

POLITICAL AFFAIRS

*A magazine devoted
to the theory and practice of Marxism-Leninism*

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

VOLUME XXIV, NO. 10

Contents

OCTOBER, 1945

America Needs the Communist Party	<i>Eugene Dennis</i>	867
Truman and the Republicans	<i>Adam Lavin</i>	876
Issues and Candidates in the New York Elections	<i>Max Gordon</i>	882
Reconversion and the Negro People	<i>Thelma Dale</i>	894
Historic Lessons of the Struggles in Greece	<i>Resolution of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Greece</i>	902
Correspondence Between Luis Carlos Prestes and William Z. Foster		913
What Is the Outlook for the Jewish People?	<i>Alexander Bittelman</i>	918
Puerto Rico and the Struggle Against U. S. Imperialism	<i>M. B.</i>	935
Patriotism	<i>N. Baltisky</i>	947
VITAL DOCUMENTS:		
Statement of the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party		959

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: \$2.00 a year; \$1.00 for six months; foreign and Canada, \$2.50 a year. Single copies 20 cents.

PRINTED IN THE U.S.A.

 209

AUTHORS AND TOPICS

EUGENE DENNIS is a member of the National Secretariat of the Communist Party, U.S.A. * * * LUIS CARLOS PRESTES, whose exchange of letters with WILLIAM Z. FOSTER, National Chairman of the Communist Party, U.S.A., appears in this issue, is Secretary General of the National Committee of the Communist Party of Brazil, recently freed after ten years of imprisonment for his heroic leadership of the anti-fascist struggle of the Brazilian people. * * * ALEXANDER BITTELMAN is a member of the National Committee of the C.P.U.S.A. and Secretary of the *Morning Freiheit* Association. * * * THELMA DALE is Acting Secretary of the National Negro Congress. * * * MAX GORDON is a member of the Editorial Board of *The Worker* and *Daily Worker* and a specialist in New York State politics. * * * ADAM LAPIN was for several years Washington Correspondent of the *Daily Worker* and is now a member of its Editorial Board. * * * M. B. is an authority on Latin American affairs.

The November issue of *Political Affairs* will contain an analytical summation of the pre-Convention discussion leading to the reconstitution of the Communist Party of the U.S.A. The article will be authored by Max Weiss, National Educational Director of the Communist Party.

The circulation of *Political Affairs* has maintained a stable level of 20,000 during the past six months. Of this number, approximately 7,500 are in the form of annual subscriptions. With the upswing in political activity following the vacation season, we look to a sharp increase in subs and a further expansion in the readership of our magazine.

AME
COM

COMRA
I speak
you w
Comm
ing ab
of our

To e
ment
of tra
and p
dear i
what

Our
ment,
a crisis
the A
posses
and c
an un
to, ou
—so t
and d
before
age.

For
munis
from
strong
shall
jealou

* Spe
New Y
of the
Comm

AMERICA NEEDS THE COMMUNIST PARTY*

By EUGENE DENNIS

COMRADES, FRIENDS: I feel sure that I speak for each and every one of you when I say that we American Communists have a very special feeling about this, the 26th Anniversary of our Party.

To every family there comes a moment of awareness that the shadow of tragedy has fallen on its home, and passed. And all that we hold dear is dearer for the realization of what we might have lost.

Our family, our Communist movement, has just passed through such a crisis. Fortunately for ourselves and the American people, we did and do possess sufficient Communist stamina and courage; we did and do have an unshakable faith in, and devotion to, our Marxist principles and ideals—so that we were able to overcome and destroy the virus of revisionism before it could do irreparable damage.

Tonight we rejoice that our Communist organization has emerged from this fateful crisis united and stronger than ever. In the future we shall know how to guard ever more jealously our Party, which is at once

our very own and also the common property of the American working class from which it sprang.

We are not alone in placing the deepest value on the Communist movement, the vanguard Party of the working class. In the course of the war against Hitlerism and the Axis, the freedom-loving peoples of all lands, all sincere anti-fascists, acquired a new and more realistic appreciation of the role of the Communists as the staunchest champions of democracy, peace and social progress. Yet, in the United States—in the most industrially advanced country of the world—there are many people still backward enough to believe that a modern nation can afford the luxury of being without a Communist Party of its own.

But every patriot in every land scourged by the flames of the anti-fascist war knows better. There is Yugoslavia, a small and weak nation, impoverished by centuries of feudal and reactionary rule. It should have been an easy thing for Hitler to enslave Yugoslavia. But, Yugoslavia had riches not listed on the stock exchanges, and a strength outside the calculations of the typewriter generals.

Yugoslavia had a Communist Party, and out of it came Tito, who inspired and led an army of people's guerrillas who achieved gloriously the liberation of the Yugoslav peoples.

It is the same story almost everywhere we look—in China, France, Greece, and Italy. Where there was a Communist Party, the core of anti-

* Speech delivered at Madison Square Garden, New York, September 18, 1945, on the occasion of the celebration of the 26th Anniversary of the Communist Party.

fascist resistance was firm, the fight for freedom went on to victory.

History has found more than one way of teaching mankind this basic truth. It has given us the examples of Germany and Japan, where, at least temporarily, the Communist Party was destroyed, the working class and the people were divided and rendered leaderless, and thus the Nazis and the Japanese militarists obtained a free hand to rob, torture, and oppress, to unleash World War II, to imperil the fate of mankind. Contrariwise, history has also given us the epic example of the Soviet Union, where the working class and its Communist Party took power, built Socialism, smashed the Nazi aggression, and consequently saved world civilization in its greatest trial.

Is the Communist Party of the United States so different from its Communist working-class brothers in other lands that it is less devoted to the interests of its class and its people? Is the United States so different from all other nations that it has nothing to learn from their experiences? Affirmative answers to both these questions are being fed the American people, and that is not a healthy thing for our nation or for the world.

We are not yet a large Party, but we have over 12,000 of our best sons in the armed forces. Hank Forbes, Herman Botcher, and many others like them will not be coming back to us. Their insight, as Marxists-Leninists, into the nature of fascism, their true understanding of

patriotism, their loyalty and devotion to the working class and the nation made them leaders among the men beside whom they fought and died. The nation has publicly acknowledged its debt to many Communist fighters, including our own Bob Thompson. Even the War Department has found it necessary publicly to repudiate the slander that Communists are not loyal and able fighters in defense of democracy.

* * *

But we American Communists are in no mood to boast of our war record, of our signal contributions to victory over fascism. We have our own yardstick of working-class service. And by that yardstick we have taken our own measure and found ourselves deficient in certain respects.

Our stern test tells us that, while it was essential and invaluable it was not enough to uphold labor's no-strike pledge, to struggle for Negro rights, to fight for the Second Front, to advance the world unity of labor, to work for the re-election of Roosevelt, to help cement the unity of the nation and the mighty anti-Hitlerite victory coalition. We Communists say that by our own fault we failed to give *all* that history asked of us. For we have been guilty in the recent period of costly mistakes, of revising Marxism. And this limited the scope and quality of our vanguard role in the struggle against fascism and actually resulted in the liquidation of the Communist Party, the independent political party of the

Ame
rooti
polic
for o
of de

But
called
now
we C
error
It w
who
corre
steer
of M

TI
claim
betw
sarie
right
we
scien
land
our
prog
ners
the
vict

M
the
deny
a ne
any
the
whic
We
that
fasci
Jou
ber

American working class. Only by rooting out our former revisionist policies were we able to avert disaster for ourselves, for labor, for the camp of democracy.

But these mistakes were never called to our attention by those who now question our patriotism. It was we Communists who recognized our errors and set about correcting them. It was we American Communists who brought our Party back on the correct course and who are now steering our ship with the compass of Marxism-Leninism.

This is the greatest service we can claim to have performed in the year between the 25th and 26th anniversaries of our Party. It gives us the right to declare, in all modesty, that we share kinship and a common science with the Marxists of other lands. It gives us the right to ask that our fellow-citizens—workers and progressives—join with us as partners and allies in unitedly shaping the destiny of our country, now that victory is won.

* * *

Men who themselves, did not have the anti-fascist war at heart would deny us that right. They have begun a new campaign to exclude us from any participation in the solution of the many complex problems with which our nation is now confronted. We learn from subpoenas, and from that ill-famed organ of American fascism and reaction, Mr. Hearst's *Journal-American*, that on September 26 the House Committee on

Un-American Activities will "investigate" the American Communist Party. It will examine the "change in our line" about which committee investigators like Charles Coughlin's former associate, Ralph Burton, have already drawn their own pro-fascist conclusions.

It seems that the gentlemen of Congress who have taken up where Martin Dies so reluctantly left off are alarmed because all kinds of alleged Communist "blocs" have suddenly become active in this country.

A so-called Negro "bloc"—in reality, a broad, progressive coalition of American democratic forces, both Negro and white—demands jobs for returning Negro veterans and laid-off war workers, a permanent FEPC and repeal of the poll-tax. A so-called Jewish "bloc"—in reality, a broad, progressive coalition of American democratic forces, both Jewish and Gentile—fights anti-Semitism. Greek-Americans, embraced in an all-American democratic coalition, make so bold as to clamour for a little more democracy and an end to reactionary foreign intervention in Greece. Italian-Americans, embraced in an all-American democratic coalition, want democracy in Italy. German-Americans, in common with the entire American people, take an interest in destroying the vestiges of Hitlerism and in the democratic re-education of the German people. There is even, "a Far Eastern Communist 'bloc' that 'meddles' in the affairs of China." That is, there is a coalition of patriotic

Americans which demands that the peace terms for imperialist Japan shall be modelled after those imposed by the United Nations on Nazi Germany; which favors United Nations action against militarist-feudal Japan; and which supports the establishment of a strong, united and democratic China.

We are not responsible for the ominous conditions which give rise to the so-called "Far Eastern bloc meddling in the affairs of China," nor for any other of the "blocs" in which the Congressional Committee professes an interest. But we deeply share with the American people those liberating aims for which they fought the war so dearly won.

We Communists will not permit the men of the trusts, the economic royalists, to substitute their private vested interests and objectives for the national liberation aims of the peoples; we will not rest until the peoples' democratic aims are fully realized. We will not accept the soft-peace aims for Japan as advocated by the State Department and practised by General McArthur. We will not agree to a divided and reactionary China, to continued American support for the pro-fascist Kuomintang dictatorship in Chungking which breeds civil war and an unstable peace in the Far East.

The Un-American Congressional Committee, whose guiding genius is John Rankin of Mississippi, finds that our new National Committee of 55 has among its members 31 comrades from two minority groups.

Naturally, this also is an alarming fact demanding "investigation." For Rankin would like to rid our country, not only of Communists, but also of Jews and Negroes, and, of course, of trade unionists.

However, the Communist Party is a stumbling-block in the way of Rankin's ambitions and of the whole program of the Southern bourgeois and reactionary finance capital.

Therefore, according to these proponents of un-Americanism, the first thing is to get rid of the Communists. This is a truism that Rankin learned from Martin Dies, who in turn picked it up from two ersatz gentlemen named Hitler and Goebbels. As a matter of fact, the reactionary American monopolists, with their editors and politicians, subscribe to this thesis, as do even some members of the Truman Administration.

In the past few months we have convinced ourselves, if not the wishful-thinkers in the camp of reaction, that our American Communist Party is a pretty hardy plant and can withstand, not only outward storms, but hidden canker. The secret of our strength and dynamic vitality is indeed to be learned from a study of the Marxist-Leninist science by which we live.

But the House Un-American Committee is not motivated by scientific curiosity, nor is it converting itself into a Marxist study circle. Its sudden interest in our "line" is just a new scheme for trying to put us out of mass activity.

More subtle means for achieving the same end have already been tried against us. We have been ridiculed. Hearst and Roy Howard, even the staid New York *Times* and *PM's* learned Max Lerner have all had their fun at our expense. Fun over our so-called "flip-flops," our public "breast-beating," our "orgy of confession."

But it appears that we have no sense of humor. We Communists did not die laughing at ourselves, nor did we become demoralized laughing at each other. When ridicule failed, abuse was heaped upon us. But we are tough, and survived abuse. So now our enemies, who again have proved themselves equally to be enemies of the American people, are trying to isolate and discredit us by painting a more lurid and alarming picture.

The broad outlines of this picture have already been sketched for us by the Hearst *Journal-American* in its issue of September 10. We are to be portrayed as "agents of a foreign power," "fomenting strife and dissension." Yet these were the epithets hurled against our Party when it issued its birth-cry in 1919.

After the last world war, the NAM used the cry of Communism to divide the American labor movement and to divert the attention of the people from a serious solution of the great issues of jobs, security and peace. And this is why the Department of Justice used the red-herring to vindicate its Palmer raids, and why Hamilton Fish spread the bogey

of Communism over the pages of his investigating committee.

Whenever the nation faces a crisis, whenever reaction prepares to launch a new offensive, a new effort is made to behead the labor movement of its advance guard, with the same old weapons of Red-baiting, slander and intimidation. And so it is again, today.

But perhaps some of the younger comrades do not remember by what "strange" means we Communists supposedly used to foment "strife and dissension" in the past. Some years ago, we said it was possible to organize the steel workers, and Bill Foster led a strike in 1919 to lay the foundation for that wondrous achievement.

We also said the automobile industry could be organized, and the marine workers, and the electrical workers—and all the mass production industries. Believe it or not, the workers agreed with us and did the job. And in time, what resulted from all our "fomenting" was not industrial strife and dissension, *per se*, but the beginnings of the orderly process of collective bargaining, and an upsurge of labor's organized, independent political action.

Foster and Amter, and many of our other comrades, led the great unemployed movement in the dark years of the Hoover depression. That, too, came under the name of "strife and dissension." But, in time, even Congress came around to our way of thinking, and Federal unemployment compensation and social

security were enacted into law.

When the veterans of World War I marched to Washington demanding their promised bonus, Pete Cacchione was one of the active organizers of this movement. Nor should it be forgotten that the same Douglas McArthur, who today uses kid-gloves toward the Japanese fascist butchers, personally commanded the troops which shot down the bonus marchers.

Ben Davis and Bob Minor exposed the Scottsboro case as a national scandal, and Elizabeth Gurley Flynn and Mother Bloor championed the cause of Sacco and Vanzetti. There has been more justice in our land since those memorable battles in which we played our part with honor.

We were called "foreign agents" when we protested against U. S. aid to Kolchak and the other White Russian counter-revolutionists, when we asked our government to establish normal diplomatic relations with the workers' State, the Soviet Union, when we called for sanctions against the fascist invaders of Ethiopia, when we called for arms to the Spanish Republicans, when we said no more scrap iron to Japan.

As befits a vanguard Party, we Communists were always a step or two ahead of the American people and the working class. But each of our "visionary dreams" of yesterday was rooted in the needs and aspirations of the working class and the people—that is why many of them have already become the realities of

today. Our ultimate goal of Socialism, which we keep ever bright before us, is but an extension of this democratic process. It, too, will someday be reached when the American people so will it.

* * *

But there is something new to be added to the old, old story when the House Committee on Un-American activities starts its witch-hunt next week. Exhibit A will be the article written by the French Communist, Jacques Duclos, calling attention to our former revisionist errors.

This will be offered as the clinching documentary proof that we are un-American and get our orders "from abroad."

We American Communists answer that it was we, and we alone, who were responsible for our mistakes. And further, that the first criticism of our mistakes came from the outstanding leader of our own Party, from Comrade Foster. It was out of his experience in the American labor movement, the Left wing of the Socialist Party, the I.W.W., and, above all, the American Communist movement, that Foster and subsequently the rest of us found the wisdom to oppose, combat and defeat the Browder revisionist line.

Of course, all of us appreciate and are grateful for the sound fraternal advice of the French Marxist, Duclos. Marxism is a science, and therefore knows no national barriers. We Marxists, as social scientists, are internationalists. However, we Marx-

ists
chan
of th
ples
and
of p
And
of w
peop
Ev
to ca
beca
went
ters
as in
the
coun
To
lorie
from
for
polit
so lo
Fren
Roos
lianc
men
othe
react
and

If
ly in
can
itself
natio
cons
our
our
ditio
certa

ists are working-class scientists, and champions of the unity and solidarity of the workers and democratic peoples of all lands. We test our findings and our conclusions in the crucible of political struggles, in life itself. And we resolutely support the cause of world labor, of all freedom-loving peoples.

Even the worst jingoes have yet to call the atom bomb un-American because the work of foreign scientists went into its invention. What matters in the social science of society, as in any other science, is whether the analysis is correct—not what country it came from.

Today we Communists are pilloried for accepting sagacious advice from the French Communists, and for drawing our own independent political conclusions therefrom. Not so long ago the Vichyites called the French Communists "agents of Roosevelt" for advocating the alliance of the French resistance movement with the United States and the other United Nations. So much for reaction's interest in scientific truth and analysis!

* * *

If the House Committee were really interested in exposing un-American activities, it would concern itself, not with our proletarian internationalism which is thoroughly consistent with the best interest of our nation and which is rooted in our country's great democratic traditions, but with all brands of a certain kind of "internationalism"

which betrays the interest of our nation and which works to foment strife and dissension at home and predatory wars—that is, the "internationalism" of the great cartels and monopolies, of Du Pont, Standard Oil, and Westinghouse.

Westinghouse, just to take one example, owns 20 to 30 per cent of the Mitsubishi Electrical Engineering Co., a part of the vast Japanese cartel system. A spokesman for Mitsubishi has told an American newspaper correspondent, "We reserved their dividends for them during the war. They can get them whenever they come."

That is monopoly capital's brand of "internationalism." That is one of the cues to the current soft-peace policy which Washington and London are pursuing towards Japan.

At home, Westinghouse has just used a company-union inspired strike of white-collar workers as an excuse for locking out production workers who ask a \$2 wage increase. That, too, is how monopoly foments strife and dissension.

But the House Committee on Un-Americanism will not pursue its investigation along these lines. For the trail would lead from Ford, Du Pont, Rockefeller and Westinghouse to Rankin and Bilbo, to Vandenberg and Wheeler, and who knows how far beyond!

* * *

We may anticipate that when the Un-American House hearings begin, our championship of American-So-

viet friendship will once again, and even at this late date, be charged against us.

Those who question our patriotism on that score do so because they have not yet given up hope of disrupting the United Nations Organization and splitting the Big Three, the unity of action of the U.S.A., the U.S.S.R., and Britain. It is they, and not we, whose patriotism must be questioned. It must be remembered that the war has taught the American people how staunch an ally is the Soviet Union in battle, and how vital an ally she is in the post-war period. They have seen American-Soviet friendship prove the keystone of the arch of victory. They know that if it crumbles, the house of peace will not long stand.

Wrestling with their own knotty problems of reconversion and demobilization, the American people learn with interest that these questions are more easily and quickly solved in the world's first socialist State, where there is no unemployment, where the right to work is the law of the land—a law validated by the Socialist system which has abolished the basis of unemployment.

Strengthened bonds of friendship and new channels of experience and communication have been opened up; new voices are heard in praise of the Soviet Union. Of first importance is the fact that world labor is at last outgrowing the anti-Soviet prejudices with which it was so long poisoned by world reaction. Now it is a Sir Walter Citrine,

a Philip Murray, who answer the lies of the George Meanys and the Mathew Wolls. In the future, those who try to stir up trouble between the United States and the Soviet Union must reckon, not only with us Communists, but with the majority of the American working people.

* * *

Nor are we Communists responsible for the strife and dissension with which big business circles now threaten to rend our own country. We are not responsible for the growth of unemployment and for the mounting attacks of the corporations upon the unions and the living standards of the people. We are at one with the American working class and its allies in the desire for speedy reconversion, for jobs and security, and for the democratic unity of our nation and all the United Nations.

But we will not accept the "peace" of factories where no wheels turn, such as is imposed upon the 50,000 Detroit auto workers by Ford. Nor will we accept unity with the congressional saboteurs of President Roosevelt's postwar program for 60 million jobs.

It is true that our political line is the line of political mass struggle, of unity of action. We will not only participate in, we will help organize and lead, every struggle of the American people for jobs, full employment, higher wages, and the rights of the Negro people and of all minorities; for the strengthening of the democratic unity of the people

against the concentrated power of the trusts, and for the forging of the greatest unity of the Big Three. We will take our stand in the forefront of all those millions of Americans who are resolved not to endure again the strife and dissension, the force and violence, the hunger and despair that followed the first World War.

* * *

The American people must therefore conclude that while the United States can easily dispense with the House Committee on un-American Activities, it cannot afford to do without the American Communist Party. Least of all now, when all the signs point to stormy weather ahead.

The responsibility for giving our country the stronger, more united, independent Marxist Party it needs rests squarely upon our shoulders.

This is a time of testing for every individual, for every organization. What each of us does and what we do together will determine such vital issues as the final destruction of fascism, the establishment of a long-term peace, the winning of jobs for all.

We Communists meet the challenge of the coming days and months with confidence. The special convention of our Communist Party equipped us to fulfill our duties with honor and effectiveness.

We Communists will know better how to strengthen the organizations and the independent political role of labor, and above all its

unity. We Communists will know how to knit closer the democratic coalition of the American people. We Communists will know better how to cement the unity of the American-Soviet-British coalition and of all the United Nations.

Within our own Communist family we will achieve unity and singleness of purpose, and learn together how more effectively to master and apply the science of Marxism.

We American Marxists will not permit the posting of "quarantine" signs upon our house by a Congressional Committee or by any other reactionary source.

Boldly, as it is our inalienable right, we will continue to march ahead, to take our place in the front ranks of the struggles of the American labor and progressive movements. For this is our own, our native land, and we Communists have the faith, the vision, and the courage with which its labor and democratic traditions endow our people—the working people.

And thus, on our 26th anniversary, we American Communists declare:

Forge the unity of action of labor, of Communists and non-Communists, of all anti-fascists, of all democratic forces! Answer the enemies of our working class and our nation by joining the ranks of the Communist Party!

Complete the destruction of fascism! Forward to new struggles and new victories in the cause of jobs and security, democracy and peace!

TRUMAN AND THE REPUBLICANS

By ADAM LAPIN

THE REPUBLICAN PARTY has emerged in recent weeks as the party of unalloyed reaction, both in domestic and foreign policy. The obvious contradiction between the glib liberal double-talk of a Governor Dewey in the last election and the bleak record of the G.O.P. in Congress is being resolved. So far at least the Republicans are planning to conduct their 1946 and 1948 campaigns on the basis of outright opposition to the Roosevelt heritage, to every progressive proposal put forward by President Truman.

This generalization must, of course, be stated with reservations. There are still in the House and the Senate a handful of Republicans who occupy a position relatively independent of the Old Guard party leadership. Nor can it be assumed that the party leadership itself has completely exhausted the possibility of liberal demagoguery. In the New York City elections, for example, Governor Dewey's Republican slate is appealing to progressive voters—with the aid of its Liberal Party allies. The Liberal Party busily puts forward as vote bait far-reaching programs for social reform—which

the Republican Party in Congress is even more busily engaged in sabotaging.

But by and large the Republican leaders have chosen to rally around the slogans of "conservatism" and "free enterprise." This would appear offhand to simplify the task of defeating the G.O.P. in the crucial 1946 Congressional elections. Unfortunately the problem is not as simple as it sounds.

Three conditions will perhaps be most important in determining whether or not the Republicans can be decisively defeated in 1946: First, the record of the Truman Administration in acting to combat the trend towards economic crisis and to make minimum provisions for the welfare of the people. Second, the activity of the Administration and the Democratic Party leadership in combatting and exposing the reactionary Republicans and their poll-tax Democratic allies. Third, the extent and the solidity of the alliance between the Truman Administration and the Democratic Party on the one hand and the labor and progressive forces on the other hand.

There is no room for complacency or undue optimism about the manner in which the Truman Administration is fulfilling any of these conditions. And it must be assumed the G.O.P. leaders who are, after all, no political babes in the woods, realize this and are shaping their campaign strategy accordingly.

Although Wendell Willkie was never a decisive influence in the

ranks of the G.O.P. machine, the extreme reactionaries in the party have consolidated their sway since his death. Men like Senators Aiken or Tobey or Morse are hardly effective enough or consistent enough to constitute a significant counterweight. Senator Ball, the only Republican Senator who supported Roosevelt, has been spending most of his energy in devising methods for shackling the labor movement. Commander Stassen has been adroit in building his own prestige, but has shown no signs of tangling with the dominant leaders of the party.

