism. But since neither are inevitable, both can be stopped by the struggle waged against those whose policy breeds war and fascism. Let us rally for the struggle all who are not hopelessly corrupted.

We have traced the deliberate and calculated ruthlessness of these men in government. We have traced their planned use of the institutions of government as weapons of terror against Negro Americans and now against militant and progressive whites. We disclose their conspiracy of government, a conspiracy in which every branch of government is involved. The conspirators do not come from the ranks of America's exploited and oppressed white men, women and youth. The conspirators are the policy-makers, the actual rulers, of America.

GENOCIDE IS A PATTERN

Where we have shown individual barbarities in the book it is not for the purpose of placing emphasis there. This picture must be seen as a whole. By their number, their similarity and scope, we have shown that these crimes could have occurred only where there exists a policy of government which demands terror to insure the enforcement of a criminal way of life. The cases, though individual, are not isolated. They are parts of a pattern, a terrible pattern of *genocide*.

The book *We Charge GENOCIDE—The Crime of Government Against the Negro People!* differs in a basic way from the *Black Book of Nazi Atrocities Against the Jewish People*. That book was written after the Second World War when some few of the Nazi leaders sat before the court at Nuremberg. The bloody deeds had been done. *We Charge GENOCIDE* is written before the monsters we condemn have been able to launch their Third World War. Our petition carries a warning which, if heeded, can spare us the immeasurable horrors of that war.

We ask that the men in control of the government of the United States face the charge of Genocide as defined by the Convention on Genocide of the United Nations and be answerable to the law. They are not yet too powerful to escape the consequences of their crimes. The security of today demands a reckoning today.

TERROR UNCONFINED

For the masses of Negro workers and farmers of the South, this homeland is becoming a vast torture chamber. The rantings of depraved and cowardly Dixiecrats match the fith spewed from the mouth of any Nazi. Do not believe that their terror will be confined to the South or that the victims will be only Negroes.

It is true that reaction in our country has bought some Negro men and women. For money and a title these Negro hirelings will travel the wide world over preaching the glories of this blood-thirsty dollar-democracy. But the proof here will overwhelm these agents of the lynchers and give the lie to their statements.

Our defense of constitutional liberties, civil and human rights, must be based upon the undying love of the vast majority of the American people, Negro and white, for the magnificent documents that are our heritage. We must strive untiringly to create a united front of action defending every victim of social and political persecution. We must not forget our obligations to victims in the American hemisphere of the repressive programs our rulers are exporting. The police, whose early-morning raids have broken peaceful sleep in hundreds of homes in the U.S.A., now have the power to arrest indiscriminately, citizens of the U.S.A., in Mexico, Cuba and perhaps elsewhere whom the thought-controllers want at home. For men and women here or in other nations now to remain silent is to take a consenting part in these crimes.

Even if we have not yet achieved that "government of the people" of which the immortal Lincoln spoke, there are victories which the united power of the people in struggle can win today.

- Full and complete equal op-

portunity and rights for all minority groups regardless of race, nationality, creed, color or political affiliation can be won.

- The Ku Klux Klan and all other terrorist gangs can be outlawed.

- The spewing of racist filth and anti-Semitism can be made a crime against the people.

- Fair Employment Practices can be made a law assuring the stability of the right to work.

- The inviolability of dwelling can be enforced. The ghetto system can be destroyed and all restrictions on residence based on color, creed, nationality or political belief ended by law.

- Jim-Crow and segregation can be rooted out of every branch and department of government, and the practice of either made punishable by law.

- Lynching can be made a crime against the Federal Government, with death the punishment.

- The poll tax system can be abolished.

- The Dixiecrat weapon of the filibuster can be destroyed, and progressive legislation passed in Congress.

With these and other changes accomplished, our government would begin to reflect the will of the people.

TOWARD UNITY IN STRUGGLE

We are calling upon the U.N. to

act favorably on this petition. But regardless of the outcome, these are a few of the conditions for which we fight. The thinking of the white supremacist has sunk deep into the minds of white Americans. Its effect upon the thinking of even Negro men and women has been extremely harmful. But the victims of genocide, both white and black, can find unity in struggle. The battle against the racists is being mounted everywhere. Victories on a world scale have already been won. We face the last great bastion of the enemy of mankind. It, too, is not impregnable.

We Charge Genocide! And we dedicate ourselves to the task of wiping it out!

This country is too small to hold

both the formulators and breeders of lynch justice and white supremacy and those who fight for a people's democracy. The blood of the thousands of black victims of lynching and of inspired mob violence cries out aloud to us: "*Put an end to these evil ways! Bring justice and democracy to America!*"

From the dead lips of Samuel Shepard of Groveland, Florida, comes the call that justice be done, that his death be avenged. Samuel Shepard, though dead, calls aloud for an end to these terrible crimes in the name of peace and democracy.

We will carry on to victory—a people's victory and a people's peace.

By H

WHAT
the 19
official
still m
two o
nomin
workin
to vote
But
man's
moven
genera
experie
this ar
change
countr
have u
ment i
tions.

