

# POLITICAL AFFAIRS

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

## EDITORIAL BOARD

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

ALEXANDER BITTELMAN; MAX WEISS; HENRY WINSTON

---

VOLUME XXV, NO. 4

## Contents

APRIL, 1946

- Defeat the Anglo-American Imperialist War Drive! Restore  
Big Three Unity to Preserve World Peace!  
*Statement of the National Secretariat, Communist Party, U.S.A.* 291
- The Imperialist Threat to Peace *Editorial* 294
- On Churchill's Call for an Anti-Soviet War Alliance *Joseph Stalin* 305
- The Vatican's War on Peace *V. J. Jerome* 310
- The Iranian Situation *"Izvestia"* 327
- The New Postwar Tasks of the U.S.S.R. *V. M. Molotov* 331
- On the Expulsion of Browder *William Z. Foster* 339
- Party Tasks Among the Negro People *Henry Winston* 349
- Lessons of the Congressional By-Election  
in New York *George Blake Charney* 362
- The Strategy of the Packinghouse Workers' Strike *James Keller* 371
- BOOK REVIEW:  
A Powerful Searchlight on the Imperialist Warmakers *Fred Blair* 380
- 

Re-entered as second class matter January 4, 1945, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879. POLITICAL AFFAIRS is published monthly by New Century Publishers, Inc., at 832 Broadway, New York 3, N. Y., to whom subscriptions, payments and correspondence should be sent. Subscription rate: \$2.50 a year; \$1.25 for six months; foreign and Canada, \$3.00 a year. Single copies 25 cents.

PRINTED IN THE U.S.A.

 209

## AUTHORS AND TOPICS

WILLIAM Z. FOSTER is the National Chairman of the Communist Party, and a veteran of more than fifty years of active leadership in the American labor movement. His most recent public address, *The Menace of a New World War* (issued by New Century Publishers), was given an initial printing of 750,000 copies. \* \* \* JAMES KELLER, a leader of the Communist Party in Illinois, has been an active leader of the trade union movement for many years. \* \* \* GEORGE BLAKE CHARNEY, Secretary of the Communist Party in New York County, recently returned from service in the U. S. armed forces. \* \* \* HENRY WINSTON, recently discharged from the U. S. armed forces, is a member of the National Committee of the Communist Party, and Secretary of its National Negro Commission. \* \* \* V. J. JEROME is Associate Editor of *Political Affairs* and author of *The Treatment of Defeated Germany, Intellectuals and the War*, and numerous other pamphlets and articles. In a future issue of *Political Affairs* he will discuss the subject of the Party and the writers. \* \* \* FRED BLAIR is the President of the Communist Party in Wisconsin, and a literary critic and poet.

Scheduled for publication in the May issue of *Political Affairs* are articles by Alexander Bittelman, "Wages and Profits Under Monopoly Capitalism," and by James S. Allen, "'Enlightened' American Imperialism in the Philippines." Also scheduled to appear in the next issue are two contributions by Max Weiss and Francis Franklin to the discussion of the national aspect of the Negro people's struggle opened by Claudia Jones in the January issue.

Stat

WINS  
poses  
chine  
It f  
Byrne  
capita  
world  
perial  
It  
Amer  
other  
Ch  
grava  
can-S  
the U  
If  
effect  
a con  
the  
conse  
Ch  
a cri  
logic  
crus  
and  
Pr  
the  
prov  
Chu

# DEFEAT THE ANGLO-U.S. IMPERIALIST WAR DRIVE! RESTORE BIG 3 UNITY TO PRESERVE WORLD PEACE!

*Statement issued on March 5, 1946, by the National Secretariat of the  
Communist Party.*

WINSTON CHURCHILL'S SPEECH proposes an American-British war machine to dominate the world.

It follows the speech of Secretary Byrnes in which American monopoly capitalism bluntly spoke its dream of world domination, with British imperialism as junior partner.

It is a plan that confronts every American home with the peril of another world war!

Churchill's speech reflects and aggravates the rupture in the American-Soviet-British coalition and in the UNO.

If not balked by an immediate and effective public protest, it can mean a complete break in the relations of the Big Three, with all its terrible consequences.

Churchill's deliberate creation of a crisis in the postwar world is the logical squence of the anti-Soviet crusade recently launched by Byrnes and Vandenberg.

President Truman directly shares the guilt as a leading partner in the provocation. He set the stage for the Churchill speech.

• • •

The grotesque "spy scares," created in the Canada lie factories for world export, were part of the same preparation. The world can easily see that now.

The scheme for world domination comes right out of the circles of the big trusts, the huge monopolies in the United States who see a chance to use their enormous power.

They are the same trusts who launched the drive against American labor, who today sponsor lynch violence against the Negro people.

The imperialist plan for which Churchill proposes military alliance is intended to cow and frighten the national liberation movements in Latin America, in Asia, in Indonesia, Egypt, and India.

It is a plan to bolster the rotten British imperial system, on the one hand, to crush democracy in Europe, on the other.

It is above all a scheme to save the capitalist system as it heads into deeper crisis, contradictions and antagonisms.

The trusts are ready to spill man-

kind's blood to save their rotten system.

To conceal this aim, they have manufactured the falsehood of Soviet "expansion." By this they mean the rise of democracy in Europe, the aspirations of the whipped colonial millions in Asia, China, etc., for freedom.

This plan for world domination will warm the heart of every Nazi left in Europe. It will encourage every feudal-monarchist clique trying to kill the advance of democracy in Europe. It will bolster Franco.

\* \* \*

The immediate basic cause for the deterioration of relations between the Soviet Union and the British-American imperialists lies in the fact that Britain and America have refused to carry out the Yalta and Potsdam pledges.