THE HOOVER-VANDENBERG-TAFT G.O.P. LEADERSHIP

Men like Herbert Hoover and Senators Vandenberg and Taft are the undisputed policy-makers for the party. The titular G.O.P. leaders, like Governor Dewey and Republican National Committee chairman Herbert Brownell are the obedient mouthpieces for these policy-makers. For the time being the G.O.P. enjoys a unified leadership and a uniform policy. It is the party of the most reactionary sections of monopoly capital.

A radio address by Brownell on August 24 indicated the extent to which the Hoover-Vandenberg-Taft foreign policy has become official party doctrine. Brownell enunciated a program of brass-knuckles American imperialism.

The United Nations organization, he said, would be watched closely

and regarded with many reservations. This was substantially the same attitude as evidenced by the Hoover-Vandenberg-Taft policy-makers who gave lip service to the objectives of U.N.O. but made every effort to twist it into an anti-Soviet instrument.

Brownell laid the basis for American intervention in the democratic countries of Europe: "Shall we see the realization of our understanding of free elections and the expressed will of the peoples? Or shall something quite different but under the same name be carried out?"

There was at least implicit in the Brownell speech a plea for revising the Potsdam agreement on the boundaries of Germany, a plea against destroying the military potential of Germany. Brownell expressed grave concern at "the mass deportation of peoples and large transfers of territory being made." This can refer only to the scaling down of the Hitler Third Reich.

The G.O.P. chairman demanded to know the extent of American political—and financial commitments—abroad. He claimed that Roosevelt and Truman had already made financial commitments apart from Lend-Lease amounting to something like \$10 billion.

Here again his statement was fully in line with the actions of Republicans in Congress, and this is another example of how the gap is closing between pious statements by G.O.P. leaders and the performance of its

men in the House and the Senate. Taft, chairman of the G.O.P. steering committee in the Senate, had led the fight against Bretton Woods. And perhaps the most blatant statement of American imperialism came from Representative Harold Knutson, ranking Republican on the powerful House Ways and Means Committee, on the question of economic assistance to Great Britain.

"Uncle Sam became a glorified Santa Claus. I think it is high time we take the old gentleman into a barber shop and give him a shave. . . . Just what kind of saps do they think we are. . . . We should tell the government of the United Kingdom that if they wish to forcibly take over all major private activities that they must themselves finance it and failing in that, they should look to Moscow for such financing. The program that we are asked to finance is alien to our concepts of government and contrary to our philosophy of government."

TRUMAN'S CONCESSIONS TO THE G.O.P.

It should not be too difficult to expose the attacks of the Republicans on our Allies, to point to the dangers of war and imperialism inherent in their policies, to point the finger of scorn at the G.O.P. campaign on the Pearl Harbor issue in view of their own record of softening up the country politically for Pearl Harbor.

But for this it would be necessary for the Truman Administration to have a firm policy of international cooperation. For example, Administration spokesmen could more easily combat the demands of the Republicans for anti-democratic intervention in Europe if Secretary of State Byrnes were not espousing precisely the same policy in regard to Rumania and Bulgaria. This is not to say that the Truman and Hoover foreign policies are the same. But the frequent concessions to Hoover and Vandenberg, as well as the rise of John Foster Dulles as an official Administration adviser, certainly weaken the Administration's foreign policy position in the face of Republican attack.

This problem is reflected just as sharply in the field of domestic policy. President Truman has put forward a reconversion legislative program which on the whole is in the Roosevelt tradition and reflects the demands and aspirations of the labor movement. Republicans in Congress have fought that program in detail and as a whole. But the situation has again been complicated by Truman's reluctance to fight for his own program.

In his radio speech of August 24 Brownell had already attacked the full employment bill on the ground that it undermines free enterprise. Senator Taft followed up in the Senate Banking and Currency Committee by doing everything in his power to emasculate the bill and to

comb
prog
firm
mer
econ
The
F.E.E
Trum
to C
Repu
Com
action
Repu
privat
the p
quate
THE
AT
It
Presi
unem
mum
that
rectly
wage
peare
mitte
unem
disco
paid
Re
up th
indu
heari
need
lower
on t
voted
using
right

combat the efforts of labor and of progressive Senators to establish firmly the responsibility of government for filling in the gaps in the economy left by private enterprise.

The record of the Republicans on F.E.P.C., one of the points listed by Truman in his reconversion message to Congress, has been disgraceful. Republicans on the House Rules Committee helped to prevent House action on a permanent F.E.P.C., and Republicans on the House Appropriations Committee lined up with the poll-tax Democrats to block adequate funds for the agency.

THE G.O.P. LEADS THE ATTACK ON LABOR

It was perhaps in the case of President Truman's proposal for an unemployment compensation maximum of \$25 a week for 26 weeks that the Republicans acted most directly as the spokesmen for the wage-cutting monopolists who appeared before Congressional committees to argue that higher rates of unemployment compensation would discourage workers from taking low-paid jobs.

Representative Knutson summed up the attitude of the die-hards in industry by stating at one of the hearings that "bull-whips" might be need to drive war workers back to lower-paid jobs. All the Republicans on the Senate Finance Committee voted against the \$25 maximum—using the hoary argument of states' rights and allying themselves with

the most reactionary Southern Democrats.

On every important phase of the Truman reconversion program, the G.O.P. came forward in outright opposition; this opposition resulted in an interesting if inconclusive controversy.

Representative Joseph W. Martin, G.O.P. leader in the House, and Representative Charles Halleck, chairman of the G.O.P. Congressional Committee, promptly took the President's message as the beginning of the 1946 Congressional campaign. Halleck said that the G.O.P. would fight it out on the "old-fashioned issue of conservatism." Martin put it this way: "Now nobody should have any more doubt. Not even President Roosevelt ever asked for as much at one sitting. The scenery is new and there is a little better decoration and he [Truman] does dish it out a little easier. But it is a plain case of out-New Dealing the New Deal."

Democratic National Committee Chairman Robert E. Hannegan promptly picked up the ball in a statement which he had discussed with President Truman. There was no doubt from Hannegan's statement that both he and the President considered it good political strategy to take cognizance of the British elections, to consider the deep-rooted desire of the American people for progressive political action.

"The Democratic Party is prepared to wage its 1946 Congressional election campaign as a clear-cut,

straightforward battle against reaction," he said. "The air is now cleared of Republican 'me too' smokescreens and at election time Americans will know that they are being asked by Republican candidates for office to accept the 'old-fashioned conservatism' of the Republican Party. . . . With the battle lines sharply drawn, the Democratic Party will be all-out in support of President Truman's forward-looking postwar program. We are pleased that the basic issue is no longer confused."

In a weak rejoinder, Brownell accepted the statement of the issues as placed by Halleck and Martin, and in a slightly revised version of an ancient line said he had never had any doubt that "at what might be the appropriate time the Administration would line up with the Hillman-Browder-Foster elements of the New Deal."

At first glance it would appear that the Republicans have made a major political blunder; and it may still turn out that they have. But there is no reason to believe that the Republican strategists accept either the Hannegan statement or the Truman message to Congress at face value. They would appear to be basing their plans on the assumption that the Truman reconversion program will not be carried out.

TRUMAN RETREATS ON RECONVERSION PROGRAM

This, at least, has been the assump-

tion of many conservative political commentators. Arthur Krock summed up in the *New York Times* the course he apparently considered it likely the President would take: "By compromise of major details, or quiet acceptance of inaction or rejection of his recommendations at the Capitol, the President can reveal whether his philosophy is determined and aggressive, or whether it is merely intellectual preference and political strategy. He can keep in the middle of the road as the leader of the contending groups in his party by making and renewing his recommendations, and then leaving their fate to Congress reserving the veto as a final exercise of his official prerogative."

As this article is written, there is good reason to believe that the President is in fact taking this course. He retreated without a battle from the first major contest in Congress on his reconversion proposals. He made it clear in a memorandum to the Senate Finance Committee that he was prepared to accept its rejection of his \$25-a-week proposals on unemployment compensation, that he would not make a real fight on this issue.

If President Truman were to follow this strategy more or less consistently, the economic and political implications would be enormous. Without a consistent fight by the Administration it would be almost inevitable that the heart would be torn out of the Truman program in Congress. And this would mean not

only an aggravation of the economic crisis but also a deterioration of the living standards of the people and a shifting of the burden of the crisis more directly on the workers who would be unprotected by vital social legislation.

Under these circumstances the political advantage accruing to the Republicans becomes obvious. They can make the most of disillusionment among the masses, of bitterness with the Truman Administration. In the absence of any real fight for a program of governmental action, it is by no means political suicide for the Republicans to raise the slogans of real jobs in private industry against governmental planning and intervention. For inaction by Truman can result only in discrediting his own program and in opening up new possibilities for Republican demagoguery.

At the same time, it would result in weakening the ties between labor and the Administration and in seriously disturbing the unity of the coalition responsible for electing the Roosevelt Administration and Truman himself in 1944. It can hardly be expected that Truman can maintain an effective coalition by making purely verbal concessions to its progressive sections while making

the concessions of action or inaction to the poll-tax reactionaries and the more conservative business sections of his party.

There is no doubt that the principal overt attack on a foreign policy of international cooperation and of a domestic policy of progressive social reform comes from the Republican Party and its poll-tax allies in the Democratic Party. But it is also true that the attacks of the Republicans can no longer be resisted without reference to the serious tendency in the Truman Administration to conciliate and appease reaction.

In fact, the most effective way for labor and the progressive forces generally to combat Republican reaction is to take the leadership in the fight for an effective reconversion program and to force Truman himself to fight. It will be necessary to make it perfectly plain to President Truman and his advisers that he does not have labor and its allies in his pocket. The progressive forces will have to find other political alternatives if the only choice narrows down to a hide-bound reactionary Republican Party with fascist overtones and a Democratic Party which refuses to make a real stand for a progressive program and is constantly in retreat.

ISSUES AND CANDIDATES IN THE NEW YORK ELECTION

By MAX GORDON

If the municipal election campaign in New York City this year is a highly complex one, it is because the lines between progress and reaction are being shaped, preparatory to 1946, not only externally—between parties—but within parties, as well.

In part this is due to the death of President Roosevelt, whose immense personal influence among the rank-and-file voters of his home state and its chief city forced Democratic machine politicians into line, unified the independent voters and won for progress a section of the Republican voters.

In part, too, the struggle within and between parties has been reshaped and intensified as a result of shifts among sections of the bourgeoisie following the crushing of the Axis.

To be more specific, four distinct struggles can be discerned in the mayoralty race alone, and one somewhat less clearly defined. These are: (1) the struggle between the reactionary Dewey machine, represented by the Republican-Liberal Party-

Fusion coalition which supports the candidacy of Jonah Goldstein, and the progressive Democratic-labor coalition behind Gen. William O'Dwyer, which carried the state for FDR in past years and represents the Roosevelt-Lehman-Smith-Wagner tradition in state politics; (2) the effort of the anti-Soviet, disruptive Social-Democratic leadership of the Liberal Party to establish itself as a political force in the city and state by hoodwinking the progressive voters of the city through a Red-baiting, hypocritical "good government" campaign; (3) the struggle of the progressive labor forces under the leadership of Sidney Hillman and the American Labor Party to strengthen the independent political position of labor within the democratic coalition by achieving a huge vote for the ALP; and (4) the battle within the Democratic Party between the pro-Roosevelt forces, led by O'Dwyer, and the reactionary elements led by Bronx County boss and national committeeman Edward J. Flynn.

The less well-defined struggle is that within Republican ranks between the Dewey forces and anti-Dewey elements represented by Newbold Morris, candidate of the independent No Deal slate. This struggle is less well-defined because the direction of the No Deal Party and its effect upon the elections is by no means certain.

Because of the peculiar position of New York in the political life of the nation and because it is the home

of Governor Dewey, titular head of the GOP, each of those lines of struggle has important national implications.

THE MAIN ISSUE

It is almost inevitable in a New York election that the contending forces should reflect the major contending groups in the nation. Here you have the most progressive electorate and the center of the progressive movement. Here, too, you have the home of the most powerful financial circles in America with Dewey as their political instrument. The results of this election between these forces, reflected, in the main, in the mayoralty contest between O'Dwyer and Goldstein, will influence national political circles.

Governor Dewey is one of the shrewdest, most subtle and most consistent proponents of aggressive American imperialist policies abroad and of the Hooverite "free enterprise" school at home. If he has intervened directly in the New York mayoralty campaign it is not because he is interested in good government in New York City but because he considers that campaign important in order to permit him to retain his leading position within the Republican Party and to capture national power in 1948.

It is patent that he must win in the state in 1946 to remain in the national picture for the next presidential election. The margin of his

victory may also be of significance, since he will face considerable challenge within his party and he may have to show that he can control the state vote. Aside from that consideration, the 1946 state elections will generally provide a weather vane for determining popular political currents and hence will influence the direction of both major parties nationally.

With approximately half the state's voting population in New York City, the way the city goes has its effects upon state results. For one thing, there is the practical question of city patronage. Dewey has built powerful machines upstate through skillful and ruthless use of the state and local patronage weapon. He has greatly increased the strength of the city machine and his hold upon it through state patronage. He would, of course, love to get his hands on city patronage, and his position would be extremely hard to crack should he succeed.

But, more important, New York City elections can, and frequently do, determine the position of conflicting elements within the major parties in the state. In this case, if the O'Dwyer forces, and particularly labor, make a strong showing in the elections, then those groups within the Democratic Party that back coalition with labor will emerge stronger. If not, the reactionary elements within the Democratic Party that oppose such a coalition may take over next year and

disrupt it. Similarly, within the GOP, if Dewey's candidate, Goldstein, gets a severe beating, the anti-Dewey elements will become bolder and stronger.

The vote cast on the Liberal Party line for Goldstein will also have an important bearing in the future political struggles in the state. It will determine whether the reactionary Social-Democratic leaders of that party will be in a position to continue their divisive activities within the labor movement effectively or not.

The endorsements given to Gen. O'Dwyer by Eleanor Roosevelt and by Henry Wallace dramatize the national aspects of the campaign. They also emphasize the fact that he is the candidate of the principal forces supporting the program left the nation by the late President. Roosevelt, before he died, had indicated that he favored O'Dwyer as the man who could unite labor, the independent progressive forces associated with Mayor LaGuardia and the Democrats in the city mayoralty race. Had the President lived, this would probably have been the line-up.

As it is, O'Dwyer has the solid and active support of the entire labor movement, with the exception of some of the Social-Democratic-led unions. He has the backing of many outstanding New York liberals and middle class progressives, some of whom are actively campaigning for him through the Citizens Political Action Committee and the Inde-

pendent Committee of the Arts, Sciences and Professions. With the single prominent exception of Mayor LaGuardia, he is the candidate of all groups that genuinely backed FDR last year.

DEWEY AND GOLDSTEIN

The City elections found the Dewey machine in something of a dilemma. Any regular machine Republican candidate for mayor would be badly defeated among the progressive voters of New York, and hence was ruled out. Any liberal Republican nominee, of the stature of a Stanley Isaacs, was by that fact anti-Dewey, and hence could not be permitted to head the GOP ticket.

The Governor tried to get out of this difficulty by projecting, together with the Liberal Party, a tri-partite coalition of Republicans, Liberals and Democrats behind some innocuous "independent." While this would not have given him control of the city, it would have had the merit, from his viewpoint, of preventing it from falling into the hands of his political foes. In addition, it would have split the Democratic-labor coalition and isolated the American Labor Party, which was ideal both from Dewey's and the Liberal Party's point of view. The idea failed because the reactionary Democrats who were interested, represented mainly by Bronx Democratic boss Edward J. Flynn, could not carry the Democratic Party with them.

When that failed, the Governor and the Liberal Party got together and emerged with the nomination of a Tammany Democrat, Judge Jonah Goldstein, who was a defeated aspirant for the Democratic nomination. Judge Goldstein's nomination permitted Dewey to resolve his dilemma concerning the GOP nominee; for Goldstein could be counted on to do Dewey's bidding in office, since the Governor had dictated his choice. Secondly, it permitted a coalition with the Liberal Party, with whom Goldstein had been on friendly terms. Thirdly, Goldstein is Jewish, and it was extremely important for Dewey to overcome some of the hostility toward himself among the progressive Jewish voters in the city, a hostility based partly on an understanding of Dewey's reactionary political role and partly on the Coughlin-like character of his speeches last year.

Finally, Goldstein is the Judge who sentenced Morris Schappes, outstanding anti-fascist fighter, to a heavy jail sentence as an outgrowth of the notorious Coudert Committee witch-hunts in New York in 1940 and '41. In view of the Red-baiting character of the campaign planned by the GOP-Liberal Party coalition, this was an asset. It is likely to boom-erang, however, since Schappes is highly respected among many anti-fascists whom the Goldstein candidacy is designed to woo, and his conviction did not sit well with them.

As far as the Liberal Party is concerned, its coalition with Dewey behind Goldstein is the logical result of its whole development. Last year it formally backed FDR in the elections but its program was Dewey's. It was compelled to support Roosevelt because it could not otherwise hope to establish itself as a party. Its main function is to cause a split in the working class and progressive movements, which it would have been in no position to do had it not gone along with Roosevelt. Its main appeal in 1944 was designed, not to win votes for FDR, but to win FDR voters for the Liberal Party.

So flagrantly similar was its program to that of the GOP in the 1944 campaign that Max Eastman, notorious anti-Sovieteer and contributing editor of the *New Leader*, weekly organ of the Liberal Party's Social-Democratic leadership, wrote a lengthy article in that paper to show that on the basis of its anti-Soviet and Red-baiting program the party should have backed Dewey to the hilt and should have fought Roosevelt bitterly. He expressed the hope that the party would never again find itself in such an unprincipled position.

Despite that advice, the Liberal Party would have preferred not to line up with Dewey directly since that exposes its character too readily. Moreover, it would have preferred to break up the Democratic-A.L.P. coalition. Hence, when it was clear that O'Dwyer was the leading

contender for the Democratic nomination, the Liberal Party approached him with an offer to endorse him if he would agree to denounce the ALP and refuse to accept its endorsement. He rejected the offer emphatically. The Liberals then attempted, together with the Dewey machine, to promote the tripartite coalition. When that maneuver failed, they had no recourse but to show their hand and ally themselves directly with Dewey.

Actually all their maneuvers were, of course, designed to aid Dewey. The only way the GOP can be defeated in the state next year is by a firm coalition of all labor and progressive forces with the Democratic Party behind the candidate who backs the program that has come down to us from FDR. Any splitting of those forces, and this is what the Liberals aim primarily to do, would mean a certain victory for Dewey and his machine.

The Liberal Party failed to create a split in the election maneuverings. All labor, both C.I.O. and A.F.L., outside of the Social-Democrat-led unions, is backing O'Dwyer. Even among some of the unions hitherto associated with the Social-Democrats there are revolts against the line-up with Dewey. This is notably true among the leaders of the AFL Hebrew Butchers union, once staunch backers of David Dubinsky and his Social-Democratic colleagues, and among some of the local of the CIO wholesale and retail workers

that have been under the influence of international president Samuel Wolchok, a political associate of Dubinsky.

There is also something of a split among the liberals who have been backing the Liberal Party. Dorothy Norman, *New York Post* columnist and one of the most prominent liberal "fronts" for the Social-Democrats, has strongly criticised the latter for lining the party up with Dewey and has backed O'Dwyer in her *Post* columns. She is a Liberal Party vice-president.

But while the Social-Democrats failed to disrupt the labor-progressive coalition as far as line-up of candidates is concerned, they are sparing no efforts to sow that disruption in the course of the campaign through vicious Red-baiting and mud-slinging.

Compelled to show their hand through an alliance with the Dewey machine, Liberal Party leaders are counting primarily on a large vote among Jews who may want to vote for a Jewish candidate but are opposed to the Republican Party. It is their main hope of emerging as a political force in state politics. Unless the Jewish voters of the city are properly forewarned, they stand the danger of unwittingly building up, not only the reactionary Dewey Republican camp, but the most bitter anti-Soviet, Red-baiting political grouping in the state. And if there is one lesson that should have come out of the horrors of Nazidom for

the Jews, it is that Red-baiting and anti-Sovietism are major instruments of fascism and anti-Semitism, no matter who the promoters may be. Hence, understandable as may be the desire of many Jewish voters to hope for protection against the anti-Semites through the election of a Jewish mayor, the fact is that they will be doing the opposite if they vote for Goldstein. They will be aiding Hoover's protégé, Dewey, who wants to split the Jewish voters so as to win a substantial section for his own candidacy next year, and Dubinsky, who wants to build his machine so that he may effectively destroy the progressive coalition in future elections. Both are disastrous for the Jewish people, and that fact must be brought home to them.

A curious and significant aspect of the campaign is the way in which certain individuals associated with anti-Semitic, pro-fascist elements within the Democratic Party are flocking to the Goldstein banner. They are being organized with the aid of Alex Rose, executive head of the Liberal Party. Thus, there is a division of labor within the Goldstein camp. While the Liberal Party is angling for the Jewish voters, its leaders are busy organizing the apparatus for corralling the anti-Semitic elements in the Democratic Party. This is a sample of the unprincipled nature, the thorough opportunism of the coalition behind Goldstein.

That is not to say that many of these pro-fascists elements within the

Democratic Party will not continue to support O'Dwyer. What is politically significant, however, is not that people associated with anti-Semitism continue to give support to O'Dwyer against a Jewish candidate but that some of them switch to the latter. Perhaps even of more significance is the fact that they have become an official part of the Goldstein apparatus, operating out of his headquarters and playing an extremely important role in the conduct of his campaign.

They function through the Democrats-for-Goldstein committees.

City head of these committees is Thomas F. Cohalan, who is, or was, personal attorney and close friend of William Griffin, publisher of the *New York Enquirer*, once indicted for sedition by the U.S. Government along with a group of alleged propagandists for Hitler. Head of the Queens Committee is James E. Doherty, Sr., county chairman last year of the bitterly anti-Roosevelt American National Democratic Committee, with which was associated William Goodwin, Christian Mobilizer leader, and Robert M. Harriss, Coughlin's adviser and financier. Head of the Bronx committee is Walter E. Barrett, friend and collaborator of pro-fascist John Devaney, who was ousted from the Assembly by the Democrats because his virulent Red-baiting and Soviet-baiting was a political liability.

The fact that these individuals now actively back Goldstein is in-

dicative of the nature of his candidacy. He cannot disavow their support, since they operate out of his headquarters and he made his first major address under their auspices.

The GOP-Liberal Party coalition is campaigning on two issues: Red-baiting and "good government." The Red-baiting issue is raised in virtually the same way as the GOP raised it against Roosevelt in 1944. O'Dwyer is backed by the "Communist-dominated" "ALP and hence he is the creature of Moscow. It is a commentary on the unprincipled character of the Liberal Party that it is the chief promoter of the very type of agitation used against the candidate it purportedly supported for president last year. The very use of the issue, of course, places the stamp of reaction upon the Goldstein candidacy.

The "good government" issue is equally a fraud. To begin with, Goldstein has been a Tammany Democrat all his political life and has never in the slightest been identified with the powerful good government movements that have agitated the city for the past two decades, including the successful LaGuardia fusion movement. His one claim to "independence" is based on his lining up with the most venal elements in Tammany to buck a non-partisan nomination of a Republican judge with a good reputation, upon which the progressive leaders of the Democratic Party had insisted. Goldstein was the candidate of these

elements against the Republican judge in the Democratic primaries, and beat him.

As a cover for their claim of being for "good government," the Goldstein forces managed to get some remnants of the old fusion movement to back their candidate. This has split the movement wide open and has proved something of a boomerang, with the most prominent members of that movement denouncing Goldstein's endorsement.

The bulk of the good government forces in the city revolve around labor, around LaGuardia and around the progressive and liberal citizenry in the ALP and in various liberal groups like Citizens PAC. These are either behind O'Dwyer or, in the case of LaGuardia, supporting the No Deal slate. Very few are for Goldstein.

THE STRUGGLE WITHIN THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY

A bitter struggle took place over the Democratic nomination for mayor. O'Dwyer's designation was sharply opposed by Bronx Boss Ed Flynn. Both men had been to liberated Europe recently, specifically Italy, and there appears to be no doubt that their struggle was based on fundamental differences regarding foreign and domestic policy.