THE

Wh
in 194
still a
concer
were
was i
ganda
ment
1947
plan
naked

1952 and Labor's Political Course

By Harris Young

WHAT COURSE will labor follow in the 1952 elections? The dominant official position, like that of 1948, is still marking time to see whom the two old parties of capitalism will nominate on the assumption that working people have no choice but to vote for one of the two.

But much has happened since Truman's re-election in 1948. The labor movement and the working class in general have learned much from the experience of the past three years. In this article we shall note some of the changes that have taken place in the country and the influences they may have upon the role of the labor movement in the coming presidential elections.

THE SITUATION IN 1948

When Truman ran for re-election in 1948 his "cold war" program was still at an early stage and illusions concerning his "peaceful" intentions were still strong. The Marshall Plan was in its first year. False propaganda on its objectives, like the statement of Philip Murray at the CIO's 1947 Boston convention that it was a plan to "feed the hungry, clothe the naked and shelter the homeless and

give medicine to the sick," still influenced the thinking of many workers.

The full economic consequences of the shift to an armament-building economy were not yet perceived by the workers. The issue was not yet a choice between guns *or* butter. The arms budget, although big, was only a fraction of the present outlay that eats up more than 70 percent of a budget that is almost up to wartime levels. We were then in an early stage of an economic crisis and mounting unemployment. Some sections of the workers even looked with favor to a buildup of a war economy as a prop for declining industries and employment.

Hopes were also strong in Truman and the Democratic Party for repeal of the Taft-Hartley Law. Some labor leaders at least entertained the belief that with Truman in the White House, labor needn't worry too much on stringent application of the law.

Illusions were also strong concerning Truman's rosy promises on civil rights and an FEPC. The widely publicized civil rights report of the President's Commission was still fresh in the minds of the Negro peo-

ple when they voted for Truman by overwhelming majorities.

Also, Truman's "welfare" program still looked attractive. Its exclusion by a full-blown war economy in peace time, was not anticipated by many. Thus it was, with Truman's eleventh-hour all-out demagoguery still ringing in his ears, that Murray said as he opened the CIO convention in Portland two weeks after the election: "We put all our might and our effort together with the expenditure of legitimate monies toward the election of President Truman and a liberal Congress: and we won! The people won! Thank God for that."

George Meany, secretary-treasurer of the A. F. of L. who was as enthusiastic over the "victory" in 1948 as Murray was, stated at the A. F. of L. convention held this fall in San Francisco that labor's stock was never so low in Washington as it is now. "We heard it so often said that labor had won," he went on, "that I am afraid a lot of us were convinced we had done it all along."

He gave an indication of the kind of response the A. F. of L.'s political arm was getting in its frantic appeals for two dollars a member: only \$592,922 in 1950 from its 8,000,000 members.

THE CHANGE SINCE 1948

The most obvious change since Truman's re-election has been brought about by a year and a half of war in Korea, with its officially

acknowledged casualty list of Americans already beyond 100,000. The myth that Truman is for peace has been shattered. The arms industry has become a Frankenstein with an insatiable maw. A wage freeze has been put into effect, although price control is a mockery and the wage dollar is already below 50 cents in terms of its pre-war purchasing power. Two tax increases were slapped on the pay envelope and more of the same is promised.

While wages lag even behind the government's cost-of-living index, profits continue to run at a rate twice that of the peak wartime annual take. This is indeed a gilded age for the war profiteers, with a total of \$5 billion in war contracts awarded in 16 months after Korea and billions more in the form of arms aid to collaborators of Wall Street abroad.

The workers are also beginning to learn the truth of the Marshall Plan, now nearing the end of the four-year stretch set for it. Even the labor leaders who worked so hard to tie the unions to it, are returning from Europe with sad reports on the results. It should be remembered that it was through the claim that the Marshall Plan would "feed the hungry" and "strengthen democracy" in Western Europe, that the trade unions were seduced into hitching onto the war chariot and the Democratic Party's political machine.

It was in the drive for support of the Marshall Plan that the CIO was split and many unions were expelled.

raided
the co
The
been
and it
fruits
have
They
dressed
belief th
illusio
the w
report
C.I.O.
confir
rect th
they
Plan.
ers' I
head
affair
saw i
The
poor
for th
nists
have
We
free
why
make
like
As f
Living
deleg
"The
failur
conce
Th
shall
mini

raided and in some cases smashed at the cost of many millions of dollars.

The labor leaders who of late have been so critical of the Marshall Plan and its application, and of the fascist fruits it is producing in Europe, still have not reversed their basic position. They are pressing for some window dressing in the program, in the belief that this may help them revive illusions in the war policy among the workers. In the meantime, the reports brought from Europe by C.I.O. and A. F. of L. leaders have confirmed for the workers how correct the Left-progressives were when they refused to back the Marshall Plan. Amalgamated Clothing Workers' President Jacob Potofsky, also head of the C.I.O.'s international affairs committee, said of what he saw in Europe:

The rich are getting richer and the poor are getting poorer. This accounts for the growing number of Communists in France and Italy where we have poured millions of ECA money.

We are hurting the morale of the free nations. They can't understand why a democracy like ours should make combinations with autocracies like Franco-Spain.