Britain and America have refused to denazify Germany and crush feudal-militarist reaction in Japan. They have refused to let the small countries of Europe decide their own fate. They are acting to stifle all freedom movements in India, Egypt, Indonesia, etc.

Carrying out the Yalta-Potsdam agreements would restore Big Three peaceful working relationships.

But the Churchill-Byrnes-Truman policy shows no such desire.

On the contrary, *their whole outlook is to impose their will on the world, including the Soviet Union, by overwhelming military power based on the atom bomb.*

Encouraged by the Truman-Byrnes-Vandenberg line, Churchill summons America to a partnership in imperialist crime!

\* \* \*

But neither the American nor the English people desire to act as executioners of European democracy, of colonial freedom. They do not want to be cannon-fodder against the Socialist Soviet Union. That is not why they fought to crush the Hitler Axis.

The British people did not kick Churchill out of office to have him come to the United States as an agent of imperialist conspiracy on the basis of Tory-Bevin war incitements.

We in America did not fight fascism in Germany and Japan merely to create a new London-Wall Street Axis to exploit and oppress mankind.

It is for America to speak out today as never before!

The Communist Party urges the men and women of American labor, and every peace-loving person, to speak out in their own defense now! Unitedly, they can stop the drive of imperialist Wall Street reaction at home and abroad.

Let an aroused American public opinion kick Churchill and his war provocations out of the United States.

The du Pont-Hearst expansionist schemes of world domination, voiced by Byrnes and Vandenberg, do not represent the will of the American

people  
Byrnes

To p  
can pe

Org:  
onstrat

Sen  
Preside

man, t  
Halt

monop  
abroad

Put  
macy

World  
Ful

Yalta  
demil

For  
coope

British  
loving

people who desire unity and peace.  
Byrnes must go!

\* \* \*

To preserve peace, let the American people speak, act, unite!

Organize mass meetings and demonstrations.

Send telegrams and resolutions to President Truman, to your Congressman, to the press.

Halt the reactionary drive of the monopolists, imperialist warmakers, abroad and on the home front.

Put an end to atom bomb diplomacy which is paving the way to World War III.

Fulfill the Moscow, Potsdam and Yalta agreements and denazify and demilitarize Germany and Japan.

Forge the friendship and peaceful cooperation of the American-Soviet-British coalition and all the freedom-loving peoples.

Support the national liberation struggles of the colonial and dependent peoples.

Defend the new democracies of eastern Europe.

No loans or credits to the British reactionaries and colonial overlords.

Grant adequate food supplies and credits to the peoples' democracies.

End the armaments race. No appropriations or universal military service for imperialist adventures and war.

Re-establish Big Three unity, the key to world peace.

SECRETARIAT,  
COMMUNIST PARTY, U.S.A.

WILLIAM Z. FOSTER  
EUGENE DENNIS  
ROBERT THOMPSON  
JOHN WILLIAMSON

# THE IMPERIALIST THREAT TO PEACE

## AN EDITORIAL

**THE PEOPLE DO NOT WANT WAR!** They do not want war against their heroic and most dependable ally, the Soviet Union; or against the new democracies in Europe; or against the colonial peoples struggling for freedom. The people therefore must struggle to implement their will for peace.

At this moment it is an imperative necessity that the people see clearly why an atmosphere of panic is being created by the camp of Vandenberg, Churchill, Byrnes, and Bevin. They must cut into the lying demagoguery of reaction to lay bare its real motives. They must grasp the fact that unless they act *now*, the victory over fascism, so newly won, may be torn from their grasp.

It is our task as Marxists to help the people see the present grave moment in its fuller connection with the process of political developments, not only since the ending of the war, but also in the course of the war. For, only by seeing the mounting threat to peace in the political context of the relationship of world forces, and of the underlying struggle among them, can the people meet the issue with understanding, with a knowledge of who the foe of peace is and who the friend, and with a realization of what the course and strategy of the struggle must be to save the peace.

The war of the United Nations,

even though it had its roots in the basic contradictions of capitalism, was a war of national liberation, a just war, a war to prevent the worldwide victory of fascism and to crush the fascist blight forever. The fact that it assumed the over-all character of a war for national freedom and democracy, and that it was fought to a victorious conclusion under the leadership of the mighty coalition of the U.S.S.R., the United States and Britain, could not but arouse the hope on the part of the peoples that the future peace of the world was ensured. This hope was particularly strong because of the belief that the Big Three would continue to collaborate harmoniously in the postwar stage. It was on this basis that the peoples trusted that they would not have their desire to establish a system of security shaken by ever-recurring fears of new wars.

### TWO OUTLOOKS

But the end of the war revealed that, while common interests exist between the Soviet Union and the peoples of Britain and the United States, as well as of the entire world, there were fundamental differences between the outlook and aims of Anglo-American imperialism and the Socialist Soviet Union. It revealed that the deep-seated designs of monopoly capitalism were a threat to peace and the freedom of nations

and peoples. It was bound to reveal that the Soviet Union now, as before and during the war, is the only great Power which is a consistent fighter for the utter destruction of fascism, for peace, and for the freedom of nations.

The end of the war has revealed that Anglo-American finance capital is attempting to return to the old, to wipe out the progress made during the war in the direction of democracy and national freedom, of the unfettering of the forces of the people. It is attempting to prevent the strengthening of the newly emergent peoples' democracies, to restore and reinforce imperialist domination over the lands which had temporarily come under the control of German-Japanese fascism; to perpetuate the super-exploitation of colonial and semi-colonial peoples; and to rebuild the old *place d'armes* against the Soviet Union. It is, in short, taking advantage of its military and economic might to assert its will to world domination.