O'Dwyer went to Italy as President Roosevelt's personal emissary. While there he was known as the foremost friend of the liberation

movement among Allied officials, and on his return he urged upon the President a re-orientation of American policy so that greater reliance be placed upon these forces. Flynn on the other hand, had had several conferences with reactionary clerical circles whose policies were in opposition to those of the liberation movement. His visit came months after O'Dwyer had been in Italy, and he exhibited his opposition to O'Dwyer's nomination immediately upon his return from Europe.

For personal reasons, Flynn had supported President Roosevelt before his death and had become his chief patronage dispenser in New York City. His sharp break with the Roosevelt policies was doubtless partly due to the President's death. Yet it is also highly probable that with the new problems created by the end of the war, Flynn, a wealthy corporation lawyer, would have gone his way under any circumstances.

His break with the Roosevelt policies was symbolized by his bitter opposition to a coalition with the American Labor Party. He made it plain that he wanted a Democratic Party tie-up with the Liberal Party in an effort to smash the A.L.P. In his own county, he prohibited the local Democratic candidates from accepting A.L.P. backing. Since O'Dwyer was friendly to the A.L.P., Flynn made desperate efforts to eliminate him. O'Dwyer won the nomination over the Bronx boss' last-ditch opposition and even licked

an attempt to saddle him with weak running mates for other city-wide offices.

Flynn's struggle against O'Dwyer has far more than local significance. He is Democratic national committeeman from New York and a powerful figure both in state and national party circles. He and those in the state Democratic organization who are followers of former state and national chairman James A. Farley will make a strong bid to break up the Democratic-labor-progressive coalition in 1946 and to line up with the Social-Democratic leaders of the Liberal Party. This would assure a Dewey victory, since the sole possibility of beating him is the development of the firmest possible Democratic-labor coalition. Whether Flynn will be able to win the Democratic Party to his policy depends in part on the results of the city elections, particularly the relative strength of the A.L.P. and Liberal Party votes. Clearly, a strong A.L.P. vote and a weak Liberal Party vote will make it exceedingly difficult to get the Democratic politicians to agree to any such line-up.

While O'Dwyer is a strong friend of labor and a supporter of the policies of the late President, reactionary elements within the Democratic Party are constantly pressing upon him. His ability to resist those pressures will depend to a large degree on the extent and effectiveness of labor's activity on his behalf. That activity will help to determine his actions in

the campaign and the direction he will pursue if elected.

The A.L.P. objective in the campaign has been to promote the widest possible unity of the independent labor and progressive forces behind a candidate who would follow the program laid down by F.D.R. After it was certain that Mayor LaGuardia would not run for re-election, the A.L.P. helped to promote the candidacy of O'Dwyer as the most suitable man to lead the coalition that would assure holding the city for progress and strengthening the progressive and labor forces for 1946.

The A.L.P. vote for O'Dwyer is being watched with a great deal of interest everywhere. As in the case of the mayoralty race in Detroit, where Richard Frankenstein, C.I.O. leader, is running, it will indicate just how strong labor is politically. It will thus be a factor in the actions of the Administration, of Congressmen and of politicians of all parties. A large A.L.P. vote is an important form of labor "pressure" for its national program.

THE NO DEAL CANDIDATE

One of the complicating aspects of the campaign is Mayor LaGuardia's sponsorship of the No Deal Party, an independent ticket headed by City Council President Newbold Morris. Morris, a Republican, had been named by Dewey as candidate for reelection on the Goldstein slate, but he turned the nomination down after attacking Dewey

as a reactionary and Goldstein as a "discarded Tammany candidate." The Mayor had backed O'Dwyer's nomination by the Democrats and it was assumed he would support O'Dwyer or, at least, keep hands off the race publicly. The explanation for his putting a third ticket in the field seems to be fear he would otherwise lose his influence in city politics.

While it may appear superficially that the Morris candidacy will draw more votes from Goldstein than from O'Dwyer, since Morris is popular among Republican "good government" elements, it is also likely that many anti-Deweyites who might have voted for O'Dwyer may switch to Morris because of the "Tammany" bogey. Much will depend on the content of the No Deal Party campaign and at this writing this has not yet been determined.

Whatever the Mayor's motives in putting the No Deal ticket into the field after he had backed O'Dwyer for the Democratic nomination, it serves to split the progressive forces in the election and hence is a negative factor. The ticket itself is backed largely by middle-class groups, some of which are anti-Dewey and liberal, and others of which are for "economy" in government and hence for "clean government." It has no labor backing and unquestionably some of its supporters are opposed to government policies that will require the spending of money or that will strengthen labor.

THE FIGHT FOR COUNCILMAN DAVIS

The line-up of G.O.P. and Social-Democratic reaction has been carried over into the councilmanic campaign, specifically in the effort to defeat for re-election Manhattan Councilman Benjamin J. Davis, Jr., only Negro in the Council and member of the National Board of the Communist Party. Councilman Davis has become an outstanding figure in the city in the fight not only against Jim-Crow, but against all discrimination. Even those Negro newspapers under reactionary G.O.P. influence that are opposing his re-election have been compelled to admit that his record in office has been brilliant. He has also been a leader in the campaign against the black market and has fought actively on behalf of the demands of the city workers and other sections of labor. His candidacy is a symbol and a rallying banner of the vital alliance of labor and the Negro people, which will be appreciably strengthened by his re-election.

In an effort to eliminate him, the Liberal-G.O.P. coalition has nominated Benjamin F. McLaurin, an officer in A. Philip Randolph's Sleeping Car Porters Union, as a candidate for the Council. McLaurin will have the Republican and Liberal Party designations, and the Social-Democratic leaders of the Liberal Party are throwing huge sums of money

into Harlem in an effort to split the vote there in his favor.

The Democrats originally gave their designation to Davis, upon the insistence of the Negro Democratic leaders, who are solidly behind him. Under pressure from reactionary circles, they withdrew the designation and they nominated a Negro woman lawyer instead. Those Democratic leaders who yielded to this pressure rendered a distinct disservice to the Democratic-labor-progressive coalition. Such concessions to Red-baiting can only have the effect of weakening its campaign.

Should the G.O.P.-Liberal Party elements succeed in splitting the vote in Harlem sufficiently to eliminate Davis, the result would probably be that no Negro would be elected to the City Council from Manhattan. That, of course, will not greatly trouble the leaders of the reactionary coalition. Negro newspapers throughout the country, incidentally, have called attention to this effort to split the Negro vote and have noted that this is a tactic of anti-Negro forces whenever a Negro political leader seeks office with a good chance of success.

Davis' struggle for re-election is being closely watched and overwhelmingly supported by the Negro people throughout the country. He has become one of the outstanding champions nationally for Negro liberation and equality. The Negro people consider his campaign a fight for political recognition. In New

York City, the most prominent figures in all aspects of Negro life have come to his support and are helping to unify Harlem behind him.

The progressive labor movement has also rallied to his support, both because of his strong pro-labor record and because he is an outstanding fighter for minority rights. He was one of the two councilmanic candidates to receive the primary endorsement of the C.I.O. Council. The other was Laborite Councilman Michael Quill of the Bronx, who heads the C.I.O. political action committee. Many unions, both A. F. of L. and C.I.O., have voted to make Davis the first choice candidate in Manhattan. The American Labor Party, while it has not given him its designation, has endorsed him. Its candidate, Eugene P. Connolly, has agreed to campaign for him as second choice.

Communists throughout the county are conducting an unprecedented drive, not only to elect Davis, but to put him over with one of the top votes in the county. They are campaigning second choice for the labor candidate and are backing the city-wide labor slate.

In Brooklyn, Councilman Peter V. Cacchione, Communist leader, is running for his third term. Two years ago, because of a splendid record both in the Council and as an organizer of the people of the county in various campaigns on state and national issues, Councilman Cacchione received the highest first choice

vote in the city. He came out on top in the final count in Brooklyn. This year, his backers hope to repeat that record and are mobilizing to give him a higher vote than in 1943.

Two candidates are running with American Labor Party designations in Brooklyn, one a Negro Democrat. Both have the Democratic designation, and both are conceded a chance to win. The current Council has no A.L.P. member from Brooklyn. If the Negro nominee, Bertram L. Baker, is elected, he will be the first Negro elected public official in Brooklyn's history.

In the Bronx, Councilman Michael Quill and Charles Rubinstein are the American Laborite nominees, and both are expected to come in. Communists are giving Councilman Quill first choice because he is the major candidate in the city of the trade unionists. Partly because of Ed Flynn's refusal to permit a coalition with the A.L.P. in the Bronx, the Labor Party has nominated two strong candidates for borough president and district attorney, Assemblyman Leo Isacson and George Salvatore. The American Labor Party campaign around these candidates is of particular interest because of Flynn's policies.

In Queens, labor is running Charles Belous, former city councilman, who has a good chance of election. Because of the relative weakness of labor and the progressive

movement in the county, his victory would have considerable significance.

CONCLUSION

The struggle between progress and reaction is taking place on a world scale. As a result of the smashing of the fascist Axis, the progressive forces everywhere have become immensely stronger. The center of the reactionary forces in the world today rests in the United States. The Hoover-dominated Republican Party is the chief political instrument of American reaction. Governor Dew-

ey is the titular head of that party.

Thus, the New York City election struggle, in which the Governor's future is directly involved and in which he is actively participating, is an inseparable part of the postwar struggle now going on throughout the world. The New York City electorate, by defeating decisively the Dewey-organized coalition and electing the Democratic-labor-progressive coalition, will not only be placing in office a progressive administration in this key American city, but will also be dealing a heavy blow to reaction everywhere.

RECONVERSION AND THE NEGRO PEOPLE

By THELMA DALE

FINAL VICTORY in the Pacific and events on the home front since bring into bold focus the continued second class citizenship status of the Negro people. Whether the 13,000,000 Negroes in America will be able to realize the fruits of victory, for which they too fought, is a challenge to all Americans. It summons the Communists especially to the full exercise of their duty as vanguard in the struggle for Negro rights. The military victory over fascist racism and aggression has not yet been translated into terms of freedom and equality for Negro Americans. Instead, reaction is lighting a fire of race hatred in America against the Negro people which can destroy many of the important gains made by the entire working class movement during the war unless it is checked quickly and decisively.

In the succeeding pages is a statement on some of the most pressing problems confronting the Negro people, as well as on some of the ways in which Communists and other progressives can deal with these problems.

Negroes, like all workers, today

face a critical situation with respect to jobs. However, Negro workers, precisely because of their continued insecure status in American life, face the possibility of a return to pre-war economic instability more than any other section of our population. Already employers are beginning their age-old policy of utilizing Negroes as the unemployed reservoir to break labor organizations and depress wages.

THE STRUGGLE FOR JOBS

Of the million and a half Negroes employed in 1944 in war industries, reliable estimates indicate less than half are employed today. Employers have already begun the down-grading of Negro workers in those plants which have kept them. A good many other employers are using every possible means, including the alleged "inviolability of seniority rules," to exclude Negroes from their plants.

Reports indicate that the United States Employment Service even in the North and East is reverting to its pre-war policies of forcibly encouraging Negroes to return to domestic service and other low-paid fields of employment despite new skills learned during the war. What will happen in the South in this connection in the coming period, unless drastic steps are taken by the trade union movement and peoples' organizations is clear.

Negro women who were the very last to be hired in industrial employment, of course, have borne the

major brunt of the lay-offs in the present period. Reports from Detroit as early as the spring of 1945 indicated wholesale lay-offs of Negro women in the automobile industry.

More than a year ago a few leading Communists called attention to the need for developing programs for maintaining and extending the wartime gains of the Negro people in industry. One of the means suggested was a flexible application of seniority, where necessary, to maintain in the plants during the reconversion period a fair proportion of Negroes in all occupational capacities.

Later a study of several plants in the New York area by the National Negro Congress substantiated this thesis,* as well as a more recent study by Dr. Robert C. Weaver.**

However, opinion was sharply divided over the issue in the country generally as well as in the labor movement. The lack of a unanimous, clear, and decisive position in our own Party on this issue deprived the labor movement of effective stimulus and assistance to meet this problem.

Opponents of seniority modification argued that any modification would break down the whole seniority system, and thus ultimately destroy the unions; that white workers would not accept it because it would be unfair to them and would turn

them against the Negro people, and that, moreover, the Negroes themselves did not want it.

Those who argued for seniority adjustments contended that unless the labor movement was willing and able to find the means with which to keep a proportion of Negroes in the industries and in job classifications achieved during the war in the crucial reconversion period, employers would use the unemployed reservoir of Negro workers as a threat to weaken the labor movement and depress wages. Such weakening of the strength of the unions might spell the difference between success of labor's reconversion program and defeat for all workers.

Further, it was pointed out that the assertion that white workers would not accept seniority modification was a time-worn argument used against every advance of the Negro people. Proponents of seniority adjustment did indicate that the vast majority of white trade unionists would have to be educated to accept the proposal for their own good and that of the union. The vast majority of trade union leadership became so engrossed in the quarrel over seniority modification that it failed, for the most part; to look for the necessary answers in terms of up-grading and the carrying out of day-to-day struggles to eliminate discrimination in employment.

Now, when thousands, perhaps millions, of workers have already been laid-off, even the Communists

* *Negro Workers After the War*, National Negro Congress, 1945.

** Dr. Robert C. Weaver, *Seniority and the Negro Worker*, American Council on Race Relations, Chicago, 1945.

have just begun to agree on the validity of seniority modification as an important means of maintaining and extending wartime employment gains of Negroes.

What must we therefore as Communists do to safeguard the basic rights of the Negro people to work at jobs commensurate with their skills and abilities?

First, we must demand a program of full employment for the entire nation. President Truman and a score of Senators have already indicated their support for the Full Employment Bill. We must fight vigorously for the passage of this legislation immediately.

Second, it is necessary to wage an uncompromising fight for the immediate passage of the permanent F.E.P.C. Bill. All efforts to make this fight a partisan or limited one must be thwarted. The fight for a permanent F.E.P.C. must become the property of every progressive force in America.

Third, Communists in the trade union movement must carry on a struggle to clean out of its ranks all opportunism on the Negro question and in every way carry on a relentless fight to maintain and extend the unity of the Negro people with organized labor in support of jobs and all social benefits, without discrimination, for all.

Fourth, in plants where a rigid and formal application of seniority plays into the hands of employers by placing the brunt of lay-offs on Ne-

gro workers, seniority regulations must be flexibly applied so as to retain a proportionate number of Negro workers, or in the case of rehiring, efforts must be made to achieve the rehiring of a proportion of Negro workers at least commensurate with the wartime employment gains of Negroes.

It can be noted that despite the excellent record of most CIO and some AFL unions on the fight for Negro rights, the basic lack of understanding on the part of the trade union movement of the necessity of full integration of Negroes on the job and within their ranks has already cost a great deal. Unless we quickly rectify this situation the anti-union, anti-Negro, anti-democratic forces within the nation will ride rough-shod over the rights of all American workers by the simple process of division of the workers.

NEGROES IN THE ARMED FORCES

The sorest spot among the Negro people today is the continuing discriminations and inequalities existing in the Armed Forces, both at home and abroad as well as the plight of returning Negro veterans. The brazen and false vilification of Negro servicemen by the Bilbo, Rankin, Eastland alliance is only one indication of the disastrous trend in our country to light a fire of race hatred which will pave the way for political reaction. In the win-the-war camp a false illusion existed that Negroes

would *automatically* win their rights through all-out support of the war effort. Even the Communists, as part of the revisionist policies, to an extent were affected by this illusion which resulted at times in the soft-pedaling of the struggle to fight against the inferior status of Negroes in the armed forces. Our politically phlegmatic position on the fight for equality within the armed forces became so untenable that even before the Duclos article we had been forced to re-evaluate and adjust our position.

Despite some positive and constructive efforts to integrate Negroes in the armed forces, the result of America's dual Army policy has been a deterioration of Negro-white relations in the Army; a greater disrespect for American democracy on the part of Allied peoples throughout the world where our dual Armies have been stationed; and, perhaps most important, the frustration, the bitterness and lack of faith in American democracy on the part of the Negro people and Negro troops, among them, many of our finest Communist forces.

Let us pause long enough to hear what a young Negro soldier, with four years in the Army, two years overseas, two dependents, but still insufficient points for discharge, has to say about our ineffective struggle against Jim Crow in the Army as well as on the home front:

The Negro soldier doesn't appre-

ciate shame, and of course he didn't talk much. He's had too much sympathy and too little fight in his behalf. When you're in a struggle you need allies, fighting, vigorous allies, and sympathizers make you sick at heart.

The Negro soldier comes home filled with misgivings and certain that his fight for freedom still must be fought in his own backyard. He was heart and mind and body in the struggle to liberate the French, Belgians, Italians. Despite Jim Crow and a hundred bitter abuses in his own army, abuses which never reached the public, he made his contribution to victory. Now, turning homeward, he looks for his fighting allies to win his freedom. Let's not feel sorry for him. A soldier hates being patronized. He's stood on his own feet and asks that his friends show him respect, give him concrete aid to win his final battle.

The grievances of this Negro soldier are typical of the experiences of nearly one million Negroes who have served in the armed forces during this great war. Space does not permit a recital of the many varied and ingenious methods used to humiliate, persecute and rob the Negro serviceman of his rights, his honor, and his opportunities.

A leading white trade unionist recently returned from a tour of the battlefronts, is reported to have been far more disturbed by the virulent anti-Negro attitudes present among white servicemen than by the once felt anti-labor spirit previously reported. It is unfortunate that no apparent efforts were made to bring

this situation to the attention of the American public. If it was reported to the War Department at all, it obviously was pigeon-holed for future reference or sent to the dead files.

Substantiating this general impression are a raft of court-martial cases, in many of which death penalties have been invoked, framed-up rape and mutiny cases, and scores of "incidents" now breaking in the Negro press as a result of the lifting of censorship.

Typical among such cases are the Fisher-Lowery case, the Army "Scottsboro" case, and the recent case in the E.T.O. in which twelve of fifteen Negro servicemen were given death sentences on alleged charges of mutiny.

But perhaps, more insidious than these cases which have been brought to the public attention are the innumerable cases of Negro officers and men who are dishonorably discharged or discharged under Section VIII Blue Discharge (without honor), (in both instances without benefits of G.I. Rights) as reprisals against their failure to adjust to discrimination and inequality in the Army.

One such Negro officer writes:

As far as E.T.O. is concerned the dismissal has stuck. I am on my way home to be separated from the service without benefit of a record, or the G.I. Bill of Rights.

As I stated, I don't intend to have a lousy deal like this go through with-

out a stiff fight on the basis of the facts I outlined in my last letter. I have no intentions of having given up four and a half of the best years of life, and gone through the bitter hell, stink and deprivations of war in vain.

The crux of the whole situation of Negro troops is the failure of the Army to accord equal treatment to Negroes. Negroes have not been given fair opportunities for advancement, even in the segregated set-up.

Of the nearly one million Negroes now in the armed forces, there are only approximately 6,000 officers. Reliable information indicates that the vast majority of these are not in command of troops particularly in the overseas theatres.

Further reports indicate that generally not more than 1-2 per cent of any branch of the Army is Negro except in Ordnance where 92 per cent of those assigned to Ordnance Ammunition (essentially unskilled labor) and approximately 98 per cent in Quartermaster Trucking and Service are Negroes.

The assignment of Negro troops on the basis outlined above now seriously affects their release from the Army under the present point system which is weighted in favor of combat experience.

Since Negroes were not responsible for their assignments in the war, it is clearly necessary to demand the establishment of a separate point system for Negroes, so that they may have an equal opportunity for an

early return to civilian life and all the benefits which this implies.

NEGRO VETERANS

The recent situation of the refusal to allow a broadcast of a play written by Cpl. Arnold Perl on the question of Negro veterans, their welfare, etc., is a dramatic portrayal of the seeming crassness of approach on the part of the Army to deal realistically with its Negro members on a basis of equality with all other troops and to guarantee their speedy return and adjustment to civilian life.

Those Negro soldiers who are being released are finding it increasingly difficult to gain their rights under the G.I. Bill, since the Army thus far has operated under policies which mitigate against Negro veterans.

It is the general practice to return veterans to hospitals nearest their homes. This means for the vast majority of Negro men injured in line of duty the return to hospitals in the South. Likewise, definite pressures seem to operate to limit Negroes who seek further education under the G.I. Bill to attend schools in their home states, or in the South.

Generally, the G.I. when separated from the service is given the understanding that his local draft board will assist him in securing all benefits due him. It is not necessary to elaborate here on the ways in which white-supremacy-minded Southern

officials will deny Negro veterans their rights.*

The safety and well-being of our entire nation hinges upon what we do now and in the immediate future to improve the status of Negroes in the armed forces as well as secure opportunities for returning Negro servicemen. There must be a greater awareness on the part of every Communist and white progressive to effect a positive and constructive program to deal with this highly explosive situation. It is high time the brass hats in the Army and Navy heard from, and responded to, progressive America on the demand for military equality for Negroes.

It is imperative that this whole situation be rectified now even after military victory has been won to insure the operation of a democratic policy both for the occupation forces and for peacetime military training. Practically, we should press for:

(1) the early enactment of the Powell Bill, H.R. 2708, banning discrimination in the armed forces six months after victory;

(2) the passage of the G.I. Assault Bill making it a Federal offense to assault a G.I., and for improvements in the G.I. Bill of Rights with particular emphasis on the need for uniform Federal application and control of all veteran facilities and services; and

* See *Southern Frontier* issued by Southern Regional Council—June and July issues, 1945, and Wm. A. Caudill's *The Negro G.I. Comes Back*, American Council on Race Relations, 1945.

(3) the establishment of interracial veterans' organizations, particularly as exemplified in the Labor Legionaires. In many instances, mass organizations will have to establish Veteran Information Centers to assist ex-service men in securing a fair deal.

THE SOUTH

It is impossible to deal adequately here with the problems of the South, where the majority of the Negro people still live. This subject should be dealt with in an authoritative and comprehensive manner in an early issue of this magazine.

Much of what has been said above concerning the plight of the Negro people is due in the main to the continued domination of our American life by the poll-tax white supremacy doctrinaires of the South. Fundamental to elimination of Jim Crow in America must be the building and mobilization of democratic organizational expression on the part of the masses of white and Negro Southerners in support of full civil, political, and economic rights for all in the South. Indispensable to such a mobilization must be the re-establishment of the Communist Party in the South and making this area of our work a major point of concentration.

After World War I when Negro veterans still in uniform returned to many parts of the South there were vicious attacks upon them and their fellow citizens. There is the immi-

nent danger of new frame-ups, Scottsboros, and lynchings in the coming period unless the labor movement and all progressives marshal their forces against the flames of reaction still burning throughout the South.

The organized labor movement has much at stake in this crisis. It will become a potent force in the liberation of the entire working class in the South only as it cleans out all white chauvinism in its own ranks and fights for equality of Negroes and all other minorities.

Even the C.I.O. in the South has some real house-cleaning to do if it is to maintain the record on non-discrimination of that section of labor.

As to the reactionary leadership of the A. F. of L. and, in regard to this issue, also the Railroad Brotherhoods, it is well known that, in the South as well as throughout the nation, they are the active purveyors of white supremacy policies in the labor movement, which must be combatted and rooted out.

COMMUNIST RESPONSIBILITY

Communists obviously must lead and always be in the vanguard of the struggle for Negro rights. In order to play an effective role, we as Communists, will have to extricate ourselves completely from the revisionist way of thinking and acting, and move with dispatch to meet the immediate problems confronting us.

The lack of any fundamental theoretical analysis of the Negro question at the recent national and state conventions was a serious weakness. It is even more serious that, to date, very little if anything has happened to translate the good resolutions passed at these meetings into concrete policy and programs of action.

It is imperative that we cut through the red tape of any bureaucratic hangovers still existing within the Party and quickly set up the Commissions on Negro Work, both nationally and locally.

These Commissions should become part of the life-blood of our Party, continually adding new life and vigor to our struggle. The Convention resolutions proposed that these Commissions be staffed with some of the top leadership of our Party, both Negro and white, as well as shop workers, mass organization people, etc. It is felt by some that those decisions should be taken a step further by making a member of the National Secretariat the chairman, or at least co-chairman, of the National Commission (with like procedure in the State Commission), so as to provide a definite organizational tie between the Commissions and our entire Party organization.

The Commissions on Negro Work should not become mere debating societies or advisory committees, but should provide the necessary appa-

ratus for research, theoretical analysis, and policy making.