As far back as August, 1950, John Livingston, heading a U.A.W.-C.I.O. delegation in Europe, told newsmen: "The Marshall Plan is a miserable failure as far as the common man is concerned."

The sharpest criticism of the Marshall Plan and of the Truman Administration, came from the platform

of the A. F. of L.'s convention. Charles MacGowan, head of the Boilermakers and an A. F. of L. vice-president, on his return from Europe, said of the West European beneficiaries of the Marshall Plan: ". . . instead of improving the condition of the workers as a part of the Marshall Plan aid program, they have established their iniquitous cartels."

As to the role of "labor" in this program through E.C.A. "labor attachés," of which the A. F. of L. and C.I.O. leaders were very boastful, MacGowan said: "I found their spirits low. They feel that they are practically useless because of this policy of not being consulted at least in an advisory capacity."

MacGowan's comment was typical of what George M. Harrison of the Railway Clerks and other A. F. of L. leaders reported. They all rationalized that things would have been better if the "original purposes" of the Marshall Plan had not been forgotten. But all their talks add up to an admission that the honied words they used to describe the Marshall Plan in its initial days were designed to cover up its real nature as a program for militarization and conquest. It exposes the bankruptcy of the A. F. of L.-C.I.O. foreign policy position.

Recent experience has also shattered the popular 1948 belief that Truman is a champion of civil rights. The gradualists among some leaders of the Negro people, and the white top labor bureaucracy to which they

are allied, have had very slim pickings upon which to build a confidence in Truman. The past year was the worst in many. It included the executions of the Martinsville Seven and Willie McGee, the Cicero outrage, the Florida murders and widespread brutalities against the Negro people in ghettos of numerous Southern and Northern cities. This record and the absence of an effective F.E.P.C. after five years of promises leave little confidence in Truman as a "champion" of civil rights.

The change in America has been especially profound on the civil liberties front. The Supreme Court decision validating the Smith Act and the conviction of the Communist Party's leaders, climaxed the process of undermining the Bill of Rights that was already developing rapidly.

This development has alarmed even some Right-wing leaders of labor, especially those of the C.I.O. The latter's 1951 convention, summarizing the depressing picture on civil liberties, declared that the Smith Act convictions constitute a "grave blow to America's precious heritage of freedom of speech." This alarm is spreading far beyond the ranks of the Left, because this fascist-like drive is already taking a heavy toll among non-Communists and is paralyzing even the movement for mild reforms headed by the Right wing.

Equally significant is the growing realization in the labor movement that the increasingly throttling effects of the Taft-Hartley Law as the ad-

ministration applies, and the courts approve, one after another of its basic provisions, is part and parcel of the general effort to deprive Americans of traditional rights. The fact that the Supreme Court handed down a series of drastic rulings upholding the Taft-Hartley Law on the same day it upheld the Smith Act, truly symbolized for the workers the oneness of this struggle.

THE RISING MILITANCY OF THE WORKERS

The disappointments since the "miracle" of 1948, have spurred the workers to greater reliance upon their own militancy. This shows itself mainly in the struggle against the economic effects of the war program, very often in defiance of the labor leaders who try to get the workers to submit to a policy of sacrifice. The basic feature of the current struggle is the obvious unwillingness of the workers to submit to *any* sacrifice. There is also a strong pressure among the workers for seizure of the present opportunity to *lift* living standards beyond the "catch-up" formula before the expected economic decline sets in.

The "mass sickness" that seized the railroad workers early in 1951 and tied up the railroads gave some indication of the mood that was sweeping the workers. Their direct interest was economic. But their attitude implied also a rejection of the Administration's war policy. Frantic

appeals by the war mobilizers and even by the President on the ground that the country was in "danger," seemed to make little impression upon the workers. They obviously did not feel there was a justified ground for an "emergency" nor that the country was in peril.

The steel negotiations were preceded for months by a wave of "wildcat" stoppages in the steel plants of every area. Hardly a day passed in most of the important steel centers without such stoppages on a plant-wide or department basis, over seemingly "small" issues. But the fact that workers "exploded" so readily with as many as 26,000 involved in some cases, as in Birmingham, showed what a combustive feeling there is among the workers in the country generally. The steel workers' union's general office has been deluged with thousands of resolutions from the locals pressing for a substantial raise and for important changes in the contract.

The situation is basically the same in the auto plants. A movement is spreading for abrogation of the five-year contract which would hold the workers to four more years under the fraudulent cost-of-living escalator and subject them to a clause allowing unrestrained speedup while mass unemployment and periodic plant shut-downs continue. Walter Reuther's administration has not been under such strain and rank-and-file pressure since he took office.

The movement against Reuther's

program is crossing old dividing lines among the U.A.W.'s members. A notable example is the Right-to-Left united front in Ford Local 600 based on a program of saving the jobs of thousands, stopping the moving of departments to other cities, for a shorter workweek, and a return to a peace economy. Such unity to meet the needs of the workers is taking one or another form in many sections of the U.A.W.