On the other hand, the end of the war could not but disclose that the Soviet Union, which had borne the brunt of the war against Hitlerism, which had been the most powerful and unwavering force in the fight against the growth of fascism, would take its place beside the new democracies and the colonial peoples struggling for freedom; would insist that world fascism be smashed beyond resurrection; would take the necessary steps to prevent a policy of neo-Munichism; and would

strive to champion the building of a peace organization which would not, like the imperialist-controlled League of Nations, be a threat to the peoples and an instrument for a *cordon sanitaire* against the Soviet Union.

These differences in aims and outlook reflected themselves even during the course of the war, on the part of Britain and the United States, in their long delay of the Second Front; in their conciliatory policy toward fascist Argentina and Spain, as well as to pseudo-neutral Turkey; in their support of reactionary governments-in-exile; and in the unbroken relations between the Anglo-American and German cartels. The differences were reflected sharply even before the end of the war with Japan, at the San Francisco Conference, when the forces of Anglo-American reaction began the organization in the UNO of a bloc against the U.S.S.R., with the aim of breaking up the only guarantee of the consolidation of victory, the Anglo-Soviet-American coalition. Following the war, the differences were made patent for all to see in the sabotage by Byrnes and Bevin of the London Conference.

The impact of events since the war's end has shown the hollowness of the dream that the capitalist class either could or would lead the peoples into new green pastures, toward peace and plenty. The aggressive arrogance of atomic imperialism has amply exposed the reactionary utopia of Browder's assurance

that "Britain and the United States have closed the books finally and forever upon their old expectation that the Soviet Union as a socialist country is going to disappear some day."

The background of these developments brings into clear focus Churchill's war-bristling speech at Fulton, made on March 5, with Truman beside him and applauding. No postwar utterance to date by any spokesman of finance capital has so sharply revealed the real intent of U.S.-British imperialism with regard to the peace of the world. As the statement issued on March 5 by the National Secretariat of the Communist Party declared:

Winston Churchill's speech proposes an American-British war machine to dominate the world.

It follows the speech of Secretary Byrnes in which American monopoly capitalism bluntly spoke its dream of world domination, with British imperialism as junior partner.

It is a plan that confronts every American home with the peril of another world war!

The root cause of this threat to the peace is the imperialist drive of the United States, in conjunction with Britain, for world domination. It is the expansionist scheme of American trustified capital which seeks, with its enormous power, to turn the victory of the United Nations into a victory for imperialism.

#### ROOT OF WAR THREAT

The end of the war finds the United States, in Churchill's words,

"at the pinnacle of world power," economically and militarily. While the economic strength of the other countries has either been shattered or exhausted by the war, the increase of American economic power during the war clearly expresses itself in the huge growth of productive capacity and monopoly.

This growth only sharpens the basic capitalist contradictions in the United States, makes more difficult the solution of its internal problems, and drives it toward a crisis sharper than the Great Economic Crisis of 1929. Monopoly capital seeks the solution for its problems in an attack on the living standards and democratic rights of the people at home, and in a drive for imperialist domination of the peoples abroad. The contradictory position of monstrously powerful American monopoly, in the midst of a capitalist system in general crisis, and further weakened by the war, impels it to an offensive directed at the Soviet Union, at the new rising democracies, at the liberation movements of the colonial peoples—at the basic forces that stand in the way of its crusade for world domination. In this expansionist design, American finance capital, despite the U.S.-British rivalry, finds itself abetted by the British Tories and Tory-Laborites, who hope, with the support of American imperialist might, to prolong the existence of the British Empire, of everything reactionary in England.

However, issuing from this analysis, as the cited National Secretariat

stater  
basic  
relat  
and  
ists l  
Ame  
the Y  
Th  
taged  
agree  
stroy  
tary  
nese  
Ame  
resol  
liber  
cratic  
both  
domi  
coun  
Impe  
posse  
tiona  
force  
tion  
ple.  
to tu  
war,  
Sovi  
dem  
An  
thes  
harm  
amo  
trary  
ends  
rupt  
relat  
its b  
by t  
that  
to t



statement declared, "The immediate basic cause for the deterioration of relations between the Soviet Union and the British-American imperialists lies in the fact that Britain and America have refused to carry out the Yalta and Potsdam pledges."

The U.S. and Britain have sabotaged the fulfillment of the united agreement of the Big Three to destroy Nazism and Germany's military potential, as well as the Japanese feudal-militarist clique. Anglo-American imperialism has set itself resolutely the task of reconstituting liberated Europe, not on a democratic, but on a reactionary basis, both as a means of ensuring its own domination and as a pro-imperialist counterweight to the Soviet Union. Imperialist military force has imposed on Greece a regime of reactionary terror. Imperialist military force has acted to crush the liberation movements of the colonial people. Imperialist pressure is striving to turn the UNO into a weapon of war, an instrument to terrorize the Soviet Union and the newly-sprung democracies of Europe.

Anglo-American reaction, under these circumstances, cannot desire harmonious working relationships among the Big Three. On the contrary, it can only hope to achieve its ends by bringing about a complete rupture in Anglo-Soviet-American relations; for at every turn it finds its broken pledges thrown in its face by the Soviet Union, which insists that the agreements be carried out to the letter as the only means of

achieving the utter eradication of German-Japanese fascism, of guaranteeing the peace.

The whole outlook, therefore, of the U.S. and British imperialists is "to impose their will on the world, including the Soviet Union, by overwhelming military power based on the atom bomb. . . ."

*"Encouraged by the Truman-Byrnes-Vandenberg line, Churchill summons America to a partnership in imperialist crime!"* (Statement of the National Secretariat, cited.)