Our theoretical understanding of the Negro question must be developed in practical day-to-day action, carefully planned and executed. Negro leadership within the Party must be strengthened and broadened, in the interests of a wholesome movement. We must continue the trend in training Negroes as Marxist-Leninist teachers, thinkers and workers within the Party. Negro Communists should function in every realm of Party life and not in any sense be restricted to work amongst Negroes only.

Mass organizations of the Negro people should be encouraged and helped to follow a correct political line with major emphasis on strengthening the role of Negro labor and cementing a closer tie between the Negro people and the trade union movement, the Jewish peoples' movement and other progressive forces in our nation. Never again must we allow a situation to develop in which Social-Democrat and Trotskyite demagogues can assume leadership of important struggles in the Negro movement.

The Communists have always enjoyed the highest respect of the masses of Negroes. We must maintain the faith of the Negro masses in our movement through a conscious and virile program of action destined to achieve full citizenship status for the Negro people.

HISTORIC LESSONS OF THE STRUGGLES IN GREECE

RESOLUTION OF THE 11TH PLENUM OF THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF GREECE (K.K.E.)

On April 5-10, the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Greece (K.K.E.), holding its 11th plenary session, discussed the following subjects:

1. *The activities of the Party in the past year since the meeting of the Tenth Plenum and the new tasks of the K.K.E.*

2. *The organizational development and the adaptation of its organizational policy to the present needs of the work of the K.K.E.*

3. *The convocation of the Seventh Convention of the K.K.E.*

4. *The election of the Political Bureau.*

It was decided to hold the Seventh Convention of the K.K.E. in 1945. All decisions were unanimous.

The Plenum unanimously approved the decision of the Political Bureau to reinstate all comrades and members of the "Old Central Committee" of the last period of the fas-

*cist dictatorship of the 4th of August.**

The Presidium

* * *

The Eleventh Plenum of the Central Committee of the K.K.E. meets at this historic moment when the war is terminating and the peoples of Europe, relying on the anti-fascist aims of the war, are free to enter the road of securing the victory. The victorious armies of the Allies, of the Red Army from the East and the Anglo-American and French armies from the West, are approaching Berlin. The Yalta agreement, an extension of the Atlantic and Teheran agreements, demands the uprooting of fascism, guarantees the free democratic development of all countries, and ensures the great progressive changes that are being achieved in the liberated countries of Europe. Even in the satellite Axis countries, fascism is being uprooted, collaborators are being punished and the democratic regeneration is being achieved steadily. This course is being taken in a severe struggle against fascism because, despite military defeat, it does not lay down its arms, but, as an ideology, as an organization and as a remnant of the State machinery, it bends its desperate efforts to retain its footing and hold its forces together in order to thwart the work of peace and democratic regeneration.

* The 4th of August, 1936, is the date when the Metaxas dictatorship was established.—Editor.

Like a tragic note of discord in what is taking place all over Europe and, even more manifestly, in the neighboring Balkan countries, our country has fallen again into the hands of black reaction, which resorted to armed intervention by means of a *coup d'état* in December, in order to check the course of peaceful democratic development.

THE STRUGGLE FOR LIBERATION AND FOR A NORMAL DEMOCRATIC EVOLUTION

The year which has passed since the Tenth Plenum has been characterized by the greatest development of the national liberation war in the cities and in the mountains intensified by the efforts of the K.K.E. to bring about the unity of all national forces in the liberation struggle against the conqueror, for the liberation of Greece.

The creation of the Political Committee of National Liberation (P.E.E.A.) and the convocation of the National Council* constitute historic landmarks in the development of the national resistance movement and in the realization of national unity against the conquerors, as well as for the democratic regeneration of our country. The declaration on the sanctity of freedom and labor, the adoption of equality of women, the official adoption of the living language of

the people, the granting of the right to the new generation to participate in all manifestations of political and social life, the application of a series of measures for the benefit of the people (the granting of forests to communities, Community Welfare, etc.), and in particular, the adoption of the institutions of self-administration and people's justice, constitute the greatest democratic conquest in the history of our nation and the foundations for the genuine democratic regeneration of Greece.

The K.K.E., consistent in its policy of national unity, participated in the Lebanon Conference and in the National Unity Government in order to concentrate all national forces in the struggle against the conquerors and ensure a normal development.

The E.L.A.S. developed to the highest degree its offensive action against the conquerors in the mountains and the cities. It crippled the enemy communications, exterminated many thousands of invaders and carried out in full the plans of the Allied High Command of the Middle East.

REACTION ATTEMPTS TO CHECK THE COURSE OF DEMOCRATIC DEVELOPMENT

With their blood, with the aid of the Allies, and especially with the descent of the Red Army in the Balkans, the Greek people succeeded in liberating their country and en-

* The National Council called after the elections in Free Greece in 1944 elected a National Assembly.—*Editor.*

suring exemplary order and security throughout the country.

The extreme reactionary right tries to check the recreative work of peace and the normal, postwar evolution. The men of the 4th of August, the collaborators with the conquerors, the lackeys of foreigners, the merchants of patriotism, the black marketeers, the black market merchants of the people's hunger and misery with Glucksburg [King George II] as the main instigator behind the scenes—all the vicious plutocratic world trembling before the democratic emancipation of the people, placed their personal, party and class interests above the national interest and reacted from the very beginning against the National Liberation Front.* They slandered the struggle of the resistance forces, bent every effort to halt and paralyze the struggle of the nation and for this purpose, did not even hesitate to come out in an open, armed collaboration with the conqueror. Abroad, even before the formation of a national government, reaction launched the civil war, dissolved the heroic army of the Middle East, interned tens of thousands of the heroes of El Alamein in concentration camps, and deprived Greece of the honor of being present in the Allied war fronts with an important army in fighting shape. In the interior, in collaboration with the quislings, reaction armed the Security

Battalions and the "National" fascist organizations with Greek and Allied arms. It sowed discord and spread civil war together with the conquerors and against the struggling nation.

Even after the formation of a National Unity Government, Greek reaction did not abandon its aim to crush the people's democratic movement which constituted a guarantee for democracy, in order to restore fascism. For this anti-national purpose, Papandreou, a Premier of the National Unity Government, invited sizable British forces to Greece even before the liberation of the country, to rely on them in his move to organize a monarcho-fascist conspiracy. Therefore, instead of dissolving the armed fascist gangsters, he armed them; instead of punishing the collaborators and purging the State machinery, he retained them and reinstated them in the State services; instead of sending the armed forces to liberate the enslaved areas of our country and to the Allied war fronts, he forced the immediate dissolution of the E.L.A.S.*; instead of creating a National Army, he organized a Praetorian army against the people.

It is evident that the reactionary extreme Right was travelling steadily along a pre-outlined plan of extermination of the people's democratic movement, in order to prevent normal development and to establish a

* E.A.M.—Editor.

* The National Liberation Army—Editor.

régime of fascist violence indispensable to the compulsion of the popular masses and make them pay again with their life for all the destruction of the war and foreign occupation.

The reactionary Right relied on the Churchill Government and put into effect anti-national and anti-popular plans when it organized the conspiracy, the blood shedding of the unarmed Athenian people on December 3, 4, and 5. The Greek people were faced with the dilemma either of bowing their heads or accepting the provocation and defending, even with their arms, their threatened liberties and the future of their country.

THE DECEMBER RESISTANCE

The December struggle was an all-people's armed resistance against the *coup d'état* of reaction which sought to check violently the normal and peaceful democratic development of the country. That conflict was the peak in the struggle of our nation for the democratic resurgence and independence of Greece. It was a manifestation by deeds of the struggle carried on by all freedom-loving peoples against the dark forces of international reaction. The struggle of December created a great and precious moral asset in the interior and abroad, an asset which will very soon achieve fruition, because it is a struggle against fascist tyranny, a struggle absolutely in accordance with the declared purposes and the moral principles of the war

waged by progressive humanity. The struggle of December places the Greek people in the front ranks of the liberation struggle of the peoples for the crushing of the dark forces of violence, for the realization of the anti-fascist principles of the war, of democracy and national independence.

Our Party proudly salutes the whole people of Greece, the heroic fighters of the E.L.A.S. and of El Alamein, the people of Athens and Piraeus who astonished all of mankind with their heroism and self-sacrifice and raised themselves to the magnificent heights of the principles for which all freedom-loving humanity is struggling. Our Party stands reverently before the fighters of the E.L.A.S. and all those who offered their blood as a libation for the realization of those aims in our own country.

Our Party offers a brotherly, anti-fascist, democratic salute to the parties and the organizations of the glorious E.A.M. which embraces the most vital, democratic section of our nation and constitutes a guarantee for the freedom, independence and democratic regeneration of Greece.

THE CORRECTNESS OF OUR POLITICAL LINE; SHORT-COMINGS, WEAKNESSES, MISTAKES

The Plenum of the Central Committee of the K.K.E. testifies to the correctness of the political line and the tactics of the Party. The policy

of the union of all national forces in the struggle against the conquerors and the ensuring of a normal, democratic development is justified by the course of events. Owing to this policy our Party mobilized and aroused the whole nation around the national resistance war. It created the gigantic people's organizations of the resistance—E.A.M., E.P.O.N.,* E.L.A.S. It roused a broad people's struggle in the cities and in the countryside, which saved the Greek people from hunger, from becoming hostages and from Hitlerite mobilization. Owing to this policy the E.L.A.S. army was created, with its heroic achievements, as well as the magnificent work of the Political Committee of National Liberation and the National Council. This policy brought about the great, mass Communist Party, with hundreds of thousands of members, which constitutes the greatest guarantee in the struggle for the democratic regeneration of Greece.

The Plenum of the Central Committee also testifies that in the practical application of the political line of the Party there were some marked serious shortcomings, weaknesses, mistakes, vacillations to the Right and to the Left which brought more difficulties to the course of our struggle for the uprooting of fascism and democratic regeneration. The most

serious mistakes of a Right character were:

a. The agreement of Lebanon, which did not correspond to the concrete correlation of forces and, consequently, did not advance and ensure to the proper degree the realization of national unity and normal democratic development against the plottings of reaction. The Caserta Agreement, as a continuation of the Lebanon Agreement, was also a mistake of a Rightist character.

b. The endorsing by Communist members of the Cabinet of the Government's economic measures and the failure of timely and decisive intervention by the leadership of the Party in order to make clear the responsibilities of the K.K.E. in the economic policy of the Government of National Unity.

In particular, the Plenum of the Central Committee of the K.K.E. underlines the mistakes committed during the December conflict, mistakes of a military and Leftist political character caused by the incorrect estimation of the disposition and the role of the English Government of Churchill; the underestimation of the forces of reaction, in the interior and abroad; the overestimation of our own potentialities; and, in the main, the lack of the necessary political flexibility. These things prevented the Party leadership from having a clear perspective of the course of the conflict and brought them to miss opportunities

* Union of Political Organizations of Youth.—
Editor.

for an agreement with the English military authorities under more favorable terms than those of the Varkiza Agreement made after a military defeat in Athens.

c. The arrest of non-combatant persons, although a defense measure against the savage persecution and hostage-taking of Papandreou-Scobie, was a serious political mistake which gave the reaction the opportunity to raise a campaign of slanders for the purpose of covering up its own crimes.

THE REACTIONARY FORCES IN POWER—THE DANGER OF THE RESTORATION OF THE MONARCHY

The armed intervention of Mr. Churchill's British forces in December has prevented for the time being the normal democratic process and progress; has thrown Greece back to the times of the *coups d'état* and dictatorships, to the barbarous fascist forces and to anarchy in which the monarchical bands of collaborators are reveling. This intervention has sharpened considerably the already acute Greek problem and has rendered its solution more painful.

The Resistance movement which has brought glory to Greece, this most vital, anti-fascist power of the country which is the greatest title of national honor, is now undergoing severe persecution. Its fighters are being hunted, imprisoned, murdered. Participation in the liberation

struggle is considered a crime and is being persecuted. The fighting men and officers of the E.L.A.S. are not accepted in the new army which acquires a class character, an anti-people's fascist form. The collaborators who cooperated with the invaders are rewarded for their acts of betrayal. In all the State machinery, the people of the 4th of August and the collaborators of the occupationists predominate. The treacherous Security Battalions have been fused within the National Guard. The fascist organizations are being armed, and, in the country, special armed fascist bands are being formed from collaborationists with the invader, who are the actual and real State.

While, on the one hand, the reactionary extreme Right tears our national dignity to shreds and sells out the independence of Greece, on the other hand, it lets loose the most adventurous, grandiose, chauvinistic propaganda which day by day assumes a more dangerous character for our country.

The main objectives of this adventurous, chauvinistic campaign are to distract the attention of the Greek people from internal issues, spread anti-Soviet propaganda and justify the one-sided foreign policy of the rulers.

This fact leads to the creation of frictions, endangers the peace in the Balkans, and threatens to isolate Greece from its democratic neighbors as well as from its great allies.

The Voulgaris Government is even closer to the predominance of the most reactionary fascist circles and strengthens the danger of the return of the monarchy.

The Plastiras Government is largely responsible for the present situation, because it did not enforce the Varkiza Agreement, but, instead, persecuted the Resistance movement and helped and encouraged monarcho-fascism to gain positions and to rear its head.

The leading elements of the old democratic parties are splitting the democratic forces and objectively reinforcing the prevalence of monarcho-fascism by siding against the Resistance movement, refusing the concentration of the democratic forces into the struggle for democracy, and standing aloof from the provocations and terror of the monarcho-fascist elements.

The return of the monarchy will be the greatest danger for the perpetuation and the sharpening of internal disunity at the expense of peace, of the reconstruction of the land, of progress, civilization and the welfare of the Greek people; at the expense also of the friendly relations of Greece with the democratic countries.

THE STRUGGLE FOR THE UPROOTING OF FASCISM, THE PREDOMINANCE OF DEMOCRACY

Under the circumstances in which reaction puts forth stubborn and

furious efforts for the return of the country to the dark period of fascist retrogression and barbarism, the *basic political aim* of the Communist Party of Greece is the struggle to uproot fascism, secure the democratic process, and the democratic regeneration—a *people's democracy*.

The Varkiza and Yalta agreements are a worthwhile political basis for the struggle against fascism and for the normal, democratic process in the country. The creation of a representative government and the arrival of the inter-allied commission at the proper moment are necessary measures for the return of the country to political normalcy and the securing of a free and unadulterated manifestation of the sentiments of the people through a political referendum and the election of a constitutional assembly.

The imperative demand of the Greek people, issuing from the national need, should be to purge the State machine of fascists and collaborators of the occupationists, punish the collaborationist traitors, dissolve the fascist organizations, purge the officers corps of all fascist and dictatorial elements, and create a real national army.

Today, *the main political obligations of the Party are the struggle against monarchy and for the victory of democracy*. In order to achieve this aim, the Communist Party of Greece offers all its forces and *calls upon all the democratic forces to democracy's forefront*.

The political parties, the organizations and the followers of the E.A.M. who led the nation in the struggle for liberation, must now throw in all their forces into the struggle to uproot fascism and win the victory of democracy.

The E.A.M. must readjust its political aims and its organizational form in accordance with the new conditions created after the liberation of the country and the transformation of the present internal political situation.

The workers and the employees, together with the farmers and the popular strata of the cities—the professionals, artisans, scientists, intellectuals, are the most democratic, anti-fascist power. The task of the Party must be to turn its attention squarely in full support and unification of the forces of the people and transform them into an invincible power for the crushing of fascism and for democratic regeneration.

THE ROLE OF YOUTH AND OF THE WOMEN

Youth has taken a very active part in the struggle for national liberation. It contributed many sacrifices in blood, in enthusiasm and in youthful daring. It gained the esteem of the whole nation and is proud of the position it holds today in the nation. The fascist reaction puts forth desperate efforts to snatch back our youth to the state of corruption of the monarcho-fascist E.O.N., to deprive it of all its rights

gained during the war for national liberation, to emasculate its progressive activities through the cultivation of false, grandiose ideas and to divert its energies into reactionary channels.

The Party must help the youth, with special attention and affection, to win it in the struggle for a modern, free and civilized Greece.

The long-lasting national liberation movement has brought forward to the political arena a new, militant, progressive factor—the mass political activity of the women. The mass participation of the women in all manifestations of the national liberation struggle—strikes, mass meetings, sabotage, partisan war—has raised the activity and the militancy of the nation to the highest degree. Women have become an important factor in the victory of the democratic struggle and the regeneration of Greece. The fascist reaction will do its utmost to deprive woman of her democratic rights which she gained at the time of the struggle for national liberation and to force her back to the status of illiteracy, backwardness and estrangement from every political and progressive activity.

THE RECONSTRUCTION OF GREECE FOR THE PEOPLE'S BENEFIT

The Party must strengthen its efforts to develop and consolidate the participation of the women in all the manifestations of the social and

political life of the country on a par with the men.

The basic principle upon which the postwar reconstruction of the country should proceed is: reconstruction for the benefit of the whole nation and not only of a plutocratic oligarchy. The reconstruction can be realized soon and steadily only through activating all the national forces towards this direction. This national activity of forces is impossible when the reconstruction is made at the expense of the working masses and under a regime of fascist force exerted exclusively for the subjugation of the working people to the cruelest exploitation by a plutocratic oligarchy and by the waste of human energy as a result of the hunger and unemployment from which these masses suffer.

Only a really democratic internal regime can mobilize the vital national forces and all the material assets of the country for reconstruction in the people's interest.

The reactionary oligarchy, through the perpetuation of the political crisis and the persecution of the nation's vital forces through its predatory economic policy at the expense of the masses, through inflation and chauvinistic adventurism, not only does not strengthen the building up of the country, but, instead, leads it towards economic chaos and catastrophe.

The working people are the most priceless national asset, and for this reason all the fiscal and taxation pol-

icies must be based on the development of the living standard of the workers, on the preservation of their health and on their cultural and political development.

The organization of the struggle of the workers, the white-collar class, and the unemployed, the unity of the working class and the consolidation of the freedoms of the labor unions constitute the first line of tasks of the K.K.E.

The struggle to grant the peasants the means of livelihood and farming tools, rebuild the villages destroyed by the foe, solve the problem of easy credit, distribute the large estates and the land which became arable through drainage, and abolish the numerous bureaus of exploitation (as the A.S.O.) is a vital necessity for the peasantry. It is a necessity for the building up of the agricultural economy.

The cooperatives must be the mass organization of the peasantry. They must grapple with the problem of agricultural credits and the exchange of agricultural products.

These measures are imperative for the development of the agricultural economy which will prop up significantly the whole work of the reconstruction of the country.

The economic relief of the toiling strata of the cities (tradesmen, craftsmen, professionals, intellectuals) and their internal development are an important factor in the establishment of the national economy and the progress of the land.

This policy is only realizable through the application of bold and drastic progressive measures.

The properties of the collaborationist traitors must be confiscated, as also those of the big black marketeers who grew rich by collaborating with the occupationists and the pillars of the 4th of August, who gained wealth illegally during the period of the monarcho-fascist dictatorship.

The large banks, the railroads and coastal shipping must be nationalized.

The industries whose owners are sabotaging or obstructing their productive functions must be requisitioned.

The gold coverage of the Bank of Greece which was sent abroad must be returned.

The International Fiscal Control must be abolished. The foreign public debt must be adjusted in accordance with the present situation in the country.

A tax policy based upon the heavy, progressive taxation of big capital and the relief of the masses from taxation must be instituted by the government.

The three aggressors must be made to pay indemnities according to the destructions they brought upon our land.

The Greek people who became the holocaust in the common allied struggle are entitled to demand the economic assistance and strength of

the big Allies for the rebuilding of their destroyed country.

DOMESTIC AND FOREIGN POLICY

The independence and the integrity of Greece must be made secure. Border safety through the peaceful adjustment of all the differences with our neighboring countries, through the fraternal cooperation of all the Balkan peoples, must be realized. The fulfillment of our national restoration, based on the principle of the self-determination of the people, is the basis of the national policy of the K.K.E.

The application of a full political parity for all national minorities living in our country will assure the peaceful coexistence of the different elements and will facilitate the work of the economic reconstruction of the country.

The foreign policy of Greece must be based on a sincere, stable, close relationship with all the great allies, without exception: Great Britain, the Soviet Union, the United States, France, and all the neighboring Balkan countries. Each one-sided orientation of the foreign policy is a disaster to the real national interests.

Communist men and women, heroes and heroines of the national liberation struggle!

You, the Greek people!

Awake! Black reaction, fascism and the fifth column are trying to maintain themselves, to solidify their position in the State power in order

to forestall, to annihilate the work of re-creation which began with the mass movement of national Resistance. It is seeking to crush the democratic forces of the land in order to perpetuate the régime of slavery and fascist tyranny. It is endeavoring to consolidate forcibly the old privileges and the class interests of big capital oligarchy at the expense of the life of the people.

All its fire is directed against the advance guard of the people's democratic movement, against the K.K.E., against the parties, organizations, cadres, and followers of the E.A.M., against every democratic-minded

citizen and every democratic manifestation. It is attempting to split their unity and break their contact, because in their struggle these democratic elements with their blood and their lives form a barricade against fascism.

The unity in purpose of the Communist Party of Greece and the unity of action of all the democratic progressive forces of the country is the invincible power which will overthrow all the plans of reaction, will uproot fascism, will bring about the victory of democracy and will pave the way for the democratic regeneration of Greece.

CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN LUIS CARLOS PRESTES AND WILLIAM Z. FOSTER

Rio de Janeiro,
August 21, 1945.

William Z. Foster,
National Chairman,
Communist Party of the U.S.A.

Dear Comrade:

At its first public meeting, after having won its legality, the National Committee of the Brazilian Communist Party sends its warmest and fraternal greetings to all the brother Communist Parties of the Hemisphere that are fighting under the banner of Pan-American unity and solidarity, for democracy and progress in our fatherlands.

Today when fascism is militarily defeated, when the unity of the United Nations is every day strengthened, as now with Potsdam, and the democratic forces in every country are being consolidated, all the greater are the responsibilities of the Communists in order to guarantee the victories, which were achieved at the cost of the sacrifices and blood of millions of fighters.

This new period of peaceful development finds the Communist Party fighting legally for national unity and for the further democratization of the country.

The National Committee of the Communist Party of Brazil which recognizes the responsibility that the Brazilian people has before the other peoples of the Americas, as a factor of peace and progress, will make all efforts against the attempts of dividing the

American nations, which are being made by the fifth column, the agents of American isolationism and English colonialism, supporters of fascism over the world.

In greeting the brother Parties, the National Committee of the Communist Party of Brazil assumes the task of continuing the glorious traditions of struggle of the champions of liberty in America, as Tiradentes, O'Higgins, San Martin, Bolivar, and many other heroes.

Long live the United Nations!

Long live the Unity of the Peoples of the Americas!

Signed: LUIS CARLOS PRESTES,
General Secretary,
Communist Party of Brazil.

New York,
September 19, 1945.

Luis Carlos Prestes,
General Secretary,
Communist Party of Brazil.

Dear Comrade Prestes:

The National Board of the Communist Party of the U.S.A. is happy to express our Party's pleasure at the receipt of your letter, written upon the occasion of the first public meeting of the Communist Party of Brazil. We hail this event as a most important phase of the widespread democratic awakening which is now getting under way in Brazil, and which includes such significant developments as the all-out participation of Brazil in the war against the fascist Axis powers, the

establishment of diplomatic relations between Brazil and the U.S.S.R., the growth of the great new Brazilian trade union movement, the rapid upsurge of democratic sentiments among the masses of the people, the gradual restoration of civil liberties, the release of yourself after many long years of unjust imprisonment, and now the legalization of the Communist Party—all of which developments are taking place upon the background of the considerable expansion of Brazilian industry that was achieved during the war. Without attempting to minimize the still great strength of fascist-minded reaction in Brazil, we realize that the present democratic progress of the Brazilian people is bound to have wide repercussions in strengthening the struggle for democracy throughout the Western Hemisphere.

While congratulating the Brazilian Communist Party for the splendid progress it is making under your capable leadership, we also desire to make a few general remarks about the relations between the United States and Latin America. We especially wish to do this in order to try to correct various illusions enunciated by our former General Secretary, Comrade Earl Browder, relative to United States policy in Latin America. These false notions, circulated widely through many countries of Latin America by means of Browder's writings, are part and parcel of his general opportunist policy, which was recently so sharply criticized by Comrade Jacques Duclos, Secretary of the French Communist Party, as "a notorious revision of Marxism," and which we are now proceeding to eradicate from our Party.