Perhaps the most dramatic of the events in this trend of militancy among the workers was the recent 26-day strike of New York A. F. of L. longshoremen. It was a strike both against the shipowners for improvements that would break through the wage freeze, and against the stooges and gangsters of the shipowners in their union headed by "King" Joe Ryan. The solidarity of those workers for so long a time was especially remarkable in view of the fact that the full force of the "emergency" empowered government and waterfront gangdom was employed against them. The strike of these workers came nearest to linking the struggle on economic issues to the fight against the war program of the imperialists.

The struggle of major importance in the recent period was the nationwide strike of copper workers called by the progressive-led Mine, Mill and Smelter Workers, with the cooperation of a number of A. F. of L. craft unions in the industry. The strike was ended after a week by

Truman's invoking the Taft-Hartley injunction. But by showing its readiness to strike again after expiration of the 80-day limit, the union forced an average raise of 15 cents an hour plus a pension and other concessions equal to five or six cents more an hour. Most of that increase was "above ceiling"—the first significant break-through of the freeze in a basic industry.

It is the militancy of the workers, of which we have given only an indication, that has forced the C.I.O.'s convention to pass a resolution declaring its intention to break the wage freeze in the new round of steel and other negotiations. Yet only some weeks earlier, when heads of eight progressive-led unions expelled by the C.I.O. met in New York and declared themselves for cooperation to smash the wage freeze, some C.I.O. leaders resorted to the demagoguery of calling their decision a "commie line." Life and pressure from below is having some influence even on the Right-wing leaders.

Another very important development from below that is causing discomfort to top labor leaders and some Negro leaders cooperating with them is the rapid growth of the Negro Labor Council movement. The Cincinnati convention with more than 1,000 delegates, 80 percent of them Negro trade unionists from the shops, and local unions, gave some indication of the growth of this movement for a more vigorous drive for full rights for the Negro

people and for the Negro workers in the industries and unions. The convention was undoubtedly an indication of the growing dissatisfaction with any kind of lukewarm leadership in the struggle for Negro rights. It was a demand for greater vigor in this struggle, with the Negro workers pressing for leadership.

The President, too, apparently felt the vigor of this movement and the need for another empty gesture to bolster his supporters among the Negro people against this new movement. His order for a toothless committee to "investigate and advise" on the enforcement of F.E.P.C. clauses in government contracts is too transparent to fool anyone. His action only proves that he feels the need of doing something to revive his sagging support among the Negro people.

THOUGHTS ON 1952

From the foregoing it should be evident that the trend among the workers is to move away from Truman and in some important respects even from his war program. But for the most part it is not yet a conscious or consistent peace sentiment; nor has it taken an organized political form. The workers have come up against the affects of the war program—especially its economic consequences for them in the wage freeze, higher prices and taxes—and such by-products as the more intense oppression of the Negro people and

suppression of civil liberties. They are showing an increased dissatisfaction over it.

But it is wrong and dangerous to view this dissatisfaction among the workers as a conscious peace movement. Their experience offers the peace forces the opportunity more easily to show that a guns *and* butter economy is not possible and that the fight for peace is interlocked with the fight for a decent living standard, free unionism and collective bargaining, an end to discrimination and other such elementary objectives.

But it should also be borne in mind that if the advanced peace forces do not raise this developing trend to a higher level, the pro-war forces will succeed in channeling it to their path, with such proposals as more war work to "solve" unemployment or an immediate A-war to "get it over with." In what direction are the labor leaders steering? In the main, the top leaders are still trying to hold the workers within the confines of the two old parties of capitalism. But they are up against greater difficulties than ever to make their bankrupt political line attractive to the workers. Their difficulties produced a hodge-podge of political confusion that throws more discredit upon their political "non-partisanship."

The A. F. of L. convention, approving a line set by the Montreal executive council meeting, sharply criticized the Truman administration and Democratic Party bosses on

the ground that labor is "ignored" in the selection of candidates. The A. F. of L. threatens to "sit out" campaigns where its advice is ignored on nominees. At the same time, the A. F. of L. is putting very strong emphasis on the "non-partisanship" of its political position. Formally the A. F. of L. was "non-partisan" between the two old parties since its inception. But in the light of the close relations with the Democrats on the part of most of the leaders since 1932, its strong emphasis on "non-partisanship" today amounts to moving away from the Democrats.

The Building Trades Department of the A. F. of L., its leaders usually the main influence in top A. F. of L. circles, gave a clearer expression of the trend among some labor leaders when its bulletin recently denounced Truman for his "terrible labor record" and charged that he never pressed seriously for Taft-Hartley repeal. But the bulletin came to the strange conclusion that the workers should switch to the Republicans in 1952 and thereby teach the Democrats a "lesson." After four years of Republican rule, runs the reasoning of these leaders, the trade unions will regain a "respect" from the Democrats and repeal of the Taft-Hartley law will be possible in the 1956 presidential election.

This line of defeatism and hopelessness shows to what sad state the A. F. of L. and C.I.O. political line has brought labor. But it has re-

ceived the endorsement even of the United Mine Workers *Journal*. Put into effect, this is a line of withdrawing the workers from political activity. It can only mean sitting out the presidential election next year because the workers could not possibly be mobilized to vote for the "worst" candidate to teach the Democrats a "lesson."