However, these basic objectives cannot be achieved unless, screened by their moral preaching, their "stop-thief" hue and cry against Soviet "expansionism," and the atmosphere of panic they have created, they succeed in their drive to attain certain immediate objectives.

Thus, American reaction is striving to push through a gigantic armaments program; to establish a three-ocean navy; to extend selective service; to build up a huge standing army through compulsory military training; to ensure military control of the atom bomb, and through that the increasing militarization of the government—all at the service of a policy of ruthless imperialist expansion.

Secondly, the United States and Britain are pressing for an immediate peace settlement, involving Germany, Japan, and their former satellites. What such settlements are likely to mean in terms of proposed governments and treaties can be imagined in the light of the re-

luctance with which fascism is being "eliminated" in MacArthur's Japan and in the British and American zones in Germany.

Thirdly, American monopoly aims to cover up its simultaneous drive at home to destroy the trade unions, and the economic security and democratic rights of the people, especially of the Negro people.

To win the fight against the new war danger, sound strategy requires that we name those responsible for the war crisis so that the fire may be properly directed against them.

First, while heavy fire must be directed against the Vandenberg, Taft, and Wherrys, direct responsibility must be placed on the Truman Administration for its imperialist course in foreign affairs. It was Truman himself who set the stage for Churchill's speech, which came as the logical development of the warmongering anti-Soviet speeches of Vandenberg and Byrnes. It is the Truman Administration which has systematically violated the will of the people, expressed in the Presidential vote for Roosevelt's program, that the United States pursue a policy of peace, of continued Anglo-Soviet-American collaboration. At the same time, it must not be forgotten that Republicans and Democrats are united on a foreign policy of imperialist aggression. Nor must it be forgotten that behind the actions and speeches of these fine statesmen is the root source of American reaction—the power of the trusts, monopoly capital.

Secondly, British Toryism's Labor government shares direct responsibility in pursuing an anti-Soviet, imperialist policy. The British people did not kick Churchill out the front door to have Bevin, the butler of imperialism, admit him the back way. Under the guise of "socialization," Social-Democracy in Britain is working overtime to carry through in office the imperialist task of the discredited Churchill crew out of office.

#### DANGEROUS ILLUSIONS

A major barrier to the full mobilization of the American people for the anti-war struggle against these enemies is the existing illusion as to the non-aggressive, non-expansionist character of American imperialism. The illusion that the United States is not an imperialist power arises mainly from the conditions that, for historical reasons, it is not a possessor of colonies on a large scale. But, as Comrade Foster stressed in a recent article,\* "One of the major necessities of the American labor movement now is to understand that the United States, with its present economic and political set-up, is an imperialist country. It has the need to master the great lessons of Lenin in regard to this matter."

The United States is an imperialist country, and the most powerful one in the world. Monopoly is the quintessence of imperialism, as Lenin demonstrated, and nowhere is monopoly so powerfully developed as

\* "Leninism and Some Practical Problems of the Postwar Period," *Political Affairs*, February, 1946, p. 99.

here. It is false to point to the lack of extensive colonial possessions by the United States as a sign that it is not imperialist. For, as Lenin profoundly analyzed the nature of imperialism: "Finance capital is such a great, it may be said, such a decisive force in all economic and international relations, that it is capable of subordinating to itself, and actually does subordinate to itself even states enjoying complete political independence." (*Imperialism, the Last Stage of Capitalism.*)

And it is through the economic power of its monopoly-capitalist system that the United States has striven in the past and is still striving today for world hegemony, as against its imperialist rivals.

Clearly, it is not in the American people that the seeds of aggression lie, but in monopoly capital, the real ruler of the country. That is made clear by the American imperialist record in Mexico, Nicaragua, Puerto Rico, the Philippines, and China; by the far-flung predatory activities of Standard Oil and other great trusts; by America's entry into the imperialist First World War; by U.S. intervention against the U.S.S.R. after the October Revolution.

The imperialist character of the United States is seen, above all, in the concrete aggressive actions it is taking today: its call for an armed force bigger than that of the rest of the world together; its intervention against the rising democracies in Poland, Rumania, Bulgaria, Yugoslavia, etc.; its supervising of "free"

elections in Greece; its maintenance of an army of 300,000 in the Philippines to support Roxas and his fellow-collaborators with Japanese fascism; its strengthening of reaction in China with U.S. armed forces.

Its imperialist character can be seen in its unilateral possession of the atomic bomb and the bludgeoning use of that possession; its collusive deployment of lend-lease equipment to the British murderers of Indonesian fighters for freedom; its move to lend four billion dollars to Britain, whereby British imperialism will be aided in keeping India down, as well as in supporting the fascists and monarchists in Greece. Its imperialist character can be seen in the appointment of Hoover to use the weapon of food to kill freedom.

#### SOVIET "EXPANSIONISM"

To conceal their aim of world domination, the forces of reaction "have manufactured the falsehood of Soviet 'expansionism.' By this they mean the rise of democracy in Europe, the aspirations of the whipped colonial millions in Asia, China, etc., for freedom." (Statement of the National Secretariat, cited.) On the basis of this falsehood they hope to create an atmosphere favorable for a new war of intervention against the Soviet Union for, with the directness called for by the issues at stake, Stalin correctly characterized Churchill's proposed Anglo-American alliance as a "set-up for war, a call to war with the Soviet Union."

The lie about "Red Imperialism" has been refuted in text and in life a thousand times. But the refutation still has to be made an integral part of the thinking of the people.