Comrade Browder's systematic re-

visionism was most sharply expressed in the distorted interpretation which he made of the decisions of the conference of President Roosevelt, Prime Minister Churchill and Marshal Stalin at Teheran in December, 1943. Among his wrong conclusions, Browder argued to the effect that world capitalism, through its alliance with the U.S.S.R., had acquired a new lease of life. He believed it had overcome its general crisis, had become progressive again, and was about to enter into the greatest period of expansion in its history. Browder's ideas, contradicting Lenin's basic theories, held that imperialism was dead, or dying. He painted an idyllic picture of world capitalists spontaneously living in harmony with each other and with the U.S.S.R. and pursuing policies calculated to promote the well-being and freedom of the various peoples. He particularly stressed the beneficent role that United States capitalism was supposed to play in the postwar period. Led by "enlightened" capitalists acting in their "true class interests," the United States was to carry on vast programs of industrialization and democratization in all the more undeveloped sections of the globe. Living standards in the United States were to be greatly raised and a new prosperity would reign throughout the world. It all summed up to a bourgeois liberal capitalist Utopia, which had nothing in common with Socialism.

At our convention in May, 1944, the convention which dissolved the Communist Party and reformed our forces into the Communist Political Association, Comrade Browder enthusiastically applied his revisionist theory to U.S.A.-Latin American relations. The general thesis which he then outlined was that

the old-time Yankee imperialism, which had wrought such havoc in Latin America, was dying out and that the great monopolists of the United States were launching policies that were bound to enhance greatly the freedom and prosperity generally of the peoples of Latin America. Speaking of American imperialists, Browder went on:

Their day is finished, because they can no longer answer even the problems of the American capitalist class. With their methods they cannot produce markets big enough for American industry, and therefore more enlightened men have to come into the direction of American capitalism. Such enlightened men are beginning to appear, and they are going to become strong because the forces of history are with them. . . . These are the kind of American capitalists to whom the future belongs in this country, because they are the only kind of men who can go out and get a market. . . .

There is no basis whatever for Browder's rosy notions to the effect that the monopolists of the United States are abandoning imperialism and that, under "enlightened" leadership they are going to build up the industries and democracy of Latin America. In the United States itself the great monopolists of the North and East are trying to prevent the full industrialization of the South and West, why, then, should we expect them to encourage a full industrialization of Latin America? Actually American imperialism, although it is working with new methods, is now stronger and more active and ruthless than ever. The United States is coming out of this war the most powerful nation in the world; militarily, economically, and financially. Within the United States the great trusts and monopolies have enormously enriched themselves during the war and, with all other capitalist countries sorely weakened by the

struggle against Germany and Japan, these big combinations of capital are definitely nursing ambitions to achieve American imperialist world domination. They are pressing the Truman Administration, which endorsed the Roosevelt liberal traditions, to adopt an aggressive imperialist policy everywhere. There are evidences throughout the world of this new surge forward of American imperialism, as, of course, you have noted. We may be sure, therefore, that Latin America, which the imperialists consider to be their special preserve, will not escape this imperialist drive. What with the influence of Germany smashed in Latin America and with that of Great Britain seriously weakened, the influence of the United States is greater than ever before, and the reactionary forces in our country will seek ruthlessly to intensify this influence for their own profit and at the expense of the Latin-American peoples. A striking example of this influence was the way the Latin American delegates followed the United States' lead at the San Francisco conference of the United Nations. In our judgment, Lombardo Toledano, President of the Latin American Federation of Labor (C.T.A.L.), in his speech on August 5, 1945, in Mexico City, gave a much more realistic picture of the Latin-American and U.S.A. relations than Browder has done. Said Toledano:

They (the American imperialists—W.Z.F.) will try to put into effect plans for economic domination of Latin America and the world, such as the Clayton Plan, which they presented at the Inter-American Conference in Mexico City this spring. And I think that this pressure of United States imperialism will grow proportionately stronger as the popular forces of Europe move ahead and Governments adopt new and progressive economic and political forms."

The Clayton Plan, known as "The Economic Charter of the Americas," which was introduced into the Mexico City Conference by the United States delegation, is a far cry indeed from the "enlightened" economic policies of American Big Business in Latin America prophesied by Earl Browder. The great stress placed upon "free trade" in this document definitely favors the powerful industries in the United States as against their very much weaker competitors in Latin America; the emphasis upon "free enterprise" and against government intervention in industry also puts Latin-American industries at a disadvantage as against the great industries in the United States; the provision for "the free movement and investment of capital giving equal treatment to national and foreign capital," while appearing on the surface to be liberal, actually greatly favors the multi-billionaire bankers of the United States. Lombardo Toledano said on this general point: "The establishment of legal requisites for such investments should be an essential part of the defense of Latin America's political independence and of the struggles to obtain her economic independence. . . ." Small wonder, therefore, that this "Economic Charter" has evoked widespread criticism and opposition among business and labor circles in the various countries of Latin America.

Not only is American Big Business not cultivating an all-round industrialization of Latin America, but it is also not championing democracy in the lands to the south of us. Even under the liberal Roosevelt regime, when the Latin-American republics were accorded more democratic treatment by the United States Government than

ever before, the agents of the great American trusts, most of which were in violent opposition to Roosevelt, busily cultivated fascist-minded reaction throughout Latin America. Their most recent blows against democracy (struck by two big businessmen holding office in the State Department, Rockefeller and Stettinius) were to maneuver fascist Argentina into the Pan-American Union and also into the United Nations, during the closing days of the Roosevelt Administration and in the opening period of the Truman regime. The way, too, the United States stubbornly refuses to grant national independence to Puerto Rico is no stimulation to Latin-American confidence in the democratic intentions of the United States. Although the liberalism of Roosevelt has exerted a very considerable progressive influence throughout Latin America, the important democratic progress made by the peoples in the twenty Republics is their own work.

The master-key to the general economic, political and social advance of the Latin-American peoples is, of course, the all-round industrialization of their respective countries. At the present time, for the most part, these countries are economic dependencies of the United States. This economic dependence is a grave hindrance to the well-being of the peoples of Latin America. It is also a danger to the people of the United States; for, unless the United States, with its gigantic industries, can find big markets in Latin America and in other undeveloped sections of the world, which can only come from the industrialization of these areas, it will face unprecedented economic crises in the near future.

We are not going to try to advise you in detail as to how Latin America can be industrialized. You need no advice from us on these things. It seems to us, too, that the progress of the Latin-American Federation of Labor answers that problem thoroughly. Two things are quite clear to us, however, in this general respect. The first is that the peoples of Latin America should nourish no illusions, such as those cultivated by Browder, to the effect that the great monopolies of the United States are adopting "enlightened" policies leading to the industrialization and democratization of Latin America, since this could only lead the Latin-American countries into still deeper economic dependency upon the United States. Secondly, these peoples should realize, however, that they do have powerful allies in the trade unions and other democratic mass movements in the United States, and they should work in even closer collaboration with them against the common enemy of the peoples of both Latin America and the United States, namely, the great imperialist American trusts and monopolies. Such collaboration is the path along which to realize

a democratic application of the Good Neighbor policy and to achieve a genuine cooperation of the nations throughout our great Hemisphere. It is also the way for the peoples of the new world to play their proper democratic role in the United Nations in maintaining world peace and in bringing about the material betterment of the world's peoples.

In the crucial days now dawning after the final defeat of fascist Germany and Japan the nations of Latin America are certain to play a most important part in combating fascism in this Hemisphere and throughout the world. Especially will this be the case with your vast country, which is larger than the United States and which is one of the lands most richly endowed with natural resources in all the world. We are sure, too, that your Communist Party will play a fitting vanguard role in these great developments.

With all best wishes for your personal welfare,

Comradely yours,
WILLIAM Z. FOSTER
 National Chairman
 Communist Party, U.S.A.

WHAT IS THE OUTLOOK FOR THE JEWISH PEOPLE?

By ALEXANDER BITTELMAN

THE OUTLOOK for the Jewish people is a question of serious concern not only to the Jews; it involves the progress and well-being of all peoples and nations. For the freedom and security of the Jewish people have always been the reflector, in modern history, of the freedom and security of all peoples.

It is an axiom that general political and economic reaction has invariably meant extra brutal oppression, discrimination, and persecution of the Jews. And it is equally well established that where Jews are enjoying freedom and security, of whatever quality or degree, democracy and economic progress are the prevailing trends of development. The more freedom for the Jewish people, the more general democracy, and vice versa.

Anti-Semitism and general reaction are inseparable twins. Fascism is brought on by reaction and develops anti-Semitism into a system for the physical extermination of the Jewish people. Furthermore, fascism

stems from general imperialist reaction and develops from that basis an ideology of race supremacy which results in Maidaneks—the technologically most modern crematoriums of the Hitlerites for burning alive or otherwise murdering millions of people of the “inferior” races. Thus the Jewish people alone have lost 6,000,000 of their kind to the attempt of German fascism to conquer the world.

Nothing else is needed to demonstrate the truth that the fate of the Jewish people is the affair and concern of all peoples. For, wherever anti-Semitism is allowed to grow unchecked, there democracy and all human decency must perish. But equally important, especially for the Jews, is another truth. That is, that the salvation of the Jewish people lies only in such a course of world development as leads to ever more general democracy, social progress and social justice; and that the only safe allies the Jewish people can have are the democratic classes and groups in society, the most consistent among them being the working class and the toiling masses generally.

The victory of the bourgeois revolution at the end of the eighteenth century ushered in the period of bourgeois democracy, liberating nations and peoples from feudal reaction and backwardness; it also liberated the Jews and proclaimed for them equal rights. The victory of the great Socialist revolution in Russia,

in 1917, ushered in the epoch of socialist democracy, liberating the peoples of one-sixth of the earth from imperialist reaction and backwardness; it also liberated the Jews of Russia, and realized there in practice a complete solution of the Jewish question, creating opportunities, for the first time in modern history, for the development of a full-fledged Jewish nation with its own Soviet statehood in Birobidjan. This has had and is having the most profound effects upon the outlook for the Jewish people in all parts of the world.

At the present time, any discussion of the future of the Jews must start from the following fact: German fascism has succeeded in destroying an estimated 6,000,000 Jewish lives, but it has not succeeded in its proclaimed aim of destroying the Jewish people. There is a Jewish people in existence. It is smaller by more than a third but is more vital in many respects—more determined to live—and has the advantage of a number of objective circumstances highly favorable to the restoration and rebuilding of Jewish life, even though new threats are rising from the spread of imperialist reaction and its companion, anti-Semitism.

Most of these circumstances arise from the military defeat of fascism. Peoples' democracies are coming to the fore in many parts of the world, especially in eastern and southeastern Europe, where Jewish communities are beginning to rebuild them-

selves under conditions of progressive and democratic economic developments. The prestige of the Soviet Union and its tremendous success in establishing fraternal and harmonious collaboration among its numerous nationalities and peoples, creating cultures that are socialist in content and national in form, are exerting a powerful influence for the freedom and happiness of all peoples and nationalities, and for the moral and political defeat of all fascist and imperialist ideologies of race supremacy and national oppression.

The Jewish people can successfully fight for the realization of its aspirations—for survival in equality, security, and freedom—as part of these historic forces and in alliance with their most dependable spokesmen, especially the working class and the labor movement. It is especially the task of the Jewish workers, and of the Communists among them, to rally their people to the camp of anti-fascist democracy everywhere for the realization of the common progressive aims of all peoples and the special needs of the Jewish people.

These common progressive aims have by now become pretty well established. They call for the moral and political defeat of fascism everywhere; for the success of the United Nations headed by the United States, the Soviet Union, and England in maintaining and protecting world peace; for restraint of mo-

nopoly domination and resistance to imperialist reaction; for democracy, jobs, and social security. It is this historic struggle, as analyzed and formulated by the emergency national convention of the Communist Party of our country in its main resolution, which is the central task of the anti-fascist unity of the American people headed by the working class. As an organic part of the American nation, the American Jewish people, led by the Jewish workers, is also faced with this central task. This is the task for which we must fight as Americans and as Jews in order to realize also the special demands and aspirations of the Jewish people—against impairment of its freedom, for its equality, well-being and culture.

Speaking to the Jews of the United Nations, on the victory over Nazi Germany, the Soviet Jews projected the postwar tasks of the Jewish people in the following way:

In the difficult years of the war, the fighting friendship between our countries was strengthened, the mutual understanding among the Jews of all countries has increased, and a foundation has been laid for firm unity for the welfare and culture of our people. The present great victory imposes upon us the obligation to cement still further our friendship and to intensify the struggle against all forms of reaction in Jewish life, combatting all open and hidden defenders of fascism. (Manifesto by Jewish Anti-Fascist Committee in Moscow, *Morning Freiheit*, May 17, 1945.)

This program of common action has already received the support of the Jewish anti-fascist movements of all countries.

IS THERE A JEWISH PEOPLE?

At this point, the inevitable question—is there a Jewish people?—is bound to arise. The answer is, of course, that there is a Jewish people. Its existence is simply one of the facts of common everyday experience.

But the question remains, nevertheless: What kind of a group is it and what is its historic course? Perhaps, the best way to answer this, is to define first what it is not. From the standpoint of the Marxist-Leninist conception of the national question, the Jews are *not* a single nation.

According to Stalin,

A nation is a historically evolved, stable community of language, territory, economic life and psychological make-up manifested in a community of culture. (*Marxism and the National Question*, International Publishers, New York, p. 8.)

Taken on a world scale, the Jewish people very definitely hold in common only one of the basic attributes of nationhood. It is a distinct "psychological make-up," or "national character," expressing itself in a "community of culture" into which have gone ages of common history and tradition.

As to language, it might be said that considerable sections of the Jew-

ish people continue to share in common the Yiddish language. But here it must be added that for very large numbers of Jews Yiddish does not yet exist as a living language, though it may in the future, and that Jewish communities in all countries acquire as their own the language of the land in which they live.

The Jewish people certainly does not enjoy a community of territory or of economic life. It has not passed through the historic development of either the eastern or western peoples which have produced such nations as the French, German, Russian, English, Polish, American, etc.

But, if the Jewish people is not a single nation, what is it? To begin with, it must be noted that a distinct transformation has been taking place in the last quarter of a century in the nature of the Jewish people, lending greater stability to the relationships between the Jews of various countries and bringing forth Birobidjan and Palestine as growing centers of Jewish national homelands of different social formations.

The chief factor that brought this about was the victory of the great socialist revolution in Russia in October, 1917, and the solution of the Jewish question attained by the Soviet Union as part of the solution of the national question in general. Contributing factors, although of a different kind, were the emergence of a great Jewish community in the United States and new smaller communities in the other Americas.

Naturally, in any summary of the situation today, a major role will be assigned to the effects of the rise and military defeat of fascism upon recent national developments among the Jewish people.

What then was the situation and outlook prior to the victory of the socialist revolution in Russia? The Jewish people was made up of a number of national minorities and groups, concentrated overwhelmingly in the old empire of the Tsar. There were also different and very unstable types of Jewish communities in central and western Europe. More important was the growing Jewish community in the United States. In addition, there was the small Jewish settlement in Palestine, as well as old but small Jewish communities in the Orient generally. But the main centers of Jewish life—cultural and otherwise—affecting large masses of the Jewish people, among them workers, artisans, and intellectuals, were located primarily in eastern Europe, although Jewish developments in the United States were making great headway. The eastern European Jewish centers were in Poland, Lithuania, and the Ukraine, which were at the time all parts of the Russian empire. Closely connected with these was the vital Jewish community in Galicia, Austria, and to a smaller extent such communities as those in Rumania and Hungary.

These eastern European Jewish communities, especially in old

Russia, were terrifically oppressed national minorities, segregated, persecuted and discriminated against in every way. Anti-Semitism was official government policy and pogroms a method of rule. This reactionary feudal-imperialist regime of old Russia gave rise to certain types of Jewish national minorities.

Economically, most of the Jews were excluded from the main branches of the national economy, forced into the more backward forms of economic life, on the periphery of industry and commerce, or into positions of middlemen. Simultaneously, a Jewish working class was beginning to develop but was confined mainly to small-scale industry and artisanship.

Politically, most of the Jews were denied the most elementary rights. The general autocratic regime of tyranny and oppression fell with double weight upon the Jewish people.

Culturally, the bulk of the Jewish people were developing a modern Jewish culture, in the Yiddish language. Certain professional and intellectual groups were seeking to revive and modernize ancient Jewish culture in Hebrew, while considerable bourgeois and petty bourgeois sections of the Jewish population, including some workers, were moving toward assimilation with the dominant cultures, particularly Russian, partly Polish, etc.

This was typical of the position and trends of development of the

bulk of the Jewish people which was concentrated in eastern Europe.

As to the young and growing Jewish community in the United States, its characteristics, or at least its permanency, was at the beginning of the present century still very unclear. All that could be said about it, from the Marxist viewpoint of the national question, was that a Jewish national group was being crystallized, different from the national minorities in eastern Europe, because of the advanced capitalist development of the country and the existing bourgeois-democratic regime. Hence, it was correctly assumed that the Jewish community in the United States would be less isolated and less stable and that assimilationist tendencies would be stronger there than in the Jewish communities of eastern Europe.

Then there was the slowly developing Jewish national community in Palestine. Jewish nationalism, bourgeois and petty bourgeois, as represented in one form by the Zionist movement (another form was embodied in the Jewish "Bund") was projecting the establishment of a Jewish national homeland in Palestine as a home for the Jews of all countries, as a solution of the Jewish question on a world scale. This obviously was and remains utopian. In addition, the Zionist movement was basing its main hopes for securing political rights and opportunities in Palestine upon such "friendly" forces of that time

as the Russian Czar, the Turkish Sultans and the British imperialists. This was not only sheerly utopian but profoundly reactionary, involving the Jewish people in the schemes and machinations of these reactionary forces.

Hence, the Jewish community in Palestine could not and did not introduce any serious changes into the general position of the Jewish people on a world scale; nor did it open any perspectives of an objective and progressive nature, at that time, to indicate a possible change in the course and direction of development of the Jewish people.

Consequently, a Marxist-Leninist analysis of the position, prior to the socialist revolution in Russia, had to come to the following conclusion: First, that the Jewish people were not a nation but a very unstable national group having only some of the attributes of nationhood and therefore incapable of acting as a nation and of developing progressive national policies. Second, that the Jews form in most cases "isolated national minorities within integral regions of compact majorities of other nationalities" which "is undermining the existence of the Jews as a nation and is driving them toward assimilation" (Stalin, *Marxism and the National Question*, p. 37).

Proceeding from this analysis, the Russian Bolsheviks advocated a program of struggle for the defense of the general democratic and national rights of the Jews. It partook of the

program for all other national minorities, and was part of the general struggle for the overthrow of the Czarist regime, for the democratization of Russia, for opening the road to social progress and to the socialist transformation of the country. It was the position of the class-conscious revolutionary Jewish workers of Russia who followed the leadership of the Bolsheviks.

Stalin states this national demand as follows:

National equality in all forms (language, schools, etc.) is an essential element in the solution of the national problem. A state law based on complete democracy in the country is required, prohibiting all national privileges without exception and all kinds of disabilities and restrictions on the rights of national minorities. (*Ibid.*, pp. 58-59.)

This general analysis and policy had to be defended among the Jewish masses against two nationalist currents. One was the Zionist movement, which was basing itself on the utopian conception of the Jews as a nation and which was seeking to ally itself politically with some of the world's most reactionary forces, as has been shown above. Its bourgeois nationalist ideology had to be systematically combatted in order to promote among the Jewish masses the proletarian ideology of Marxism.

But there was in old Russia yet another nationalist current, embodied in the Jewish "Bund." The "Bund" was a Jewish political party

which, though composed in the main of workers and artisans, among whom sympathy for the Bolsheviks was strong, fell under the domination ideologically and politically of Menshevism (reformist opportunism) and a certain brand of petty bourgeois nationalism. It was primarily in the fight against this current among the Jewish masses that the Bolshevik position on the Jewish question was established.

People are sometimes misled by the traditional fight between the "Bund" and the Zionists. It was in essence a fight between various nationalist currents of a bourgeois and petty bourgeois nature, although many of the workers belonging to the "Bund" and to certain labor-Zionist groupings were subjectively viewing themselves as proletarian revolutionists. Hence, the fight of the "Bund" against Zionism had nothing to do with the Marxist-Leninist position on Zionism.

The "Bund" fought Zionism, for example, on the issue that the Jewish people do not need a common territory and national economy in order to be a nation and to be able to act as one; whereas, on the contrary, Marxism-Leninism insisted, as Stalin developed the teaching, that *without* a common territory and economy, plus language and culture, the Jewish people *cannot* develop into a nation following progressive national policies. Thus, Bolshevism combatted, not the Zionist territorial and national-economic aspirations as

such but the utopian and reactionary foundations upon which Zionism was building its program in Palestine. At the time, the Bolsheviks took the position that there were no objective and progressive forces for the realization of any such program in Palestine, thus characterizing Zionism as a bourgeois-nationalist current of a utopian and reactionary character.

But the Bolsheviks had to carry on the main fight against the "Bund," particularly since the latter constituted the main bourgeois-nationalist influence among the Jewish workers in old Russia. The fight was carried on along these main lines: First, against the attempt of the "Bund" to construct *artificially* a Jewish nation out of the various Jewish national minorities in old Russia, which was similar to the Zionist attempt to construct a Jewish nation in Palestine in the absence of any serious favorable objective forces and conditions. Here the struggle was against the "Bund's" programmatic demand for a so-called "national cultural autonomy" which proposed the establishment of Jewish governmental bodies of national scope in charge of Jewish cultural affairs, independently of, and in isolation from, the general struggle for the overthrow of the Czarist regime and for the democratization of the whole country.

The mistake must not be made of thinking that the Bolsheviks were opposing the development of Jewish

national culture by the Jewish national minorities. Not at all. As shown in the foregoing, the Bolsheviks had formulated, as part of their national program, the general demand for *national equality*, including equality of *cultures*, meaning especially language, schools, etc. In opposing the "Bund's" demand for national autonomy, the Bolsheviks correctly maintained that there is no need, from the standpoint of a workers' Marxist party, to bind the dispersed Jewish minorities into an *artificial* cultural national union with governmental powers, if there exists *complete democracy* in the country, and that such an artificial union will be useless if complete democracy does not exist.

Second, the Bolsheviks fought the "Bund" for attempting to organize the Jewish workers in Russia into an independent and autonomous organization amounting to a separate political party. Said Stalin:

The aim must be to unite the workers of all nationalities in Russia into united and integral collective bodies in the various localities and to unite these collective bodies into a *single party*. (*Ibid.*, p. 59.)

The nationalist separatism of the "Bund" flowed inevitably from its general petty-bourgeois nationalist and reformist (Menshevik) position. Between its demand for "national cultural autonomy" and its policy of organizing the Jewish workers into

a separate national party, there existed a close and intimate connection.

As is well known, the Marxist-Leninist position of the Bolsheviks has been proven correct. In the victory of the great socialist revolution in Russia it has been demonstrated that the solution of the Jewish question was found, in the first stage, in the struggle for democracy and equal rights and, in the second stage, in the struggle for and the victory of socialism, which outlawed anti-Semitism, fully integrated the Jewish people into the general life of the country, and laid the basis for the development of a Jewish Soviet Socialist Homeland in Birobidjan.

The correctness of the Marxist-Leninist position has been proved by the victory of socialism in Russia. The "Bund's" petty-bourgeois nationalism and Menshevism became completely bankrupt. Its dominant leading circles degenerated into enemies of the working class, into allies of reactionary and pro-fascist machinations against the Soviet Union, while most of the workers in the "Bund" in Russia and its left-revolutionary elements went over to the Bolsheviks in the course of the revolution. During the years of the present war, the "Bund's" émigré leadership in the United States, together with the *Jewish Daily Forward* and Dubinsky, has been the main champion of the pro-fascist Polish gang in London (the so-called "government"-in-exile), as well as

the worst enemy of Jewish anti-fascist unity.

Finally, the entire period of development culminating in the victory of the socialist revolution in Russia has also demonstrated the correctness of the Marxist-Leninist position with regard to Zionism. It has been shown conclusively that the development of the Jewish community in Palestine could not be viewed as offering a solution of the Jewish question as a whole, and that the realization of Jewish hopes and aspirations in Palestine cannot be based upon the goodwill of—or alliances with—reactionaries, imperialists, or potentates.