The C.I.O.'s top leaders are also in a quandary. Philip Murray and his close associates have apparently concluded that there is no possibility but Truman within the Democratic Party. So his people have already begun to renovate the President as a "labor" candidate. They are cognizant that the only alternative for C.I.O. workers to support of the Democrats is a third ticket. Several of the C.I.O.'s major unions, in fact, have gone on record in their conventions for a "third party" in the indeterminate future. Among them are the United Automobile Workers and the textile union.

Last spring the auto workers' union convention voted for a united labor conference to be called by the now defunct United Labor Policy Committee, at which labor's political course in 1952 should be decided. This was interpreted by Reuther himself as an effective step for "independent" political action by labor and was offered as a sop to the strong U.A.W. convention sentiment for a labor party. When the union's secretary-treasurer, Emil Mazey, denounced both Truman

and Eisenhower at the C.I.O. convention, he evoked considerable applause.

But it is precisely because Murray and associates realize they will find it extra-hard to deliver labor votes to Truman next November, that they have already begun to extol the President's qualities as a "labor candidate." Murray's windup speech at the C.I.O. convention was practically a nomination speech for Truman. Some weeks later, Joseph A. Beirne, vice-president of the C.I.O. and head of its communications workers' union, started the ball rolling with an endorsement of Truman.

Thus, it is clear that if the political thinking of the top A. F. of L. and C.I.O. leaders is to "guide" labor, the votes of 15,000,000 unionists would be tossed to the two old parties, to candidates that will scramble for them, on a program of war, a heavier burden on the workers, a blackout of civil liberties and more intense violence against the Negro people.

Within the framework of this division and confusion, McCarthyism will make the most of the situation by concentrating Red-baiting fire upon those few who have been to some degree responsive to their labor constituents on domestic issues. Here is how Frank Rosenblum, secretary-treasurer of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers, pictured the situation in his notable speech before the New York State C.I.O. convention:

"How are we sowing fear, hate and division at home? Well, we are getting into the habit of substituting trial by committee for trial by jury. . . . We have begun to institute thought control. . . . The McCarthys, the McCarrans, the Tafts, the Wherrys and others of the same stripe have a field day."

On the one hand, the labor leaders demand candidates of "stature" they can endorse. On the other, they show that candidates labor leaders could support cannot win nomination or refuse to take candidacies in the two old parties.

THE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE PROGRESSIVES

While misleadership or an evasion of responsibility is the picture among the ruling bureaucracy of labor, what is the outlook of the progressive-led unions and rank-and-file forces within other organizations? This section of the labor movement is attacked by the A. F. of L. and C.I.O. leaders mainly for refusing to tie itself to the Democratic Party's kite and support the Administration's war program. Labor's progressives have generally called for independent political action by labor. In fact, those unions were expelled for holding to that position.

One would expect that the strong vindication of the position of the progressives by life itself in the past three years, and the trend among the workers to move away from Truman, would spur the leaders of those or-

ganizations to a still greater effort for 1952. Unfortunately, however, of late there has been little evidence of political activity or even discussion of political perspective, in this section of the trade-union movement. The recent convention of the U.E., for example, limited its political resolution to a resolve not to tie the union to any political party. Other progressive unions have not gone much beyond the U.E.'s position.

Many weeks have passed since the Progressive Party proposed a third ticket that would be broader than the P.P. itself, provided immediate steps were taken. But if labor's Left is slow in moving, what could be expected from forces farther out to the Right?

The very weak participation of the progressive-led unions and groups in the recent New York City election, the big majority of them not even giving formal endorsement to Clifford MacAvoy, the American Labor Party candidate, is a danger signal. Some of the progressive-led unions seem to have wrapped themselves in a cloak of "economism" which amounts to a serious underestimation or an actual exclusion of political action and, in effect, to a sort of "Left" syndicalism. It seems inconceivable that progressive unionists in this late historic period, should seriously believe that struggles of the workers could be limited to a "pork-chop" level, or that political thinking has nothing to do with the struggle. Have we not an abundance of evi-

dence of the way the demagogy of the war-mongers and illusions in Truman are used to scuttle and disrupt even some struggles of progressive unions? Underestimation of labor's independent political action is in reality an effort to avoid the key struggle of today.

There is no justification for such feelings today and there is certainly no valid reason for minimizing the strength of the progressives in the labor movement. The progressive-led unions, despite four years of effort to destroy them are here with a total membership of some 600,000—a great force if united and in motion. There is also a substantial progressive influence in the Right-wing unions. But the potential strength is far greater, if given leadership, because, as we showed, the workers in general are becoming more receptive to the program of the progressives.

There is another factor. The top labor bureaucrats whether pro-Democrat or pro-Republican, will score some success, and spread their poisonous pro-war line even into the ranks of progressive forces, if not met by an effective progressive political campaign. From the standpoint of their own preservation as progressive unions, or as a rank-and-file movement, those groups should see the urgency of waging such an effective political campaign. As they have

learned, after paying a high price, they most often have to wage a political campaign to win NLRB elections in the plants, because they have to beat the propaganda of the Red-baiters, war-mongers, and wage-freezers to win the workers.