The very expression "Red Imperialism" is an insult to intelligence. "Expansionism," *i.e.*, a policy of war and conquest, of the economic or direct political domination of peoples, is a characteristic of monopoly capitalism. It grows inevitably out of the fact that imperialism, *i.e.*, monopoly capital, tries to solve its basic contradictions by resorting to expansionism and war. This, as Stalin recently stated, "might be avoided if it were possible for raw materials and markets to be periodically redistributed among the various countries in accordance with their economic importance by agreement and peaceable settlement. But that is impossible under present capitalist conditions of development of world economy" (Address to the voters of the Stalin Electoral Area in Moscow, February 9, 1945).

On the other hand, the Soviet Union, having within its borders put an end to monopoly capital, having replaced capitalism by socialist economy, has therefore no insoluble internal contradictions driving it to war. Its policy of peace is therefore not something accidental but inherent in its socialist system; and the Soviet people need and fight for peace so that they may proceed with their socialist task of unceasingly raising to higher levels their well-being and new Socialist way of life.

But, at this point, the question may be put, whether the relations of the Soviet Union today with the European countries neighboring it reflect a policy of intervention in their affairs. This charge, phrased by Churchill as the "boundless expansionist tendencies of the Soviet Union," received an effective answer from Stalin in the recent interview he gave to *Pravda*. After pointing out that it was through these neighboring countries, and through the aid of their past governments, that the invasion of the Soviet Union took place, after pointing to the seven million Soviet citizens lost in the war, Stalin said: ". . . what can be surprising in the fact that the Soviet Union, in a desire to insure its security for the future, tries to achieve that these countries should have governments whose relations to the Soviet Union are loyal? How can one, without having lost one's reason, qualify these peaceful aspirations of the Soviet Union as 'expansionist tendencies' of our government?"

Imperialism's myth of Soviet "expansionism" is intended to cover its own predatory designs, as is currently manifested in the deliberately incited Iranian crisis. Iran is being used as a pawn in the anti-Soviet war drive of the American and British imperialists, who are seeking to repudiate the solemn agreements of Moscow, Yalta, and Potsdam, and to effect a full break in the Anglo-Soviet-American coalition.

## CHURCHILL'S WAR CALL

The reaction to Churchill's speech showed that he had over-reached himself. His speech brought out into the open the real menace of war in the speeches of Vandenberg, Dulles, Byrnes, and Bevin which had preceded it. It is evoking the increasing indignation of the people against his very obvious attempt to involve the United States in a joint militarist adventure, which, by his calculations, would help maintain and aggrandize the British Empire. What should be remembered, however, is that, while Churchill aims to draw the United States into such a war, Britain would, in essence, be the junior partner, since the main war-drive comes from American monopoly capitalism, the most powerful imperialism, as it pushes forward toward world domination.

Churchill's speech brought upon him the sharp condemnation of Senators Pepper, Kilgore, Mitchell, and Taylor, who declared in a joint statement to the press on March 18:

Mr. Churchill proposes to set the blood and treasure of American men, women and children as guardians of British imperialist interests everywhere in the world. . . .

Mr. Churchill's proposal is simply a call for preserving and rebuilding British imperialism, with the aid of the U.S., regardless of the consequences to the peace. . . .

The American people wish to live at peace with the whole world—not just with the people of Britain.

The American people must under-

stand that if Churchill were to draw them into an anti-Soviet war, the United States would, basically, have to fight that war alone. In such a war, British troops would, in the main, as during World War II, be used to protect Britain's colonial possessions. As Comrade Foster warned, in his Union Square address on March 7, a war against the U.S.S.R. would be suicidal. The United States could not count on a new United Nations alliance in such a war and would have no guarantee that it alone would have the weapon of the atomic bomb which makes American imperialism so lion-hearted. In the event of the criminal folly of such a war "literally millions of our boys would surely die in a futile, reactionary cause. And, atom-bomb or no atom-bomb, in the end the U.S.A. would fare no better than the other would-be conquerors of the Russian people in the past."

In the days following his speech, Churchill has lamely tried to deny having advocated an Anglo-British military alliance against the Soviet Union. But no denial can cancel out his plea for "the fraternal association of the English-speaking peoples," which "requires . . . the continuance of the intimate relationships between military advisers, leading to the common study of potential dangers. . . ." Secretary of State Byrnes has declared that the United States does not propose to seek an alliance with the Soviet Union against Britain (sic!) or with Britain against the Soviet Union. Bevin, after

Attlee's assent through silence had brought discomfiture upon the "Socialist" government, has said, "We have nothing to do with it at all," and has appealed to the "old world to settle down." And know-nothing President Truman has stated that he does not see anything in the international situation to worry about.

It would be folly to assume that American-British imperialism has retreated from its basic position, *i.e.*, to organize the anti-Soviet crusade, to continue on its aggressive path. These clumsy attempts to dull the edge of their attack on the Soviet Union reflect their unreadiness and hesitation to provoke immediate war, their fear of the might and prestige of the Soviet Union, which has refused to be cowed by atom bomb rattlings, their uncertainty of continued repression of the colonial upsurge, their own inter-imperialist rivalry and antagonisms, and their anxiety over the growing volume of protest in the United States and England against their inflammatory speeches and acts.

#### MOBILIZING PEACE FORCES

The forces do exist which can ward off war. They exist on a world scale—in the Soviet Union, champion of peace and the freedom of nations; in the working class everywhere, which daily gains in strength, in self-confidence that arises from a growing consciousness of its role as the leading force in the struggles of the peoples for peace, democracy, and national freedom; in the new

peoples' democracies of Europe; in the powerful forward surge of the colonial masses against imperialism; in the existence everywhere of growing Communist Parties, which, in a number of countries have come to the fore as the people's champions in the national leadership.