VICTORY OF SOCIALISM CREATES NEW CONDITIONS FOR JEWISH PEOPLE

Thus, up until the victory of the socialist revolution in Russia, the outlook for the Jewish people, from the standpoint of national development, was not only obscure but very uncertain. While subjectively, that is, in the minds of the Jewish masses, the resistance to assimilation was growing and Jewish culture in eastern Europe was reaching new and high levels of development (especially between the 1880's and the first world war), the objective base of the Jewish people as a people became ever more undermined and weakened, with assimilationist tendencies taking the upper hand in various Jewish circles. The outlook, therefore, was for the continued

existence of various Jewish national minorities and groups in many parts of the world, some of them more and others less integrated into the general life of their respective countries, but all of them subject to ever increasing forces of disintegration and assimilation.

The victory of the socialist revolution in Russia has worked a transformation in the position of and outlook for the Jewish people from the standpoint of national aspirations and development. In the words of the late Shakhno Epstein, Secretary of the Jewish Anti-Fascist Committee in Moscow, "Thus were created, under the banner of the October Revolution, all the prerequisites for the Jews to develop without any obstruction *into a complete and full-blooded nation.*" (*Morning Freiheit*, Nov. 12, 1944. Our emphasis—A.B.)

A new chapter has thus been opened in the life of our old, wise, and ever-young Jewish people. This has resulted directly from the solution of the Jewish question in the Soviet Union. For a concise description of it, we shall quote at some length from a Soviet author.

The position of the Jews in the U.S.S.R. is a particularly striking example of the triumph of the Soviet national policy. In July, 1918, by a Soviet Government decree signed by V. I. Lenin, anti-Semitism was proclaimed a criminal offense. In the very first days of its existence, the Soviet power created a number of Jewish national districts in the Ukraine and in

Byelorussia, where there is a concentrated Jewish population, and in 1934 a Jewish Autonomous Region—Birobidjan—was formed in the Far East. (*The National Question in the Soviet Union*. M. Chekalin, pp. 24-25.)

Commenting on the national significance of these historic developments, Chekalin writes:

For the first time in the history of the Jewish people its ardent desire to create its own homeland, to create its own national state system, has materialized. Under the leadership of the great Bolshevik Party and actively supported by all sections of Soviet society, the Jewish toiling masses are developing and consolidating a Soviet state system in Birobidjan, whose forms correspond to the customs and modes of life of their people. (*Ibid.*, p. 25.)

What all this has meant for the awakening of a new national consciousness among the Jews in all lands is yet to be analyzed and estimated in all implications and consequences. But this much is certain: the Soviet Jews have brought a new national factor of great potency into the life of the Jewish people, strengthening anti-assimilation tendencies in all Jewish communities, opening new fields for Jewish culture, giving greater stability to the relationships among the Jews of various lands, and imparting a new meaning to the development of the Jewish community in Palestine, as one more national Jewish homeland.

These new outlooks for the Jewish people were further aided by the

rise of the Jewish community in the United States and by the serious achievements of the Jewish community in Palestine in laying the basis there for the upbuilding of a Jewish homeland and of a new type of Jewish nationhood.

The significance of the rise of the American-Jewish community from the standpoint of Jewish national developments, lies in this: It is a community highly and intimately integrated in general American national life, despite serious anti-Semitism and discrimination. There is very little isolation about it from American economy, politics, and culture; and in this it differs radically from the Jewish minority in old Russia or in Poland. And this American community is Jewish—American-Jewish—in its own life in the United States, as well as in its relations with Jews of other lands. Jewish life in America became strengthened through the inspiring influence of the successful solution of the Jewish question in the Soviet Union which intensified immeasurably the development of Jewish life on a socialist basis. In its turn, the strengthening of Jewish life in America has intensified similar developments among the Jewish people in other lands.

Especially important has been the work of the American Jews for the upbuilding of a Jewish national homeland in Palestine, not to speak for the moment of the important role of the American Jews in the

fields of relief and rehabilitation for the European Jews in the two world wars. Mention should also be made here of the great part which the American Jews are destined to play in helping to develop the Jewish Socialist homeland in Birobidjan.

A major place in all these developments is naturally occupied by the Jewish community in Palestine. From a mere national symbol and vague aspiration it has become an important settlement of 600,000 souls, having developed a common national economy, a growing national culture, and the first elements of Palestine-Jewish statehood and self-government.

The full effect upon Jewish life and outlooks of the rise of fascism and its military defeat cannot be completely analyzed here. A general estimate is already given in the introductory part of this article. However, the following should be added: The over-all effect upon Jewish national developments of the rise and fall of fascism was to strengthen considerably all anti-assimilationist tendencies, even though assimilationism, too, has received a certain impetus. Another effect was that it became possible to work for a Jewish homeland in Palestine on the basis of anti-fascism and in alliance with the progressive forces of all freedom-loving peoples and in friendship with the Arab people. This also resulted in strengthening the progressive currents in the Zionist movement, as against its reaction-

aries, thus contributing towards the upbuilding of Jewish anti-fascist unity. Still another basic effect was the strengthening of all progressive currents in Jewish life, giving rise to a broad development of a Jewish anti-fascist unity within and between various lands, in which Jewish workers are progressively playing a larger role, and in which the Soviet Jews are naturally exercising a great and historic influence. At the same time, reactionary forces in Jewish life have also continued to be very active, as can be seen in the United States, for example, in the splitting, Red-baiting, and anti-Soviet activities of the Dubinsky-Forward-Jewish Labor Committee gang and of similar elements among the Zionists and labor-Zionists.

Something special has to be said in connection with Jewish outlooks in the liberated countries of eastern Europe, such as Poland, Rumania, Hungary, Bulgaria and in the other lands of the Balkans. It is evident that new centers of Jewish life are being built in most of these countries, especially in Poland, Rumania, Hungary and Bulgaria, within the framework of and integrated with the new people's democracy of these countries, and on the basis of their democratic economic and industrial developments. Jewish community life will probably continue in western Europe in different forms while the outlooks for central Europe are not clearly visible.

These will be *new kinds* of Jew-

ish national minorities. They will not, as in the past, be isolated and excluded from the general life of the country in which they live. On the contrary, they will be organically part of every phase of its life. Yet at the same time, they will be Jewish communities, developing a Jewish cultural life, and collaborating with the Jews of other lands for the survival, well-being, and culture of the whole of the Jewish people. In this process Birobidjan and the Jewish community in Palestine, while differing on principle in social and political systems, will exert a most powerful influence, both being centers of development where new types of organized Jewish life and full-fledged Jewish nations are growing to maturity. Thus, the Jewish people, itself not a nation, is engendering the development of two Jewish nations—nations of two different social formations.

In summing up the position and direction of development of the Jewish people, we must reach the following conclusion:

The Jewish people is not a single nation, nor is it just a religious or ethnic group. The Jews live in many countries and are parts of many nations. But they are one people just the same, having a common tradition and culture and a national language—Yiddish—common to large numbers of Jews in many parts of the world. The Jewish people have a common interest to fight against anti-Semitism and fascism, which

for the Jewish masses is a fight for their survival, for their well being and culture. Jewish national socialist life in the Soviet Union, especially in Birobidjan, and Jewish national life in Palestine are adding stability and strength to the anti-fascist unity among the Jews of all lands.

The Jewish people is composed of a number of national communities—national minorities of new types and national groups—and of two nationalities—in Birobidjan and in Palestine—in various stages of development towards complete nationhood. These minorities, groups, and nationalities differ greatly from one another, from the national standpoint as well as socially and politically, but all of them together make up one people, the Jewish people which has demonstrated afresh in the course of the war its will to live as a people.

It is for these reasons that the problem of relief and rehabilitation of the European Jews is a problem of national rebuilding and reconstruction. It is part of the general task of the Jewish people, in the realization of which the Jewish workers and trade unionists must play a leading role, to rebuild and develop further Jewish life in the Soviet Union, especially the Jewish socialist homeland in Birobidjan, in the liberated countries of eastern Europe, in Palestine, in the Americas and in the rest of the world.

We have lost about six million of our people—a loss which no power

on earth can make good. But we have helped to save the world from fascism and about two-thirds of our people have been saved as a result. With this we begin to build anew.

Although exact figures are still unavailable, the following estimates are helpful for an approximate picture. There are today about 2½ million Jews in the Soviet Union out of a pre-war 3½ million; about 100 thousand in Poland, out of a pre-war 3½ million, with another 100 thousand Polish Jews expected to migrate from the Soviet Union; 310 thousand in Rumania; 250 thousand in Hungary; 45 thousand in Bulgaria; about 180 thousand in France; about 90 thousand in Germany, among them nearly 70 thousand from other countries.

These are the forces in Europe with which our people has already begun the process of rebuilding in various countries. The five-million strong Jewish community in the United States, and also the other Jewish communities in the Americas, have a significant and important part to play in the rebuilding and development of Jewish life, in organic connection with the anti-fascist and progressive forces of all peoples and nations and especially with the trade unions and the advanced movements of the working-class. *It is the task of the Jewish masses in America to carry on this work as part of the general struggle for the moral and political defeat of fascism, for outlawing anti-Semi-*

tism, for stamping out all fascist ideologies of race supremacy, for equal rights for the Negro people, for the freedom and independence of all colonial and dependent peoples.

ERRORS OF THE PAST AND IMMEDIATE MAJOR TASKS

In the course of the struggle for Jewish anti-fascist unity as part of American national unity during the years of war, we committed a number of serious errors directly traceable to the Browder revisionist orientation which we have been following. We are at present engaged in a process of correcting these errors in accord with the decisions of the emergency national convention of the Party and of its general resolution.

We find that a major source of errors and weaknesses was our insufficient appreciation of the importance of bringing forward the Jewish workers as a leading factor in the Jewish anti-fascist unity. The practical conclusion to be drawn from this is to secure the active participation of progressive Jewish trade unionists, especially Communists, in the daily struggle for Jewish people's needs and interests.

Progressive Jewish trade unionists must become the actual leaders of these mass struggles and a leading factor in the anti-fascist and progressive unity movements of the American Jews. A substantial beginning along these lines has already been made in the organization of

"The Trade Union Committee for Jewish Unity," an affiliate of the American Jewish Congress and a collaborator of the American Jewish Conference. This trade union committee can become a large force, in alliance with other progressive Jewish trade unionists and labor-Zionists, in the national Jewish task of relief and rehabilitation, in the fight against anti-Semitism and discrimination and in combatting the reactionary conspirators of the so-called Jewish Labor Committee of Dubinsky and Chanin, stimulating thus the movements for labor unity and anti-fascist unity among the Jewish masses.

Another source of error we find in the fact that we have not always safeguarded the ideological and political independence of the Jewish workers and of their vanguard—the Communists—in the process of working with other groups, the Zionists, for example, in the Jewish anti-fascist unity.

We knew, of course, that Zionism is a bourgeois-nationalist political movement, resting on a bourgeois ideology, though embracing non-bourgeois circles. We also knew, though belatedly, that since the rise of fascism and especially with the opening of the war of the anti-Hitler coalition, it became necessary and possible to work for anti-fascist Jewish unity, including Zionists and Communists, and that this unity could also work with the progressive forces in the Zionist movement for

the upbuilding of the Jewish homeland in Palestine along progressive lines made possible by the new world situation.

Therefore, we correctly fought, are now fighting, for Jewish anti-fascist unity, including all groups and currents in Jewish life capable of supporting a program of struggle for the moral and political defeat of fascism and anti-Semitism, for the rebuilding and rehabilitation of Jewish life, for close friendship with the Soviet Jews, for support to the upbuilding of a Jewish national homeland in Palestine and of the Jewish national Socialist homeland in Birobidjan, for the welfare and culture of the Jewish people in general.

But in fighting for unity on this program, we have not always fully exposed some of the reactionary tendencies in Zionism, insufficiently promoting the ideological and political positions of the working class and of the Communists. The correction of this error will not only make stronger the influence of labor in Jewish unity but will strengthen the unity itself, including Communists as well as Zionists.

Finally, there were serious errors in our struggle for support to the Jewish (Yishuv) Community in Palestine. The position itself is fully correct. It is embodied in the general resolution of our Party as adopted by the emergency national convention, and reads as follows:

Outlaw anti-Semitism, one of the most pernicious and damaging of fascism's ideological weapons. Support the just demands of the Jewish people for the immediate abrogation of the British government of the imperialist White Paper. Support the upbuilding of a Jewish National Home in a free and democratic Palestine, in collaboration with the Arab people, on the basis of the agreement of the Big Three in the Near East.

To carry out this resolution, it is now especially necessary to concentrate on the fight to outlaw anti-Semitism and to force the abrogation of the White Paper, opening the doors of Palestine to Jewish immigration and settlement.

The errors consisted in our partial failure to insist with sufficient emphasis upon the following points: that a Jewish national homeland will become a reality *only in a free and democratic Palestine*, which means that the struggle for Jewish aspirations there must go hand in hand with the fight of all Palestinian peoples, *Jews and Arabs*, for freedom and for a democratic development of the country's economy, *agrarian and industrial*; that as a matter of principle, not only expediency, we must work for the Jewish homeland in Palestine in collaboration with the Arabs; and that internationally, the orientation must be on the agreement between England, the Soviet Union, and the United States in the Near East as in the rest of the world.

It is precisely on these special points that we had to combat the reactionary currents in Zionism, which do not care for a free Palestine, either politically or economically, which completely ignore the Arabs, and orientate internationally on either British imperialism or American imperialism, or a combination of both, resorting freely to all sorts of entanglements with reactionary forces. Against these tendencies we have not fought sufficiently. We are correcting this weakness now and are thereby strengthening our ties with the Jewish masses *including the masses and progressive forces and leaders in the Zionist movement itself*. In this way the entire struggle for the Jewish Homeland in Palestine becomes stronger and the outlook for it brighter.

The Soviet Jews have a fully sympathetic and positive attitude to the Jewish community in Palestine. It was restated in November of last year by the Secretary of the Jewish Anti-fascist Committee in Moscow, the late Shakhno Epstein, as follows:

Naturally, no reasonable and freedom-loving person will object to the Jews in Palestine being enabled to develop freely their homeland, which they have built up by hard and constructive labor, on the basis of self-government. This is their undisputable right as a group which is united by common interests and aims. (*Morning Freiheit*, November 12, 1944.)

The additional point of principle,

which Jewish Communists everywhere are underlining in this connection, is that the building up of the Jewish Homeland in Palestine creates the basis for solving the Jewish question primarily for the Jewish community in Palestine. In the measure in which this is achieved, this *helps* to solve the general problems of the Jewish people as a whole, but in itself offers no complete solution. Herein—as well as in our proletarian internationalism—we differ fundamentally from the ideology of Zionism which sees in Palestine the complete solution of the Jewish question. The way to the complete solution of the Jewish question is pointed to us by the solution of the question in the Soviet Union, that is, the struggle for democracy and for socialism *in all countries*, together with the upbuilding of the Jewish Socialist Homeland in Birobidjan and the upbuilding of the Jewish Homeland in Palestine.

We have been reproached in some circles for failure to adopt the programmatic ultimate demand of Zionism which calls for a Jewish state in Palestine. To which our answer has been, and correctly so, that the ultimate state forms of the Jewish homeland in Palestine cannot be foreseen. They will depend upon the success of mass immigration there, upon its free economic and political development, upon the collaboration between Jews and Arabs, and upon the agreement between the Big Three. For all these practical tasks

we must fight, and in so doing we shall be building the elements of Jewish statehood and self-government. Further than that even large sections of Palestine Jews are not going today, nor are influential and progressive groups of Zionists. The demand for a Jewish State today has meaning only as a programmatic ultimate aim of Zionism and not as a program for immediate united struggle of the Jewish people. Such a practical program, which we have made our own, includes the fight against the White Paper, for the upbuilding of the Jewish community in Palestine economically, strengthening and expanding its self-government (building the elements of statehood), in alliance with the Arabs in a free and democratic Palestine.

One over-all weakness to be corrected in our Jewish work is the insufficient propagation of Marxist ideology among the masses and in our cultural work—a field badly neglected. As Marxist-Leninists, we must especially emphasize the *proletarian internationalism* of our movement, and precisely because we are engaged so actively in the struggle for the national needs and interests of the Jewish people. We must combat more than ever before all tendencies to separatism from the general political and cultural life of our country, of the American nation, seeking to integrate more firmly the Jewish masses with the mass of the American people as a whole in all

progressive endeavors, especially in the labor movement.

Above all, we must guard against all separatist tendencies among Jewish Communists, strengthening daily our organic connections with the Party — its program, its tactics, its organization, its leadership, in branch, city, state, and nation. The Communist Party of the United States is the party of all American Communists regardless of race, creed, color, or national origin. This is a simple but fundamental truth for Communists to propagate and live with in every activity for our people.

The party has given us a political line and general program of action. We have applied it to the special needs of the Jewish work. Consequently, we redouble now the fight for Jewish anti-fascist unity, includ-

ing the Communists and progressive forces in Zionism, for the rehabilitation and rebuilding of Jewish life, for outlawing anti-Semitism, for the well-being and culture of the Jewish people as projected by the Soviet Jews. And we unfold a concentrated activity to bring Jewish workers and trade unionists into prominent and leading participation and influence in the Jewish anti-fascist unity, combatting systematically all reactionary elements in Jewish life and, most particularly, the reactionary Social-Democratic and anti-unity conspirators of the Dubinsky-Forward-Jewish Labor Committee clique.

In fighting for the interests of the Jewish people, we do so as American Jewish Communists, i.e., in the struggle for the entire party program today—For Jobs, For Democracy, For Peace, For Security.

PUERTO RICO AND THE STRUGGLE AGAINST U. S. IMPERIALISM

By M. B.

I.

The proletariat must demand the right of political secession for the colonies and the nations that "its own" nation oppresses.—V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. XIX, p. 61.

LEAVING THE WHITE HOUSE on a day late in August, 1945, Governor Rexford Guy Tugwell told the press that President Truman believes that Puerto Rican people, by their contribution to victory, have earned the right freely to determine their future relations with the United States. The average American, his mind busy with the pressing problems of lay-offs and wage-cuts, probably did not trouble to read the small item at all. The few who took note of the news accepted it at face value, and perhaps some of them thought, "Sure. That's what we've been fighting for over in Europe and Asia."

In the Island the announcement was received with more enthusiasm—and more skepticism. With more

enthusiasm, because Puerto Ricans never forget the shame of their colonial bondage which the majority of our own people so seldom remember. And with more skepticism because the promise of freedom has been made to them before, only to be broken.

It was just after freedom from the rule of imperial Spain seemed at long last within Puerto Rico's grasp that General Miles, landing at San Juan, issued a proclamation in the name of the government of the United States:

We have not come to make war upon the people of a country that for centuries has been oppressed, but, on the contrary, to bring protection, not only to yourselves but to your property, to promote your prosperity, and to bestow upon you the immunities and blessings of the liberal institutions of our Government.

That was in 1898, when the United States took Puerto Rico from Spain by force of arms, at the same time annexing the Philippine archipelago and Guam and establishing its political and economic dominion over Cuba. The Spanish-American War signaled a new epoch in American development and marked this country's entry into open imperialist rivalry with the great colonial powers of the Old World. It was not a popular war; for the American people had no stomach for the aggressive ambitions expressed in President McKinley's dream of "Manifest Destiny." The Anti-Imperialist League came into being and de-

manded immediate liberation of the Philippines and Cuba. Mr. Dooley "explained" the new expansionist policy to his friend, Mr. Hennessy, in the widely read articles of Finley Peter Dunne.

"I don't know what to do with th' Ph'lippeans," said Mr. Dooley, "anny more thin I did las' summer, before I heerd tell iv thim. We can't sell thim, we can't ate thim, an' we can't throw thim into th' alley whin no wan is lookin'. An' 'twud be a disgrace fr to lave before we've pounded these frindless an' ongrateful people into insinibility."

The American people, in struggle against the American imperialists, played an important part in enforcing compliance with our pledge to respect Cuba's political sovereignty—a pledge that was not wholly fulfilled until the abrogation of the Platt Amendment in the early days of the Roosevelt Administration. It was the American people who never ceased to demand the independence of the Philippines—and who are aware now that their vigilance cannot be relaxed until the pledge of independence is finally and fully met. But through all the 47 years since the signing of the Treaty of Paris, a variety of circumstances combined to make the American people "forget" Puerto Rico, while other factors that operated to advance the independence of Cuba and the Philippines did not affect Puerto Rico's status.

Located some 2,000 miles east of Florida, in the Caribbean, Puerto

Rico is a tropical, mountainous island with a land area of 3,423 square miles and a population of two million. In 1900, the Foraker Act gave it its first civil government under American rule. In 1917 the Organic Act (Jones Bill) conferred United States citizenship on Puerto Ricans and made the Insular legislature completely elective. The Organic Act still defines Puerto Rico's political status today. Under it, the Puerto Rican people have no voice in the determination of national policy vitally affecting their interest. They are represented in the U.S. Congress by a Resident Commissioner who has no vote. Their Governor, the chief members of the executive branch of their government, and the judiciary are appointed by the President of the United States—with the advice and consent of the U.S. Senate, but not of the Puerto Rican people. The President, the Governor, or either House of the U.S. Congress can repeal or annul any law passed by the Puerto Rican legislature.

An island two-thirds the size of Connecticut, with a population no bigger than that of Philadelphia, is easily forgotten by 130,000,000 people whose nation spans a whole continent. But in "forgetting" Puerto Rico we Americans have forgotten something of vital concern to us—the nature of American imperialism itself.

In other parts of the world, particularly in Latin America, our "own" imperialism has taken on spe-

cial forms which tend to blur the general characteristics it shares with other and older imperialisms, such as those of Great Britain, France, etc. U.S. imperialism in the Western Hemisphere has for the most part followed a stream-lined course of economic penetration and control, accompanied with pious expressions of respect for the political rights and sovereignty of its neighbors. Past aberrations, such as armed intervention in the Dominican Republic, Cuba, Haiti, Nicaragua and Mexico are now generally condemned as youthful crudities on a par with the excesses that marked the winning of the West. But the continued possession of Puerto Rico, against the declared will of its people, is the classical expression of imperialism, colonialism. Our Latin American neighbors conclude from this that American imperialism is fundamentally no different from the rest of its kind, and they fear Puerto Rico's bondage foreshadows their own fate.

But in Puerto Rico we also find some of the special, "more civilized" aspects of American imperialism, and these have tended to dull further our own sensitivity to its essential oppressiveness. Particularly during the New Deal period, the concessions won by American workers and farmers were in some measure extended to those of the Island—in the form of relief, W.P.A., public works, low-cost housing, collective bargaining rights, minimum wage standards and agrarian reforms. In this period federal grants-in-aid and

direct federal expenditures in Puerto Rico have amounted to around \$39,500,000 annually, to which should be added about \$10,000,000 a year for agricultural conservation and sugar subsidy payments. In spite of this largess, the average income of a Puerto Rican family of five is estimated at \$341 a year—the federal agencies tell us that "under the best conditions" some 65 per cent of the Island's working population is unemployed.

Nevertheless, it would be a mistake to minimize the effect on both Island and mainland workers, of this "progressive" peculiarity of U.S. imperialism, which is without parallel in the colonial empires of Britain, France, the Netherlands, etc. In the first place, the concessions granted were not won without struggle, and represent victories for the mature and well organized labor-progressive movement of Puerto Rico over Congressional reactionaries who fought the New Deal as bitterly in the Island as they did in the states. In the second place, the concessions, however short of meeting the basic needs of the Island people, gave rise to certain illusions among them as to the real nature of American rule—illusions which were shared also by the workers in the oppressing country and which led them to abate the struggle against their "own" imperialists.

But it was at the very peak of New Deal progressivism that U.S. imperialism showed its true colors and the brutality which is character-

istic of imperialism in general. That was during the rule of Governor Winship, when Puerto Rican patriots were cold-bloodedly shot down in the streets of Ponce for demanding their country's liberation and many nationalist leaders were sentenced to long terms in Atlanta prison. The year was 1936. Franklin Delano Roosevelt was President of the United States.