The trend of the past year that gave the progressive unions like the U.E. and Mine-Mill Workers' many important N.L.R.B. election victories in the face of the most intense Truman-line propaganda against them, should also convince them that the political trend among the people is turning against pro-war stooges in the labor movement. The 1952 campaign offers the progressives in labor a further opportunity to extend and consolidate their influence provided, of course, no time is lost in ensuring their members and followers a peace ticket they could vote for.

Equally important is the responsibility of the progressives to the people of America in general. A vigorous and fighting ticket on a platform of peace, end of the wage freeze and the war economy, for Negro rights and restoration of civil liberties, could be an important influence in the entire political fight of 1952. Essentially, such political struggle in 1952 will be the carrying forward of the struggle for the same vital objectives that the progressive wing of labor fights for every day in the year.

(Polit

Alexand
bution
ism, J.
Amter.
Febru
Great
ployed
Andreu
in Pu
Basett.
stitut
Blanca.
Stand
McCar
Bittelm
in's T
The I
Where
May.
Debat
spirat
the P
Blacks.
Camp
Union
August
gle A
Blumbe
for '5
Brookm
Negotin
Cantor.
Negro C
Capek.
her. f
Chu Tel
Wall
Commun
of the
ber. t
Commun
tion—
for I
37: M
Conve
Commun
tee—
of Ou
of P
Peace
Appea
1-3.
Commun
—Get
lectiv
Davis.
to th
Liber
Dennis.
on B

Index, 1951

(Political Affairs, Volume XXX, January-December, 1951)

AUTHOR INDEX

- Alexandrov, G.—A New Outstanding Contribution to the Treasury of Marxism-Leninism, June, 70-83; July, 65-73.
- Amter, Israel—A Letter to the Convention, February, 218-219; Foster—Leader of the Great Historic Struggles of the Unemployed, March, 79-83.
- Andreu, Cesar—The Rising Tide of Struggle in Puerto Rico, February, 220-228.
- Bassett, Theodore R.—Washington's "Constitution" for Puerto Rico, April, 64-74.
- Bianca, Michael—War Economy and Living Standards, September, 44-53; How to Fight McCarthyism, October, 23-30.
- Bitelman, Alexander—The Triumph of Lenin's Teachings, January, 38-53; Foster—The Leader of Our Party, March, 67-67; Where is the Monthly Review Going?, May, 34-53; MacArthur and the "Great Debate," June, 7-17; Who are the Conspirators?, July, 9-31; Mass Tasks Facing the Party Today, September, 15-27.
- Blake, George—The Marcantonio Election Campaign, January, 80-90; The Trade Union Movement and the McGee Case, August, 23-32; New Features in the Struggle Against Fascism, October, 41-49.
- Blumberg, Albert E.—The Electoral Outlook for '52, April, 53-63.
- Brockman, Joseph—The Korean Cease-Fire Negotiations, August, 12-17.
- Cantor, Esther—Tear Down the Walls of the Negro Ghetto, June, 48-57.
- Capek, A.—The United States in Asia, October, 52-64.
- Chu Teh—On the Defeat of Chiang Kai-shek, Wall Street Puppet, August, 38-47.
- Communist Party of India—Draft Program of the Communist Party of India, September, 55-64.
- Communist Party, U.S.A., Fifteenth Convention—Working Class and People's Unity for Peace (main resolution), January, 1-17; Messages, Reports and Speeches to the Convention, February, 3-252.
- Communist Party, U.S.A., National Committee—William Z. Foster—Foremost Leader of Our Party, March, 1-5; America's Hour of Peril—'Unite! Save Democracy and Peace!, July, 1-8; "The Court of Last Appeal is the American People," October, 1-3.
- Communist Party, U.S.A., Ohio State Board—Self-Criticism and the Struggle for Collective Leadership, June, 31-39.
- Davis, Benjamin J.—Foster's Contribution to the Cause of National and Colonial Liberation, March, 36-50.
- Dennis, Eugene—Greetings from Behind Prison Bars, March, 6-7; Peace—the Supreme and Over-riding Issue, April, 1-9; The MacArthur Ouster, May, 1-8; Intensify and Broaden the Fight for Peace, May, 9-18; The Fight for Peace Goes On, June, 1-2; "Our Cause Is Invincible," August, 1-11.
- Dreiser, Theodore—"To Him I Owe Very Much," March, 95-96.
- Editorial—Defend the Freedom of Cultural Expression, June, 2-6.
- Elder, John—A Fascist War Incendiary Unmasked (review of *Titte and Goliath* by H. F. Armstrong), July, 90-96.
- Fine, Fred M.—Developing Peace Actions, April, 43-52.
- Fisher, Martin—Urgent Tasks for Strengthening the Party, November, 29-36.
- Flynn, Elizabeth Gurley—The Militant Traditions of Labor Defense Inspire Our Fight Today, February, 124-132; The Early Years of Bill Foster, March, 51-56; The Smith Act Strikes Again, August, 18-22; What the Supreme Court Unleashed, September, 28-32.
- For A Lasting Peace—On the Glorious 30th Anniversary of the Communist Party of China, August, 33-37.
- Foster, William Z.—American Capitalist Hegemony, the National Emergency and "Totalitarianism," February, 3-11; Truman's "State of National Emergency," March, 8-12.
- Fries, Istvan—Wages in the Society of Socialist Construction, May, 78-85; June, 84-96.
- Gannett, Betty—Some Ideological Tasks in the Struggle for Peace, February, 183-194; A Non-Historical Treatment of Democracy, April, 81-96; The Second Anniversary of the Chinese People's Republic, October, 31-40.
- Gates, John—Sharpen the Fight Against Browderism, Titoism, Trotskyism, February, 79-87.
- Gordon, Joseph—The Epic Advance of Soviet Agriculture, November, 22-28.
- Gordon, Max—Crime and Capitalism, June, 18-30.
- Hall, Gus—Summary Speech to the Convention, February, 12-20; William Z. Foster, Leader in the Struggle for World Peace, March, 13-21; The Stalin Interview—a Blow at the Warmongers, April, 15-24; On Collective Leadership, July 43-49; On Independent Political Action, December, 33-41.
- Hall, Rob F.—The Meeting of American Foreign Ministers, June, 40-47.
- Hammersmark, S. T.—Foster's Early Struggles Against the Labor Misleaders, March, 88-90.