In the U.S., in the struggle against the new war danger, the labor movement, and especially the Communists, have the task of working to unite all the peace-loving forces for common action. The farmers and the Negro people, particularly, must be roused to united action with the trade unions. Every organization, labor, veteran, church, fraternal, etc., must be moved into active participation in the battle to maintain peace.

Above all, labor must understand that, unless it is alerted to the war danger and fights unitedly and determinedly for peace, the cause of peace is greatly weakened. It is a matter for alarm that the trade unions have been slow in reacting to the war danger. It shows that a wide gap exists between the magnificent economic struggles of the organized workers and their political struggle. The trade unions must learn that concentration on the economic struggle alone—especially today when the foreign-political issues are so determining for every phase of our domestic life—can lead only to monopoly's succeeding in its plans for war to achieve world domination and for the smashing of the trade unions and living standards of the workers at home. In view of this, the

Communists have, as never before, the task of helping to raise the struggle of the entire labor movement to the political level demanded by the grave situation of today. To carry through this task effectively, the Communists must bring to the workers, not only clarification of all vital current issues, but also the Marxist-Leninist explanation that wars are inherent in the very nature of imperialism and that the policy of peace is inherent in the Socialist essence of the Soviet Union.

#### WHAT TO DO

In the struggle against the war danger, it has to be pointed out that it is not a question of working out a new program for peace, but that the program already exists—in the Moscow, Yalta, and Potsdam agreements, which call for the merciless extirpation of fascism, for support to the liberation aspirations of the peoples, and for the maintenance and consolidation of the U.S.-British-Soviet coalition as the indispensable guarantee for safeguarding the peace.

The people must demand that Anglo-Soviet-American unity be re-established, not as formal unity, but on such a basis as will bring about the fulfillment of the agreements made at the Moscow, Yalta, and Potsdam conferences. As the report of Eugene Dennis to the National Committee stated:

Everyone must realize that the keystone of successful postwar cooperation amongst the Big Three rests, above all,

on whether the U.S.A. and Great Britain honor in full their commitments, and jointly with the U.S.S.R. fulfill the Big Three concords decisively to denazify and demilitarize Germany and Japan, to destroy the war potential of these two aggressor states, and to wipe out all remnants of the former Anglo-American-German and Japanese cartels and trusts.

The people must demand that the Truman Administration scrap its "get tough with Russia" policy and pursue a policy of friendly collaboration between the two countries. The Administration must be forced to work with, and not against, the U.S.S.R. in the U.N.O., which must be used as a means of furthering harmonious relations between the United States and all other peace-loving countries. Our delegation to the U.N.O. must be cleansed of its anti-Sovieteers and warmongers, and replaced by firm fighters for peace.

The people must demand that American armed forces be withdrawn from China, as well as from the Philippines, and that the Philippines and Puerto Rico be granted unconditional independence. Fullest support must be rallied in the United States to the Indonesian struggle for freedom, to India's struggle for liberation from British imperialism, and to the independence movements of all other colonial and dependent peoples. The Administration must grant no financial aid to British reactionaries and colonial masters; and credit and food, without imperialist strings attached and without Hooverization,

must be given to the new democracies of Europe. The people must repudiate with indignation Byrnes' shielding of the fact that the Franco regime is a threat to the peace. We must demand an end to collusion with British imperialism to perpetuate fascism in Spain. We must demand that the United States actively work with the Soviet Union and France toward helping the people of Spain achieve their liberation speedily. As the first step in this direction, the U.S. government must be called upon by the people to sever diplomatic relations with Franco.

The peace forces must oppose the huge and dangerous armament program of the Administration. They must reject the reactionary proposals for a three-ocean navy and a huge standing army, and insist that military control of the atomic bomb and development of atomic energy be replaced by democratic, civilian control.

The people must also link up their demands in the fight for peace, with the struggle against monopoly on the home front, with the fight for jobs, wage increases, the enactment of a permanent F.E.P.C., the maintenance and strengthening of price controls, a real housing program, the defeat of the union-busting Casey Bill, etc.

In the struggle for such a program, two impediments to the marshalling of the anti-war forces must be guarded against. First is an under-

estimation of the war danger. Second is the belief that war cannot be avoided or held off. Everything here pointed out shows that the aggressive intentions and activities of U.S.-British imperialism make the world situation fraught with peril. Churchill, Byrnes, and Bevin may have ever so slightly changed their tune, but reaction still pushes ahead on every front against the peace. On the other hand, however, shall we fatalistically see in the present threat of war the removal of the basis on which to work further to maintain peace?

As Marxists, we know that, in the last analysis, it is the struggle of the masses which decides all the major issues that confront society. And no matter how precarious the struggle for peace may seem at any given moment, the power of the people, if effectively organized and directed, can stop war.

Herein lies the special responsibility of the Communists—to help bring clarification, direction, and organization to the forces of the people. We have, above everything, the task of alerting and arousing labor to its key role in the struggle for peace today: the welding together of the broadest labor-democratic coalition in a gigantic anti-war campaign for the defeat of the warmongers, for the restoration of the Anglo-Soviet-American coalition, for close American-Soviet cooperation and friendship.



# STALIN'S ANSWER TO CHURCHILL'S CALL FOR AN ANTI- SOVIET WAR ALLIANCE

*The text of the interview with Joseph Stalin, published in Pravda on March 13, 1946.*

A FEW DAYS AGO, a "Pravda" correspondent approached Stalin with a request to clarify a series of questions connected with the speech of Mr. Churchill. Comrade Stalin gave clarifications which are set out below in the form of answers to the correspondent's questions:

Q.—How do you assess the last speech of Mr. Churchill which was made in the United States?

A.—I assess it as a dangerous act, calculated to sow the seeds of discord among the Allied governments and hamper their cooperation.