It is a favorite argument of U.S. apologists for imperialism, an argument typical of imperialists everywhere, that the tax-payers of this country would save millions of dollars by giving the Island its independence, while the Puerto Ricans would find the price of liberty too high for survival. Hearings on various bills to give Puerto Rico its independence, held over a long period of years by a succession of House and Senate committees, are replete with expressions of this view. We may cite as one example the testimony of Mr. Ben Dorfman, chief economist for the United States Tariff Commission, given before the Senate Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs on April 27, 1945, during consideration of the Tydings Bill (S. 227). Said Mr. Dorfman:

Immediately on granting Puerto Rico its independence, the federal government would presumably cease making its customary remittances to the Island and would stop making expenditures in the Island for education, agricultural research, highways, public health, and the like. Since Puerto Rico's association with the United States, these

remittances and expenditures have totaled about one-half billion dollars, and particularly in recent years, have constituted a major source of income for the Island.

Under S. 227, reciprocal free trade between Puerto Rico and the United States would be progressively eliminated commencing one year after independence. Theoretically, the trade adjustment period would extend over a 20-year interval unless Puerto Rico chose to terminate it earlier. Actually, the tariff duties on a number of articles of the kinds that continental United States obtains from Puerto Rico are such that the application of any substantial fraction of the full duties would likely stop or sharply curtail imports from Puerto Rico long before the end of the 20-year period. The preferential tariff treatment which the United States accords imports from Cuba would also operate to reduce the effective length of the trade adjustment period. The tariff status of imports from the Philippine Islands—a status not yet fully agreed upon—would also be a factor. Neither by engaging in trade with other countries, nor by becoming more nearly self-sufficient could Puerto Rico expect to employ the resources at its command more advantageously than it now does in exchanging products with the United States.

In view of these considerations, Puerto Rican independence, as provided for under S. 227, would undoubtedly create an economic situation in the Island which would render well-nigh hopeless all prospects of the Island maintaining even its present low standard of living—much less any likelihood of bettering it. . . .

If 47 years' possession of the Island

of Puerto Rico has cost continental taxpayers a half billion dollars, while it has brought the average Island family an annual income of only \$341—who has in fact profited by this relationship? It is high time a really exhaustive and authoritative study were made to provide the answers to this question. But, while this does not pretend to be such a study, we can at least cite a few suggestive figures.

The annual average of Puerto Rico's imports from the United States in the years 1887 to 1901 was \$10,548,000 or 28.7 of its total imports. In 1935 imports from the U.S. had jumped to \$79,678,000, or 97.4 per cent of the total—putting Puerto Rico *ninth* among the world's purchasers of U.S. goods. In May, 1945, the Bell Committee of the U.S. House of Representatives reported: "Puerto Rico, with its 2,000,000 people ranks as the *seventh* largest purchaser of United States goods, normally buying about \$100,000,000 annually from the mainland. Only the United Kingdoms, Canada, Mexico, Brazil, Egypt, and the Union of South Africa purchase more from the United States."

It would seem that the exporters of certain types of U.S. goods have profited from the monopoly of the Puerto Rican market, despite its relatively small and impoverished population. It is also interesting to look at the kind of goods Puerto Rico buys from the mainland, as illustrated by this list in the order of 1935 dollar values: textile manu-

factures, rice, woods and manufactures, iron and steel manufactures, lard, tobacco and manufactures, autos and other vehicles, wheat flour, fertilizers, paper manufactures, beans, gasoline.

Except for two-thirds of its food by weight and one-half by retail value, and except for a small quantity of locally made goods, Puerto Rico imports from the United States either in unprocessed or finished form practically all that it consumes. As the report of the Brookings Institution (1930) put it—Puerto Ricans must "buy the great bulk of their imports in the United States protected markets, where wages and costs are high," while being "denied the opportunity of importing their goods from markets where costs of production are lowest." Furthermore, these imports must be shipped in American bottoms, adding to the price Puerto Rico pays and to the profits made by U.S. ship owners. Altogether, on the import side at least, it is not the Puerto Ricans who have benefited from the Island's inclusion in the U.S. tariff wall.

Sugar is Puerto Rico's main export product and the curse of its economy, and Puerto Rico is indeed a sugar-bowl for American imperialists. Of the \$76,500,000 gross crop income, 60 per cent comes from sugar-cane, grown on less than 30 per cent of the total land harvested and on only 18 per cent of all farms. Sugar, since the coming of the Americans, has meant increased concentration of land under absentee man-

agement and a rural population of landless peasants who work for wages on the large estates. Manager-operated farms are only 2.3 per cent of the total number of farms, but hold 30 per cent of all farm land, 44 per cent of the value of all farm land and buildings, and average \$135 per acre in comparison with \$74 and \$71 for owner and tenant-operated farms.

Without going into the financial structure of the sugar trust and its relations with U.S. finance capital, we may cite here a few profit figures. They are taken from a book bought and paid for by the sugar companies themselves—*The Sugar Economy of Puerto Rico*, by Gayer, Homan and James (Columbia University Press, 1935). There are four big U.S.-owned sugar companies in Puerto Rico, of which only three—Aguirre, Fajardo and South Puerto Rico—get detailed consideration in this study. Their total earnings in the thirteen years 1923-1935 have been \$55,100,100, or an annual average of \$4,200,000. Income taxes totalled \$7,200,000, or \$555,000 annually. Profits from imported Dominican cane are shown at \$3,100,000 (after income tax). The net amount accruing to investors (continentals) from strictly Puerto Rican operations is thus \$44,800,000, or \$3,400,000 annually. Earnings distributed to investors averaged \$2,760,000 a year. In addition to the income payments to investors, capital was withdrawn to the amount of \$2,500,000 by the retirement of mortgage debt.

In computed percentages, total earnings have averaged 12 per cent annually upon investors' equity. According to the authors of *The Sugar Economy of Puerto Rico*—"The most striking fact about the figures is that they are almost as good for recent depression years as for years of prosperity." And they add, "The profitable basis of the Puerto Rican sugar industry has long been supported (indeed, to a large degree created) by the American tariff on sugar. This has been of special importance during the depression. As Cuban production dropped off owing to the catastrophic decline of the world price of sugar, Puerto Rican producers (together with producers in other areas within the tariff boundaries) were able to pursue an uninterrupted program of expansion up to 1934. Thereafter they received the offsetting benefits of the A.A.A. program, as represented both by subsidized crop restriction and higher sugar prices. Had the industry been compelled to meet the depression without expansion, subsidization or price control, there is no doubt that the record would have been different."

Thus, while the U.S. government was pouring increased sums of the taxpayers' (read U. S. workers') money into the Island to keep the Puerto Rican people alive through the depression years, the sugar companies were draining off undiminished profits to mainland investors. More than that, through subsidy payments and price bolstering me-

asures, the Government contributed directly to those profits—also out of the tax-payers' money.

Workers in Puerto Rican sugar cane fields and mills did not fare so well. The average hourly wage during the 1935-36 crop season was 11.5 cents for field workers and 11.6 cents for mill workers, in the American-owned companies and allied enterprises; and 10.7 cents and 13.2 cents for field and mill workers respectively in eleven Puerto Rican companies.

On the export side also, it seems clear that the sugar companies and their continental stock-holders, not the workers of either the United States or Puerto Rico, have profited from the existing colonial relationship.

II.

Never content with the concessions wrung from the United States during the Roosevelt Administration, the Puerto Rican people used them to consolidate their independent labor and political organizations and cement the unity of the pro-independence forces. Today, they are defending the gains won within the framework of colonialism and at the same time raising more sharply than ever the demand for national liberation.

The Confederation of Puerto Rican Workers (CGT) has won bargaining rights and wage increases and wields considerable political influence. By its affiliation to the Latin American Federation of Workers

(CTAL) and its sending of a delegate to the Paris conference of the World Federation of Trade Unions it has demonstrated labor's consciousness of Puerto Rico as a Latin American nation. The Free Federation, opposed to independence and affiliated to the A. F. of L, is disappearing from the scene and most of its few remaining locals are moving toward unity with the CGT.

Progressive unity in the Island reached its high point in the November, 1944, elections when the Popular Democratic Party led by Senator Luis Munoz Marin won all the legislative seats except one in the House and two in the Senate. The Popular Party is Puerto Rico's New Deal party—a loose coalition of classes and forces which encompasses all but the smallest groups corrupted by foreign imperialism. Votes for Popular candidates were, in the first place, votes for the party's progressive economic program and an endorsement of its efforts, since its establishment in 1940, to advance the well-being and democratic rights of the people to the fullest extent possible within the colonial frame-work. Popular party votes were also pro-Roosevelt votes, although Puerto Ricans have no right to choose among presidential candidates in the United States. Roosevelt's reactionary enemies in the Island were repudiated in the landslide that swept them out of the Insular legislature.

But while, in the interests of unity around these issues, the Popular

party refused to make independence an issue in the 1944 elections—Popular party votes were also pro-independence votes. The minority parties, advocating statehood and warning excitedly that “a vote for the Popular party is a vote for independence,” won only three seats. And many of the Popular candidates who triumphed are advocates of independence and members of the Puerto Rican Congress for Independence. The 1944 elections are a crushing answer to those who pretend to find a strong pro-statehood tendency in the Island.

This organization, based on the labor movement, the Popular party masses and a large section of the Island bourgeoisie, is non-partisan. It has broken with and isolated a handful of its members who tried to use the independence issue as a partisan weapon and to destroy the democratic coalition represented by the Popular party. The Congress has given serious and constructive attention to the solution of the economic problems which would face a sovereign Republic of Puerto Rico. Organized in 1943, it demonstrates the maturity of the independence movement achieved in the course of the anti-fascist war, and is a far cry from the small, isolated and petty bourgeois Nationalist Party through which Puerto Ricans first expressed their aspirations to freedom.

It was natural that the war should stimulate the independence movement in Puerto Rico. Called into the armed services as American citizens,

the Puerto Ricans participated wholeheartedly in the world struggle against fascism and subordinated their own fight for national liberation to the needs of victory. The Atlantic Charter and the declarations of Teheran, Yalta and Potsdam gave them new hope that their own freedom would be a fruit of the peace.

The war itself did not change the basic imperialist relations between the United States and Puerto Rico. Particularly during the early war years, the Island suffered severe privations through the cutting off of food supplies by curtailment in shipping. Sugar profits were not adversely affected, however. It was during the war, too, that one of the Puerto Rican people's grievances against their imperialist masters came into sharp focus—when new attempts were made to violate their Spanish culture by forcing school children to study in the English language.

But the most serious danger to Puerto Rican independence was heightening of the U.S. War and Navy Departments' awareness of the Island's strategic military importance, and their ambitions to bring it fully under their control. Elaborate plans for a whole chain of strategic bases in the Caribbean, of which those in Puerto Rico will form a part, have been hinted at but not fully revealed.

Testifying on the Tydings Bill (S. 227) in March of this year, Capt. G. B. Parks of the Office of the

Chief of Naval Operations said: "The Chief of Naval Operations is opposed to any bill for Puerto Rican independence that provides only for the retention of naval and military reservations, and does not also provide for the right of expansion of naval and military facilities and the selection of new sites at any time in the future, if necessary to the national security. The United States must be the *sole judge* (emphasis mine, M.B.) of its own military requirements in this area."

Bases designed to serve a purely defensive purpose and subject to supervision by the Security Council of the United Nations Organization need not be inconsistent with Puerto Rican independence, any more than with the independence of Brazil or Ecuador. On the contrary, free and independent neighbors, voluntarily allied with the United States through a mutual assistance agreement, would contribute to defense operations as involuntary "subjects" could not be relied on to do. To imply inconsistency between Puerto Rican independence and the plans of the U.S. military would therefore be to suggest that those plans are other than purely defensive.

III.

About the time of Puerto Rico's annexation by the United States, Mark Twain wrote a piece called "To the Person Sitting in Darkness," in which he satirized what he called "The Blessings - of - Civilization - Trust." "The Person Sitting in Dark-

ness," Twain wrote, "is almost sure to say: 'There is something curious about this—curious and unaccountable. There must be two Americas: one that sets the captive free, and one that takes a once-captive's new freedom away from him, and picks a quarrel with him with nothing to found it on; then kills him to get his land.'"

In its 47 years of operation the "Blessings-of-Civilization-Trust" has profited neither the people of Puerto Rico nor those of America. There *are* two Americas—as we are learning anew today. The "other America" is fighting the American labor movement and its allies over such matters as the President's post-war congressional program as relentlessly as it is fighting Puerto Rican independence. If labor and the people are to win anywhere, they must combat and defeat their enemy on *all* fronts. The very tenacity with which the U.S. imperialists cling to the colony of Puerto Rico, while lamenting that it is such an "unprofitable enterprise" for them, shows how heavy a blow they would suffer from its loss. Which is a very good reason for striking it, now.

The question of Puerto Rico's future relations with the United States must be decided by the Congress of the United States, and the American people must assume responsibility for determining the nature of that decision. There are three legislative proposals now before Congress, the Tydings Bill (S. 227), the Marcantonio Bill (H.R. 2781), and the Tyd-

ings-Piñero Bill (S. 1002). Hearings have thus far been held only on the first of these.

The bill introduced by Senator Millard Tydings (D. Maryland), despite all its weaknesses, offers the widest opportunity of publicizing the issue and has the most realistic chance of getting favorable congressional action. Amendments designed to provide economic assistance to Puerto Rico during the first adjustment to independence and guarantee its survival as an independent nation have been submitted to Senator Tydings by the Congress for Independence. If these amendments were accepted, they would make the Tydings and Marcantonio bills identical, since Marcantonio—always an ardent champion of the interests of the Puerto Rican people—has already incorporated them in his measure.

The heart of the difference between the Tydings and Marcantonio bills in their present form is in their treatment of Puerto Rican sugar's present privileged position in the U.S. market. Both bills recognize that the sudden imposition of a U.S. tariff on Puerto Rican sugar, as the penalty for political independence, would cut the Island off from its main export market and speedily wreck its economy. The Marcantonio Bill would provide for the negotiation of a U.S.-Puerto Rican economic treaty, certain of whose provisions are already stipulated in the proposed grant of independence. They are: (a) that the volume of commerce now carried on between

the two countries shall not be reduced by "the exclusive will of one of the parties"; (b) all U.S. imports from Puerto Rico, up to the value of Puerto Rico's imports from the U.S., shall be admitted duty free in this country. The purpose of these provisions is to permit Puerto Rican sugar to enter the U.S. without duty, until such time at least as other export products are developed by a free Puerto Rico; to permit the Puerto Rican government to protect native industry by imposing a tariff on U.S. goods; and to maintain present levels of trade between the two countries.

The Tydings Bill, as it now stands, would merely provide a sliding scale of duties on Puerto Rican imports of sugar in this country—wiping out Puerto Rican sugar's present advantageous position in the U.S. market in a period of 20 years.

Senator Tydings is not popular with the American labor and progressive movement—for good reasons based on his record over a period of many years. His motives for supporting Puerto Rican independence are suspect, and it is frequently charged that he has close ties with beet and cane sugar interests in the United States which would profit from the elimination of Puerto Rican competition. Representative Marcantonio, on the other hand, has the full confidence of labor and progressives—and therefore there has been a tendency to wait for the Marcantonio Bill's number to come up in Congress before doing any

thing at all about Puerto Rico.

This may explain the otherwise rather shocking fact that not a single witness for an American trade union or progressive organization testified on the Tydings Bill when it was under consideration by the Senate Insular Affairs Committee last spring. This is an error that should be quickly corrected, and demands on Senator Tydings made at once for re-opening hearings on his measure. In the course of further hearings it will be possible for labor to urge adoption of the amendments proposed by the Congress for Independence, to bring the Tydings Bill in line with Marcantonio's. Passage of the Tydings Bill by the Senate, a very realistic goal, would greatly enhance the chances for securing favorable House action on the Marcantonio Bill.

There is a third measure before Congress—the so-called second Tydings Bill, or Tydings-Piñero Bill (S. 1002). This goes under the guise of a "plebiscite," but in reality offers only three ways of saying "yes" to colonialism. This bill is now in the process of being revised and re-drafted, and the likelihood is that it will be presented to Congress under White House sponsorship, as the legislative implementation of President Truman's pledge to the Puerto Rican people. We may hazard a guess that in its new form it will still offer an "independence" so hedged around by limitations of sovereignty imposed under the name of "military necessity" that indepen-

dence will be meaningless, and that all economic guarantees will be missing. Puerto Ricans who do not care to vote for that kind of fraudulent "independence" will have a chance to ratify the present colonial status, perhaps under some beguiling new name and with the added trimming of an elective governor. And the third choice in this "ja" plebiscite will be statehood. As we have seen, statehood is a "solution" without mass support in the Island. But its inclusion among the three "choices" to be offered the Puerto Rican people is particularly cynical. For Congress has made it quite clear that under no circumstances would it admit Puerto Rico into the Union as the 49th state. This is understandable, for both Congress and the Puerto Rican people know that Puerto Rico is in every sense a nation—and the U.S. not a multi-national state.

Two factors weigh heavily with sincere progressives in this country who would like to see a free Puerto Rico but hesitate to carry on a vigorous campaign for independence. Can we support the Tydings and Marcantonio Bills, they ask, without "imposing" independence on the Puerto Rican people—who may prefer some other form of relation to the United States? We must answer that these bills *do not* impose independence, but on the contrary provide the only genuine means of consulting the Puerto Rican people and permitting them freely to determine their own destiny. Under both of these measures, independence does

not come into effect unless and until the people of Puerto Rico have so decided, basing their decision on the concrete and specific conditions which independence will bring to their Island.

The second stumbling block in the minds of many honest friends of Puerto Rico is the problem of the economic hazards which political separation from the United States will inevitably imply. This is a very real difficulty, and one which greatly troubles the Puerto Rican people themselves. We cannot, as we have sometimes done in the past, brush this question aside.

Many "plans" have been made for Puerto Rico, and many "surveys" of its resources and potentialities been published. These provide a useful reservoir of factual material for the student looking for an answer to the question, "How can an independent Puerto Rico survive?" But they do not provide the answer and we are not in a position, unfortunately, to give it here. A new and thoughtful approach to the working out of a realistic economic program for a free Puerto Rico must be made by American progressives, who have delayed undertaking this important task too long. The development of native industries, the diversification of agriculture, the establishment of multilateral trade rela-

tions and the development of commercial exchange with other nations while maintaining friendly trade relations with the United States—these are the familiar aspects of the subject. The new thing that is needed is a solution for Puerto Rico based on the knowledge that it can prosper only if it breaks out of the imperialist economic grip in which it is now held prisoner. "Solutions"—even if they assume political independence—which tend to avoid a clash with the sugar interests and substitute new for old imperialist relationships, will not solve anything.

It is precisely because the fight for a free and *prosperous* Puerto Rico implies a fight against U.S. monopoly capital and a weakening of American imperialism that it must become the business of American labor and progressives. Puerto Rico belongs on the agenda of every trade union meeting and every mass meeting called by the democratic organizations of the American people. Mass delegations to Washington, testimony before Senate and House Committees considering bills affecting Puerto Rico, should not be left to the Puerto Ricans alone. When the demand for Puerto Rican freedom really rings out in the United States, then we shall know that the American people's struggle against imperialism has begun in earnest.

PATRIOTISM*

BY N. BALTISKY

THE HISTORICAL TASK

THE PATRIOTIC movement which has arisen in a number of countries during the Second World War is an extremely wide movement embracing workers, peasants and intellectuals and their social organizations. Here, however, we shall deal with only one unit of the patriotic movement, with its working-class vanguard, and with the followers of Communism and Socialism in particular, because, for a long time, their patriotism was challenged, and here and there it is still a target of the attacks of reactionaries.

Perhaps the most common and, let it be frankly said, the most dangerous weapon in the ideological arsenal of the opponents of the cusation that Communists and all working-class movement is the ac-patriotic. Even after the foundation Left-wing workers generally are un-of the Soviet state, in which the Communists gave practical proof of their ardent and self-sacrificing patriotism, Communists in other countries, and Socialists who co-operated with them, continued to be hounded as "the internal enemies of their country," and the Com-

munist ideology was depicted as something directly antithetical to patriotism. With the spread of the fascist movement in many countries, this reactionary persecution of the advanced men and women of the working-class movement under the flag of patriotism grew more rabid and assumed more virulent forms. Not only the fascists, but all their abettors—the appeasers and Munichites as well—argued that the attitude of the Communists and of many Socialists towards national defense was, to say the least, suspicious.

But the historical test of the patriotism of both the Communists and their accusers was soon to come. The piratical war waged by the German fascist imperialist to enslave the peace-loving nations compelled the various classes of society and political parties to prove by deeds which of them were really prepared to defend, and which were ready to betray their country. What did this supreme test by fire reveal?

Firstly, in the German-occupied countries of Europe, it was the fascists and other extreme reactionaries, who, before the war and even on its outbreak, has been most clamantly professing their "patriotism" and denouncing the "unreliability" of the Communists, that proved to be traitors to their country. It was the most rabid foes of the Communists—Pétain, Laval, Darlan and their confrères, as well as their backers, the financial sharks of the Comité des Forges, Schneider-Creusot and

* From *New Times*, No. 1, June 1, 1945. Moscow, U.S.S.R.

the other giant firms and trusts—that betrayed France. And who were the traitors in Norway, Denmark, Holland and Belgium? Who helped the Germans in Bulgaria to turn that Slav country, whose people were deeply grateful to Russia as their liberator, into a German military base against the Soviet Union? Who offered their services to the German butchers and enslavers in Poland, Czechoslovakia, Austria, Yugoslavia and Greece? The contemptible quislings and the avaricious bankers and land magnates back of them. As the German aggressors scored temporary victory after victory in the early period of the war, the number of reactionaries who signified their readiness to sell the independence of their motherland for a mess of pottage steadily grew in all the countries they occupied.

Secondly, the Communists and many Socialists gave practical proof of their unswerving loyalty and devotion in defending the liberty and independence of their countries against the encroachments of the German imperialists and their associates. Everywhere they have been in the van of the patriots—the workers and peasants fighting the tyranny of the German invaders.

The freedom-loving nations rightly express admiration for and take pride in the patriotic deeds of the heroic soldiers and partisans of the Soviet Union, as well as of the brave patriots of Yugoslavia, France, Poland, Greece and a number of other

countries which were temporarily seized by the Germans. But everybody knows that these deeds, which will be recorded in history forever as matchless examples of patriotic heroism and devotion, were in very many cases performed by Communists and their closest comrades-in-arms.

These irrefutable facts play such havoc with the case put up by the vicious foes of Communism and Socialism that one would have thought that they would see the wisdom of letting this question of who is a patriot and who not severely alone. However, not all of them can hold their tongues, and not all of them know when they are beaten. In America, England and Sweden, for instance, some of the old anti-Communist stalwarts, relying on the tenacity of the anti-Communist prejudices of the uninformed public, are still trying to stir up trouble and to sow suspicion. It is therefore worth while examining the specious arguments which still remain in their armoury.

PATRIOTISM AND WAR

Certain foes of the working people argue as follows: it is true that the Communist Parties of the United Nations took a patriotic stand in the war against Hitler, but this was merely fortuitous, for Communist ideology affords no guarantee that its followers will support their country in any war. Consequently, in

another
patriot
This
from
course
munis
any w
of libe
patriot
triotic
no ma
may b
A war
by cri
is an a
the lif
against
own n
tionary
into an
grandi
deman
country
refuse
oppose
One
German
cause e
of the r
ple had
element
their co
against
s mor
long ag
ites of
mania,
aria. It
two de
and jur
these co

another war they may take an unpatriotic stand.

This is a false deduction made from a true premise. It is true, of course, that the followers of Communism are prepared to support not any war, but only just wars, wars of liberation. But only such wars are patriotic wars! There is nothing patriotic in wars of aggrandizement, no matter what glorious colors they may be painted in. More than that. A war of aggrandizement, started by criminal rulers in any country, is an act of violence not only against the life of other nations but also against the life and honor of their own nation. Consequently, if reactionary rulers plunge their country into an unjust war, a war of aggrandizement, genuine patriotism demands that the citizens of that country shall not only categorically refuse to support that war, but even oppose it.