- Ibarruri, Dolores**—The Struggle of the Spanish People Against Franco, November, 44-60.
- Jackson, Jim**—The Effect of the War Economy on the South, February, 106-123.
- Jerome, V. J.**—Let Us Grasp the Weapon of Culture, February, 195-215; Wall Street Orders a "Peace" Treaty, September, 1-14.
- Jones, Claudia**—For the Unity of Women in the Cause of Peace, February, 151-163; Foster's Political and Theoretical Guidance to Our Work Among Women, March, 68-78.
- Krchmarek, A.**—Czechoslovakia: Building Socialism and the New Man, August, 48-68.
- Lannon, Al**—"One Hand for the Ship and One For Myself," March, 84-87.
- Levinson, Albert**—The Passing of an Old-Guard "Socialist," November, 37-43.
- Malik, Jacob**—An Historic Call for Peace, July, 22-27.
- Mao Tse-tung**—Concerning Practice, April, 28-42.
- Martel, Harry**—Letter (concerning the Article on Psychoanalysis), May, 94-96.
- Martel, Henri**—Sectarianism Must Go!, April, 75-80.
- Minor, Robert**—A Greeting to the Convention, February, 216-217.
- Morris, George**—What the C.I.O. and A. F. of L. Conventions Show, January, 69-79.
- Neruda, Pablo**—Festival of Youth, October, 50-51.
- Newman, Henry**—The Stake of the American People in Philippine Independence, May, 54-63; On Bacteriological Warfare (review of Materials on the Trial of Former Servicemen of the Japanese Army Charged with Manufacturing and Employing Bacteriological Weapons), November, 61-64.
- Patterson, William L.**—The Epic of Peekskill (Review of Peekskill, U.S.A., by Howard Fast), May, 89-93; "We Charge Genocide!," December, 42-53.
- Perry, Pettis**—Our Work Among the Farming Masses, February, 133-150; Farm Question in California, July, 50-64; Certain Prime Aspects of the Negro Question, October, 6-22; The Soviet Union's Consistent Peace Policy: Lessons from History, November, 1-11; Negro Representation—A Step Towards Negro Freedom, December, 1-15.
- Potash, Irving**—On Broadening the United Front for Peace in the Trade Unions, February, 169-174.
- Rochet, Waldeck**—Defense of French Agriculture and the Working Farmers, May, 69-77.
- Raymond, Harry**—J. Edgar Hoover's American Gestapo (review of The Federal Bureau of Investigation by M. Lowenthal), January, 91-96.
- Ross, Carl**—The Youth in the Fight for Peace, Against Militarization, February, 175-182.
- Roxbury, W.**—A Critical Comment Pertaining to the Article on Psychoanalysis, April, 93-94.
- I. A. Seleznev**—Stalin on the War Danger and the Possibility of Averting It, December, 16-32.
- Siskind, George**—Letter (concerning the Article on Psychoanalysis), May 14-16.
- Smith, John S.**—For a Five-Power Pact for Peace, July, 28-42.
- Stalin, Joseph**—Interview with Francis B. Saypol, April, 10-14; Concerning the Atomic Weapon, October, 4-5.
- Starobin, Joseph**—The Second World Peace Congress, January, 54-63.
- Stein, Sid**—Labor's Living Standards and the Struggle for Peace, May, 19-31.
- Stewart, George**—The Chicago Group of Finance Capital, July, 74-89.
- Thompson, Robert**—Comrade Foster's New Book—a Great Marxist Work, February, 88-105.
- Walker, Richard**—An Inspiring Novel of Negro Life and Struggle (review of In City, by L. L. Brown), August, 104-106; The Issues Behind the Truman-Stewart Exchange, September, 33-43; Dressing for the War They "Do Not Want," November, 12-21.
- Williamson, John**—The Main Directions of the Party's Trade Union Work, February, 54-73; An American Labor Leader Within Peer, March, 22-35; Labor's Living Standards and the Struggle for Peace, May, 3-33.
- Winston, Henry**—Gear the Party for Its Great Tasks, February, 21-53; A Plan to Activate the Clubs, April, 25-31.
- Winter, Carl**—Ours is a Party of the New Type, February, 74-78.
- World Peace Congress, Second**—Main Documents of the Second World Peace Congress, January, 64-68.
- Wortis, Rose**—Foster's Leadership of the Needle Trades Workers, March, 91-94.
- Young, Harris**—1952 and Labor's Political Course, December, 53-62.