Q.—Can one consider that the speech of Mr. Churchill is damaging to the cause of peace and security?

A.—Undoubtedly, yes. In substance, Mr. Churchill now stands in the position of a firebrand of war. And Mr. Churchill is not alone here.

He has friends not only in England but also in the United States of America.

In this respect, one is reminded remarkably of Hitler and his friends. Hitler began to set war loose by announcing his racial theory, declaring that only people speaking the German language represented a fully valuable nation. Mr. Churchill begins to set war loose also by a racial theory, maintaining that only nations speaking the English language are fully valuable nations, called upon to decide the destinies of the entire world.

The German racial theory brought Hitler and his friends to the conclusions that the Germans, as the only fully valuable nation, must rule over other nations. The English racial theory brings Mr. Churchill and his friends to the conclusion that nations speaking the English language, being the only fully valuable nations, should rule over the remaining nations of the world.

In substance, Mr. Churchill and his friends in England and the United States present nations not speaking the English language with something like an ultimatum:

"Recognize our lordship voluntarily and then all will be well. In the contrary case, war is inevitable."

But the nations have shed their blood during five years of cruel war for the sake of liberty and the independence of their countries, and not for the sake of exchanging the lordship of Hitler for the lordship of Churchill.

It is, therefore, highly probable that the nations not speaking English, and which, however, make up an enormous majority of the world's population, will not consent to go into a new slavery. The tragedy of Mr. Churchill lies in the fact that he, as a deep-rooted Tory, cannot understand this simple and obvious truth.

There is no doubt that the set-up of Mr. Churchill is a setup for war, a call to war with the Soviet Union. It is also clear that such a set-up as that of Mr. Churchill is incompatible with the existing treaty of alliance between England and the U.S.S.R. It is true that Mr. Churchill, in order to confuse his readers, declares in passing that the length of the Anglo-Soviet treaty for mutual aid and co-operation could easily be extended to fifty years.

But how can one reconcile such a statement by Mr. Churchill with his set-up for war against the Soviet Union, his preaching of war against the Soviet Union? It is clear that these things can in no way be compatible.

If Mr. Churchill, calling for war against the Soviet Union, still considers it possible to extend the duration of the Anglo-Soviet treaty to fifty years, then it means that he considers this treaty as an empty piece of paper, to be used to conceal and disguise his anti-Soviet set-up.

On this account, one cannot consider seriously the declaration of Mr. Churchill's friends in England about the extension of the Soviet-English treaty to fifty years or more. Prob-

lems of the duration of a treaty have no sense if one of the parties violates the treaty and turns it into an empty scrap of paper.

#### AS TO MOSCOW "CONTROL"

Q.—How do you assess that part of Mr. Churchill's speech in which he attacks the democratic regime of the European countries which are our neighbors, and in which he criticizes the good neighborly relations established between these countries and the Soviet Union?

A.—This part of Mr. Churchill's speech is a mixture of the elements of the libel with the elements of rudeness and lack of tact. Mr. Churchill maintains that Warsaw, Berlin, Prague, Vienna, Budapest, Belgrade, Bucharest and Sofia, all these famous cities and the populations of those areas, are within the Soviet sphere and are all subjected to Soviet influence and to the increasing control of Moscow.

Mr. Churchill qualifies this as the "boundless expansionist tendencies of the Soviet Union." It requires no special effort to show that Mr. Churchill rudely and shamelessly libels not only Moscow but also the above mentioned states neighborly to the U.S.S.R.

To begin with, it is quite absurd to speak of the exclusive control of the U.S.S.R. in Vienna and Berlin, where there are Allied Control Councils with representatives of four states, where the U.S.S.R. has only one-fourth of the voice.

It happens sometimes that some

peop  
libel.  
limit  
Se  
foll  
out  
thro  
Bulg  
man  
vasio  
reas  
had  
viet  
A  
sion  
lost-  
and  
tion  
Sov  
cam  
oth  
lost  
Brit  
get  
It  
tryi  
sac  
ins  
fro  
F  
ge  
wh  
tha  
ins  
to  
ha  
to  
car  
rea  
tic  
sic  
m

people are unable to refrain from libel, but still they should know a limit.

Secondly, one cannot forget the following fact: The Germans carried out an invasion of the U.S.S.R. through Finland, Poland, Romania, Bulgaria and Hungary. The Germans were able to carry out the invasion through these countries by reason of the fact that these countries had governments inimical to the Soviet Union.

As a result of the German invasion, the Soviet Union irrevocably lost—in battles with the Germans, and also during the German occupation and through the expulsion of Soviet citizens to German slave labor camps—about 7,000,000 people. In other words, the Soviet Union has lost in men several times more than Britain and the United States together.

It may be that some quarters are trying to push into oblivion these sacrifices of the Soviet people which insured the liberation of Europe from the Hitlerite yoke.

But the Soviet Union cannot forget them. One can ask, therefore, what can be surprising in the fact that the Soviet Union, in a desire to insure its security for the future, tries to achieve that these countries should have governments whose relations to the Soviet Union are loyal? How can one, without having lost one's reason, qualify these peaceful aspirations on the Soviet Union as "expansionist tendencies" of our government?

#### QUESTION OF POLAND

Mr. Churchill further maintains that the Polish government under Russian lordship has been spurred to an unjust and criminal spoliation against Germany. Here every word is a rude and offensive libel.

Contemporary, democratic Poland is led by outstanding men. They have shown in deeds that they know how to defend the interests and worth of their homeland, as their predecessors failed to do.