One need not go far for examples. Germany need not be discussed, because even the blind must see that if the majority of the German people had been capable of displaying elementary concern for the fate of their country, they would have risen against the Hitler government and its monstrous imperialist adventure long ago. But take the former satellites of German imperialism—Rumania, Finland, Hungary and Bulgaria. It is significant that for over two decades the governing bodies and juridical authorities of precisely these countries regarded membership

of the Communist Party and of the working-class organizations which co-operated with it as tantamount to "high treason," liable to the penalty of long terms of imprisonment. What was the patriotic duty of those Rumanians, Finns, Hungarians and Bulgarians, who had the welfare of their country at heart when, on the outbreak of this war, Antonescu, Ryti, Horthy, Filov and the other reactionary rulers of these countries opened the gates to German troops and lined up their countries on the side of Hitler in his piratical war? Not to support the fascist war, of course, but to combat it; for war on the side of Hitler Germany was bound to injure the vital interests of these countries, and to injure them more in case of victory than in case of defeat, inasmuch as a victory for Germany would have spelled the complete loss of their independence.

The pro-Hitler rulers of these countries were obviously working for the establishment of Germany's dominion over the whole of Europe, and in doing so they brought their countries to the brink of ruin. Yet these tools of the German imperialists, who betrayed their countries again and again, concealed their criminal activities under the flag of "patriotism," and at the same time tortured real patriots—the Communists and others who self-sacrificingly fought for the salvation of their country from German tyranny and from the holocaust of fascist war.

Thus, the test of history has shown that the stand of Communism is one of consistent, active and devoted patriotism.

WITHOUT NATIONAL PREJUDICES

Some foes of the working people confuse patriotism with bourgeois nationalism and accuse the Communists and all sincere fighters for democracy of being half-hearted in their patriotism, inasmuch as they do not set their nation above all others. This is a specious screen for anything but innocent nationalist prejudices and sometimes for imperialist ambitions, which are the very antithesis of genuine patriotism.

As we know, the nationalist and racial prejudice that one's own nation or race is the "chosen" one and is superior to all others has long been fostered by the reactionaries for the purpose of winning over the politically backward masses in the fight against the democratic movement. By constantly fomenting hatred and contempt for other nations and races, the reactionaries convert nationalist prejudices into the poisonous fumes of jingoism and fascism, and then demonstrate the "superiority" of their nation by such methods as Jewish pogroms, Negro lynchings and attacks on the life of neighboring nations. But when the need arose for a patriotic fight to defend their country from alien invaders, these same jingoes and fascists made their peace with the enemy, as was the

case in the German-occupied countries, or, as was the case with certain pro-fascist circles in America and England, strove to frustrate the common fight against the enemy and to save him from complete defeat with the object of reaching a compromise with him.

The nationalists and jingoes are fond of quoting the motto: "My country, right or wrong." Evidently they think that pseudo-patriotic support of the policy of the government of their country justifies every encroachment on the life and liberty of other nations. This, of course, is a patent distortion of the concept of patriotism, and has neither historical nor political justification.

There has never been a patriotic movement in history which cherished designs against the right of equality and liberty of another nation. All the big patriotic movements of the 18th and 19th centuries aimed at the emancipation of their own country from alien dependence, or at repelling alien attack. This was true, for example, of the American War of Independence of 1775-83, the revolutionary wars waged by the French people in 1792-94, and the struggles for national liberation of the Greeks (1821-29), of the Poles (1830, 1846 and 1863) and of a number of other nations.

Clearly, readiness to fight for the liberty of one's own nation is one thing, and readiness to fight for the suppression of the liberty of another nation is quite another. The first

patriotism, the second is not. For example, dominion over colonies and the preservation of privileges which permit a metropolitan country to oppress and exploit colonial peoples cannot honestly be justified on the grounds of patriotism. To me it seems that a policy of colonial and national oppression serves the interests, not of the people of the metropolitan country as a whole, but only of definite upper strata and classes, which from the exploitation of colonies derive the material means with which to strengthen their domination both in their own country and in the colonies, and which are prone to pursue a policy of narrow self-interest at the expense of other nations. Such a policy engenders discord in international relations and brings in its train national calamities for the peoples.

Even moderate bourgeois nationalism means placing the interests of one's own nation (or of its upper strata) in opposition to the interests of other nations. On the other hand, even the most ardent patriotism, the deepest love of one's country, is fully consistent with respect for all peace-loving nations and belief in the equality of nations. Even in their day the great Russian democratic publicists of the last century were already keenly alive to and emphatically stressed this aspect of patriotic ideology. "True patriotism is incompatible with enmity towards other peoples," Dobrolyubov declared. And Belinsky fervently proclaimed:

Loving one's country means ardently desiring to see the ideal of humanity fulfilled in it and furthering this end to the best of one's ability. Otherwise, patriotism will be barbarism, which loves that which is its own simply because it is its own, hates everything that is alien simply because it is alien, and is enamored of its own loathsomeness and ugliness.

Hence, genuine patriotism is free from all national arrogance, selfishness and hatred of other peace-loving nations.

COSMOPOLITANISM IS ALIEN TO WORKING-CLASS IDEOLOGY

The foes of the working people often deny that the advocates of Communism or Socialism can be patriots, because, they say, these advocates stand for the international solidarity of the working people. Our opponents brand this as cosmopolitanism, as indifference to and contempt for one's own country.

This is a gross libel. Communism has nothing in common with cosmopolitanism. Although fighting under the banner of international solidarity of the working people, the Communist movement in every country—as the vanguard of the working-class movement—is deeply rooted in its native soil. Communism does not draw an antithesis between genuine patriotism and proletarian internationalism; on the contrary, it combines them.

Only pedants and muddleheads,

or foes of the labor movement, can assert that the working class cannot love its country and at the same time strive for fraternal solidarity with the working class of other countries. And only falsifiers and calumniators can assert that in striving for the international solidarity of labor the working class ceases to be patriotic and becomes cosmopolitan, divorced from its own country and its nation. The very idea that the working class may become divorced from or renounce its own nation is absurd on the face of it. For the modern working class is the principal limb of the body politic, not only because of its numbers, but also because of the economic and political role it plays. It is on the shoulders of the working class that the whole future of the nation chiefly rests. And inasmuch as the working class is so closely welded with the nation, the Communist Party, as the party of the working class, cannot renounce its nation unless it wants to sever all its own vital roots.

Cosmopolitanism is utterly alien to working-class ideology. Cosmopolitanism is characteristic of the representatives of international banking houses and international cartels, of the big Stock Exchange speculators, of the international armament kings (the "merchants of death") and their agents. These gentry are indeed guided by the Latin proverb: *abi bene, ibi patria* (one's country is where one is well off). They are strongroom patriots. Many of them

declare that they owe allegiance to no political doctrine. "We are businessmen and above politics," they are fond of saying. But their claim to be above politics cannot be taken at its face value. True, they really are businessmen, to whom buying and selling is the be-all and end-all of life. But this does not prevent them from hating every democratic movement of the people, or from hiring political agents of the fascist or pro-fascist brand to fight democracy.

What is more, just because of their frenzied worship of the golden calf, the international speculators not only willingly sell goods, but are just as ready to sell themselves to the highest bidder among foreign imperialists. Many cosmopolitan financiers, not only in the neutral countries but in France and the Anglo-Saxon countries as well, were prepared to render any service to the German fascist aggressor. By virtue of their cartel and other agreements with the Germans they, directly or indirectly, contributed to strengthening the military might of Hitler Germany, while during the war many of them hampered war production in their own countries in the interests of German imperialism. In the United States the anti-patriotic activities of a number of big American monopolies which were connected with German monopolies were exposed by the committee headed by Truman (now President of the United States). Many similar

facts were brought to light in other countries too.

We can take it as proved, therefore, that the cosmopolitanism of the international monopolists and speculators is certainly not "above politics." On the contrary, it is closely connected with the anti-democratic, pro-fascist policy, with that dangerous policy which gave rise to the Second World War, and which, if not curbed, will certainly create the danger of new devastating wars.

In opposition to this fatal policy of international depredation, in opposition to jingoism and fascism, intelligent workers advocate a policy of international friendship and unity, beginning with unity of action of workers' organizations and ending with close cooperation between all democratic nations in the fight against fascism and for the protection of the peace, liberty and independence of nations. Is not this political line fully consistent with the patriotic sentiments of each individual nation? Let the opponents of the working class try to prove, for example, that the decisions of the World Trade Union Conference held in London in February, 1945, are incompatible with the national interests of all the democratic countries. Let them try to get people to believe that the free development and prosperity of the various democratic countries will not be best secured by close cooperation among the democratic countries to destroy fascism and to protect the liberty and

security of all freedom-loving nations. The peoples are scarcely likely to believe it.

But this is precisely the policy of combining patriotism with international cooperation which is advocated by supporters of Communism and by progressive workers, peasants and intellectuals generally.

SOLIDARITY WITH THE SOVIET UNION

Lastly, the patriotism of the advanced workers is called into question on the ground of their solidarity with the Soviet Union. The disingenuous question, for instance, is asked: "How can people be called patriots who do not deny that they are loyal friends of a foreign state?"

Yes, in no country do the intelligent workers, or progressive peasants or intellectuals, deny their solidarity with the Soviet Union. But is not this solidarity in harmony with the noblest aspirations of true patriots in any country? This is solidarity and friendship with a *Socialist* state, a state which by its very nature is free from imperialist appetites, which respects and champions the principle of equality and self-determination of nations, and which is a reliable defender and staunch bulwark of general peace. The noble nature and role of the great Soviet state is now appreciated and acknowledged by broad sections of the public in the freedom-loving countries. Only the most reactionary,

pro-fascist circles continue to vilify the Soviet Union.

All the countries of the anti-Hitler coalition admit that their interests are bound up with lasting co-operation with the Soviet Union for the maintenance of enduring peace and the security of the peace-loving countries. Is it surprising then that genuine patriots everywhere express their profound conviction that their countries can best guarantee their security and free development by maintaining relations of friendship and close cooperation with the Soviet Union? Clearly, this conviction is a natural corollary of patriotism today.

It is equally clear on the other hand, that anti-Soviet tendencies are incompatible with patriotic convictions. True, attempts are made to gild every anti-Soviet policy with sham patriotism. But the history of the past quarter of a century and more has repeatedly shown that this gild soon wears off. This was strikingly revealed on the eve of and during the war in Europe which has now terminated. The rulers of Germany's satellite countries, for instance, tried hard to bedeck their shameful anti-Soviet war in the tinsel of patriotism, but it was not long before the tinsel was stripped away. It became clear to all that the Antonescu, Ryti, Horthy and Filov cliques were conducting an anti-patriotic war policy, detrimental to their countries. Whoever in these countries dared today to come for-

ward and repeat the anti-Soviet pseudo-patriotic catchwords of the war period would simply make himself an object of contempt in the eyes of the people. And who in Poland now believes that the Pilsudskis, the Becks and their accomplices were serving any patriotic aims by their anti-Soviet, pro-Hitler policy?

No more enviable was the fate of the "patriotism" of the French and British Munichites, who in defiance of the true national interests of their countries stubbornly sabotaged the formation of a united front of resistance to German aggression, strove to isolate the Soviet Union, and left Hitler Germany a free hand in the East. Even after England and France declared war on Hitler Germany, the French Daladier-Reynaud government and the British Chamberlain government were, as everybody knows, far less interested in the problem of defending their countries than in anti-Soviet machinations (in the first place, by rendering political and military assistance to reactionary Finland, the future satellite of German imperialism, which already at that time had been converted into a base for an imperialist attack upon the U.S.S.R.).

There would be no need to recall all this if certain British and French periodicals were not trying to discredit the patriotism of the Communists by demagogic references to the early period of the war. "Remember 1939 and 1940 [these dema-

gogues
perilou
Union
still
that ti
not inc
in its v
to reca
war, w
in the
and th
tically
all, dic
operati
any se
defensi
Instea
that ti
tution
gether
govern
Finnis
war w
Musso
the sa
the A
Counc
only t
mans i
Dunki
forme
divisio
shortly
Evid
and Br
were s
the ch
fight.
calcula
of true
in. W

gogues cry], remember that most perilous period when the Soviet Union and the United States were still not at war with Germany. At that time our Communists too were not inclined to support their country in its war. . . ." But if it is necessary to recall this phase in the European war, why not also recall the fact that in the first eight months the French and the British governments practically did not war with Germany at all, did not undertake any military operations, and did not even take any serious steps to strengthen the defensive power of their countries? Instead, the French government of that time engaged in a rabid persecution of the Communists and, together with the British Chamberlain government, supplied arms to the Finnish reactionaries who were at war with the Soviet Union (the Mussolini government in Italy did the same). More, at a meeting of the Anglo-French Supreme War Council on February 6, 1940 (*i.e.*, only three months before the Germans invaded France and before the Dunkirk disaster), Daladier informed Chamberlain that a French division and a Polish division would shortly be sent—to Finland.

Evidently, therefore, the French and British governments at that time were still not quite clear which was the chief adversary they intended to fight. Obviously such a war was not calculated to arouse the admiration of true patriots in France and Britain. When, however, in May, 1940,

the wretched war of the Reynaud-Daladier government collapsed, the French patriots—and the Communists in the first place—did not capitulate, but started their long and gallant struggle against the German invaders.

In England, government policy began to change for the better in May, 1940, when so distinguished an opponent of the Munich policy as Winston Churchill, who held a minor post in the Chamberlain cabinet, became the head of the government. But is it surprising that even Churchill could only with difficulty and only gradually steer the British ship of state definitely into the new course of the anti-Hitler struggle, the more so that in Parliament he could rely in the main only on the backing of that same majority which had hitherto approved every one of the ill-fated steps of Chamberlain's Munich policy? And is it surprising, too, that, after the unfortunate experience of British foreign policy for so many years, the convinced opponents of Hitlerism in England and other countries for some time maintained a waiting attitude even under the Churchill government, until that government by its actions furnished sufficient proof that Great Britain had definitely committed herself to this new line of policy? Of decisive importance in this respect was Churchill's declaration of June 22, 1941, of Britain's solidarity with the Soviet Union's war of liberation and the subsequent agree-

ment concluded between the Soviet Union and Great Britain for joint action in the war against Hitler Germany. After that no right-minded workingman in England had any justification for maintaining a waiting attitude. The working class was seized by patriotic fervour, and the Communists were particularly active and determined in their support of their country's war effort against Hitler Germany.

Such was the state of affairs in Britain in the early period of the war. And even if the Communists did commit certain mistakes, on the main question on which they were criticized—the need for united action by Great Britain and the Soviet Union both before and during the war—it was they, the Communists, and not their critics, who proved to be the champions of the true national interests of the British people. Far from hindering solidarity with the Soviet Union stimulated the growth of patriotic sentiment among the British workers during the war. This is corroborated by the fact that for the first time in history a spirit of labor enthusiasm swept the ranks of the British working class after the fellowship-in-arms was established between Great Britain and the Soviet Union.

Not only in England but in other countries too it was clearly apparent that the solidarity of the workers with the Soviet Union stimulated their patriotic fervor. This has been confirmed by many an impartial ob-

server in France, Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Bulgaria and other countries.

It may even be said that the development of patriotism in the ranks of politically conscious workers of all countries really began the day Soviet patriotism was born.

When the workers of Russia became the complete masters of their country, the intelligent workers of other countries naturally conceived a deep attachment for our Soviet country and began to call it the motherland of the workers of all countries. But at the same time their attachment for our country aroused in them a deeper attachment for their own country. The inspiring example of the Soviet people led them to believe in a brighter future for their own people. They conceived a deeper love for their own country as the home of the brighter future of the working people of their own nation.

The strength of this proletarian patriotism, born of the reflection of Soviet patriotism in the hearts of the intelligent workers of other countries, was vividly manifested in the courageous partisan struggle they waged against the German fascist invaders, who wanted to rob the workers forever of the hope of country and the right to country.

PATRIOTISM AND DEMOCRACY

During the Second World War

many
enced
vigor
did
Hitler
contin
In
triotic
necte
ment
racy.
patrio
was:
nity.
of the
jority
triotic
demo
forme
a feti
true
rebirth
follow
dition
ments
a rea
strugg
press
cratic
litical
of lib
again
masse
again
the w
in so
In
of nat
cism,
triotic
mark

many bourgeois countries experienced a rebirth and efflorescence of vigorous patriotism, which, of course did not cease with the victory over Hitler Germany and will certainly continue to grow.

In its historical origins, the patriotic movement was closely connected with the revolutionary movement of the young bourgeois democracy. The watchword of the French patriots a century and a half ago was: Liberty, Equality and Fraternity. It was not until the latter half of the 19th century that in the majority of the capitalist countries patriotism had entirely lost its living, democratic spirit and was transformed by the ruling classes into a fetish to deceive the masses. The true patriotism which has found a rebirth among the masses in our day follows and develops the finest traditions of the great patriotic movements of past centuries. It combines a readiness for self-sacrifice in the struggle for liberation from alien oppressors with a profoundly democratic and progressive trend in political aims. It is inspired by a love of liberty and a spirit of protest against the disfranchisement of the masses, against class oppression and against the ruthless exploitation of the workers by the parasitic elements in society.

In our day, when the chief enemy of national liberty everywhere is fascism, there can be no genuine patriotism which does not bear a markedly anti-fascist and anti-reac-

tionary character. The defenders of the fascists who flaunt the flag of patriotism are false patriots of a particularly dangerous kind, because they would prevent the accomplishment of the prime patriotic task: the eradication of every vestige of fascism and Nazism.

The reborn patriotism of our day is not a thing of idle ceremonial, but a devoted struggle for a free and happy future for one's people. We have witnessed in a number of countries which were temporarily occupied by the Germans noble examples of civic courage and martial valor displayed not only by the workers but also by those sections of the population* which had long ago ceased to manifest any capacity or inclination to wage a real fight for ideals which further social progress. Many partisans who came from the ranks of the democratic intelligentsia and the peasant youth fought side by side with the workers and revealed themselves in a new and noble light as true patriots, capable of being fired by lofty ideals and ready, if need be, to lay down their lives for those ideals.

Naturally enough, the Communists everywhere were in the van of this patriotic movement. For Communism, as no other ideology, arms and inspires its followers with the ideal of both the national and social emancipation of the people. Communism today is the close communion between the advanced workers and the intellectual world of the

broad mass of the people, their everyday life, their memories of the heroic past and their aspirations for a better future. And it is not surprising that the masses for their part, are now according the Communist Parties such strong support and confidence as we are witnessing, for example, in France, Yugoslavia, Poland, and Bulgaria, and even in Italy, Finland and Rumania.

In the Soviet Union, the great country of the working class triumphant, patriotism, of course, has already attained a far higher development.

Soviet patriotism was powerfully stimulated by the magnificent tenets of Lenin and Stalin on the national question, and by the successful practical application of those tenets by the Bolshevik Party and the Soviet Government. The rapid strides made by the national cultures of all the peoples of the Soviet Union helped most effectively to weld them together into a single family, bound by unbreakable ties of mutual friendship and brotherhood.

The Stalin Constitution, which is based on the principles of Socialist democracy, is the firm foundation not only of the political system of the U.S.S.R., but also of the further development of Soviet patriotism. At the same time, as Stalin foresaw when this only thoroughly democratic constitution in the world was adopted, it has served as a moral

backing and a real support for all those who have been waging the fight against fascist barbarism in other countries.

The abolition of the exploitation of man by man, and all the other historic achievements of Socialist construction in the U.S.S.R., have served as a constant stimulus to the growth of patriotism among the millions of working people of the Soviet Union. The result was that in the Great Patriotic War the Soviet people came through its unprecedented test with credit. Soviet patriotism proved to be an invincible force. And nobody can doubt that in the new period of peaceful constructive labor on whose threshold we now stand Soviet patriotism will perform new miracles.

Abroad, the patriotic movement in each country will undoubtedly continue to fight for the extirpation of fascism and reaction, for the democratization of the country, and for the ensurance of its security and independence. The true patriotism of workers, peasants and intellectuals is everywhere prepared to resist all imperialist ventures and to promote the establishment of relations between countries on the basis of justice and peaceful cooperation. True patriots will also support the right of all oppressed nations to full self-determination, and fight for human conditions of existence for the working masses.

The victo
Japa
whol
years
has
perio
come
worl
know
front
new
inter
ize d
livel
wide
demo
indep
stron
with
Amer
other
peace
Th
Japa
the f
aggre
recon
before
the c
allies
of A
Chin
army
that
tion

VITAL DOCUMENTS

STATEMENT OF THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF THE CHINESE COMMUNIST PARTY, YENAN, AUGUST 25, 1945.

The surrender of Japan has brought victory and an end to the sacred anti-Japanese war of resistance in which the whole nation has persisted for eight years! The war of the entire world has also ended victoriously! A new period of peaceful reconstruction has come to entire China and to the whole world. The Chinese Communist Party knows that the important task confronting the Chinese nation at this new historical stage is to consolidate internal unity and internal peace, realize democracy and insure the people's livelihood so as to bring about nationwide unification on the basis of peace, democracy and unity, to build up an independent, free, prosperous and strong new China, and in cooperation with Great Britain, the United States of America, the Soviet Union and all other allies, to consolidate an enduring peace among nations.

The successful conclusion of the anti-Japanese war has finally exterminated the fascist tyranny, enslavement and aggression, and the road to peaceful reconstruction and progress is opened before mankind. This is the result of the common effort of the four great allies—Great Britain, the United States of America, the Soviet Union and China—as well as that of the entire army and people of China. We believe that our countrymen of the entire nation will certainly direct their indom-

itable spirit of gallantry as exhibited against Japan to the great cause of national reconstruction.

The millions of people in China's liberated areas have exerted the greatest efforts and sacrifices during the anti-Japanese war. This is admitted by the people in China and abroad. In the period of peaceful reconstruction that will follow in the liberated areas, the people should also continue to become a model in the democratic reconstruction of the entire nation and a pillar in peace and unity and fulfill their great mission.

• • •

But the path in the struggle for an independent, free, strong and prosperous new China is not without obstacles, difficulties and thorns. The Japanese imperialistic aggressors have not carried out the Potsdam declaration and have not abandoned their designs to rejuvenate the ashes of the aggressive military. They are still unreservedly carrying out dark designs of sowing dissension, splitting and enslaving China. Their running dogs in China—China's quislings—are carrying out the instructions of their Japanese masters. They have effected a vanishing trick and covered themselves with a protective coat to continue their designs of instigating civil war, undermining unity and hampering democracy. Their

attempt met no rebuff and their crimes are not punished. On the contrary, they are encouraged and become still more unscrupulous. Thus the sinister activities of Chinese quislings and other reactionaries constitute a grave menace to peace, democracy and unity in China. The Chinese people must seriously guard against and frustrate the sinister plot of the enemy.

The Chinese Communist Party considers that the national government must be asked to carry out immediately certain emergency measures to lay the foundation for the coming peaceful reconstruction. These measures are:

1. Recognize a popularly elected government and anti-Japanese troops in liberated areas and withdraw troops surrounding and attacking the liberated areas so as immediately to realize peace and avert civil war.

2. Map out areas where the 8th Route Army, the New 4th Army and the South China Anti-Japanese Brigade will receive the surrender of Japanese troops, and grant them all rights of participating in the work of dealing with Japan in accordance with justice.

3. Severely punish traitors and disband puppet troops.

4. Carry out a just and rational reorganization of troops and a scheme of demobilization. Relieve refugees and lighten taxes so as to ameliorate the difficulties of the people.

5. Recognize the legal status of all parties and groups. Repeal all laws hampering people's freedom of assembly, association, speech, and publication. Liquidate secret political groups and release patriotic political prisoners.

6. Immediately call a conference of all parties, groups and non-party representatives to discuss all vital questions arising after the conclusion of war against Japan. Frame a democratic administrative program. Put an end to the period of political strife. Establish a democratic coalition government to ensure national unity and prepare for a National Assembly through free and unrestricted universal suffrage.

The Chinese Communist Party declares that it is willing to come to an agreement with the Kuomintang and other democratic parties and groups in China in order to effect a rapid solution of various pressing problems, to establish lasting solidarity and unity and thoroughly realize the Three People's Principles of Dr. Sun Yat-sen.

Dear Countrymen! The war of resistance has victoriously concluded! A new period of peaceful reconstruction has begun! We must persist in peace, democracy and unity, and struggle for an independent, free, prosperous and strong new China!

*Central Committee of the
Chinese Communist Party
August 25, 1945.*

status of all
al all law
n of asse
publication
groups and
isoners.
ference
n-party
al question
on of w
mocratic
t an end
. Establish
vernment
re for a N
ee and un

st Party
come to
mintang
nd groups
a rapid
problems,
nd unity
hree Peop
t-sen.
e war of
concluded
reconstruct
sist in pe
d struggle
osperous

mittee of
munist Pa
1945.