over's Ann
Federal B
Lowenthal

e Fight
n. Febru

ment Pers
analysis B

War Doo
ing It, Dec

urning the
y 14-16
lower Part

Prison Co
concerning
s.
World Pea

standards of
y, 19-21
Group of 5

Foster's W
ork, Febru

ing New
review of
August, 19
uman-Shwe
; Dressing
nt," Novem

Directed
ork, Febru
Leader Whit
Living and
Peace, Mar 5

Party for
2-53; A Man
il, 25-27
ty of the 19

nd—Male
Peace Comp

dership of
March, 21-23
Labor's Polit



NEW PAMPHLETS

MUST THERE BE WAR? by Joseph Clark	\$.10
HOW TO PROTECT YOURSELF FROM THE ATOM BOMB, by R. Friedman03
GRASP THE WEAPON OF CULTURE, by V. J. Jerome10
WHITE CHAUVINISM AND THE STRUGGLE FOR PEACE, by Pettis Perry10
THE SOVIET UNION BUILDS FOR PEACE, by L. Beria10

NEW CENTURY PUBLISHERS • 832 Broadway, New York 3

STATEMENT OF THE OWNERSHIP, MANAGEMENT, AND CIRCULATION REQUIRED BY THE ACT OF CONGRESS OF AUGUST 24, 1912, AS AMENDED BY THE ACTS OF MARCH 3, 1933, AND JULY 2, 1946 (Title 39, United States Code, Section 253)

Of Political Affairs, published monthly at New York, N. Y., for October 1, 1951.

1. The names and addresses of the publisher, editor, managing editor, and business manager are: Publisher, New Century Publishers, Inc., 832 Broadway, New York 3, N. Y.; Editor, V. J. Jerome, 832 Broadway, New York 3, N. Y.; Managing Editor, None; Business Manager, Joseph Felshin, 832 Broadway, New York 3, N. Y.

2. The owner is: (If owned by a corporation, its name and address must be stated and also immediately thereunder the names and addresses of stockholders owning or holding 1 percent or more of total amount of stock. If not owned by a corporation, the names and addresses of the individual owners must be given. If owned by a partnership or other unincorporated firm, its name and address, as well as that of each individual member, must be given.) New Century Publishers, Inc., 832 Broadway, New York 3, N. Y.; Joseph Felshin, 832 Broadway, New York 3, N. Y.

3. The known bondholders, mortgagees, and other security holders owning or holding 1 percent or more of total amount of bonds, mortgages, or other securities are: (If there are none, so state.) None.

4. Paragraphs 2 and 3 include, in cases where the stockholder or security holder appears upon the books of the company as trustee or in other fiduciary relation, the name of the person or corporation for whom such trustee is acting; also the statements in the two paragraphs show the affiant's full knowledge and belief as to the circumstances and conditions under which stockholders and security holders who do not appear upon the books of the company as trustees, hold stock and securities in a capacity other than that of a bona fide owner.

5. The average number of copies of each issue of this publication sold or distributed, through the mails or otherwise, to paid subscribers during the 12 months preceding the date shown above was: (This information is required from daily, weekly, semiweekly, and triweekly newspapers only.)

JOSEPH FELSHIN, Business Manager

Sworn to and subscribed before me this 28th day of September, 1951.

(Seal)

MYRON J. BLUTTER

(My commission expires March 30, 1952.)

"A distinguished contribution to the literature of our time," say -

Herbert Aptheker	Betty Gannett	John Howard Lawson
Lloyd L. Brown	Hugo Gellert	Pettis Perry
Howard Fast	Barbara Giles	Waldo Salt
Joseph Fields	Louis Harap	Samuel Sillen

of the forthcoming new novel

A LANTERN FOR JEREMY

by **V. J. JEROME**

Illustrated by Hugo Gellert

Scheduled for Publication in March, 1952*

Price \$2.50

* A LANTERN FOR JEREMY, by V. J. Jerome, is the first in an expanded program of book publishing which began with Lloyd Brown's "Iron Curtain" and which will include in 1952 a novel by Phillip Bonosky, an autobiographical work by Joseph North, a volume of poems by Nazim Hikmet, and a fifth anniversary anthology, all under the imprint of

MASSES & MAINSTREAM, 832 Broadway, New York 3, N.Y.

n
C
to
ik

N