What reason has Mr. Churchill to maintain that the leaders of contemporary Poland can submit their country to a lordship by representatives of any country whatever? Does Mr. Churchill here libel the Russians because he has intentions of sowing the seeds of discord between Poland and the Soviet Union?

Mr. Churchill is not pleased that Poland should have turned her policy toward friendship and alliance with the U.S.S.R. There was a time when in the mutual relations between Poland and the U.S.S.R. there prevailed an element of conflict and contradiction. This gave a possibility to statesmen of the kind of Mr. Churchill to play on these contradictions, to take Poland in hand under the guise of protection from the Russians, to frighten Russia by specters of war between Poland and herself, and to take for themselves the role of arbiters.

But this time is past. For enmity between Poland and Russia has given place to friendship between them,

and Poland, present democratic Poland, does not wish any longer to be a playing-ball in the hands of foreigners. It seems to me that this is just what annoys Mr. Churchill and urges him to rude, tactless outbursts against Poland. After all, it is no laughing matter for him. He is not allowed to play for other people's stakes.

As for Mr. Churchill's attack on the Soviet Union in connection with the extending of the western boundaries of Poland, as compensation for the territories seized by the Germans in the past, there it seems to me that he quite blatantly distorts the facts.

As is known, the western frontiers of Poland were decided upon at the Berlin conference of the three powers, on the basis of Poland's demands.

The Soviet Union repeatedly declared that it considered Poland's demands just and correct. It may well be that Mr. Churchill is not pleased with this decision. But why does Mr. Churchill, not sparing his darts against the Russians in the matter, conceal from his readers the fact that the decision was taken at the Berlin conference unanimously, that not only the Russians voted for this decision but also the English and Americans?

Why did Mr. Churchill have to delude people?

#### CHURCHILL'S "DEMOCRACY"

Mr. Churchill further maintains that the Communist parties were very insignificant in all these eastern

European countries, but reached exceptional strength, exceeding their numbers by far, and are attempting to establish totalitarian control everywhere; that police-governments prevailed in almost all these countries, even up to now, with the exception of Czechoslovakia, and that there exists in them no real democracy.

As is known, in England at present there is one party which rules the country—the Labor party. The rest of the parties are barred from the government of the country. This is called by Churchill a true democracy.

Meanwhile, Poland, Romania, Yugoslavia, Bulgaria and Hungary are governed by several parties—from four to six parties. And besides, the opposition, if it is loyal, is guaranteed the right to participate in the government. This Churchill calls totalitarian and the government of police.

On what grounds do you expect an answer from Mr. Churchill? Does he not understand the ridiculous situation he is putting himself in by such speeches on the basis of totalitarianism and police rule? Mr. Churchill would have liked Poland to be ruled by Staknovkovski and Anders, Yugoslavia by Mikhailovitch and Pavelitch, Romania by Prince Stirbe and Radescu, Hungary and Austria by some king from the House of Hapsburg, and so on.

Mr. Churchill wants to assure us that these gentlemen from the fascist servants' hall can insure true democracy. Such is the democracy of

Mr. Churchill.

Mr. Churchill wanders around the truth when he speaks of the growth of the influence of the Communist parties in eastern Europe. It should, however, be noted that he is not quite accurate. It is not only in eastern Europe, but in almost every country of Europe where fascism has ruled before: Italy, Germany, Hungary, Bulgaria, Romania and Finland, and in countries which have suffered German, Italian or Hungarian occupation—France, Belgium, Holland, Norway, Denmark, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, Greece, the Soviet Union and so on.

The growth of the influence of Communism cannot be considered accidental. It is a normal function. The influence of the Communists grew because during the hard years of the mastery of fascism in Europe, Communists showed themselves to be reliable, daring and self-sacrificing fighters against fascist regimes for the liberty of peoples.

Mr. Churchill sometimes recalls in his speeches the common people from small houses, patting them on the shoulder in a lordly manner and pretending to be their friend.

But these people are not so simple-minded as it might appear at first sight. Common people, too, have their opinions and their own politics. And they know how to stand up for themselves.

It is they, millions of these common people, who voted Mr. Churchill and his party out in England, giving their votes to the Labor party.

It is they, millions of these common people, who isolated reactionaries in Europe, collaborators with fascism, and gave preference to Left democratic parties.

It is they, millions of these common people, having tried the Communists in the fire of struggle and resistance to fascism, who decided that the Communists deserve completely the confidence of the people. Thus grew the Communists' influence in Europe. Such is the law of historical development.

Of course, Mr. Churchill does not like such a development of events. And he raised the alarm, appealing to force.

But he also did not like the appearance of the Soviet regime in Russia after the first world war. Then, too, he raised the alarm and organized an armed expedition of fourteen states against Russia with the aim of turning back the wheel of history.

But history turned out to be stronger than Churchill's intervention, and the quixotic antics of Churchill resulted in his complete defeat.

I do not know whether Mr. Churchill and his friends will succeed in organizing after the second world war a new military expedition against eastern Europe. But if they succeed in this, which is not very probable, since millions of common people stand on guard over the peace, then one man confidently says that they will be beaten, just as they were beaten twenty-six years ago.

# THE VATICAN'S WAR ON PEACE

By V. J. JEROME

The appointment of the 32 new cardinals and all the pomp and circumstance surrounding it need to be evaluated in relation to the closely connected, concerted drive of American and British imperialism to undermine the basis of the peace and to effect a complete break in the victory coalition of the Soviet Union, the United States, and Britain. The highly dramatized action of the Consistory must be seen in full context with this drive—whether expressed in the atomic-terror diplomacy; in the conspiratorial maneuvers within the UNO; in the speeches of a Vandenberg, a Byrnes, a Bevin, or of visiting "vacationists" with a purpose; or in the feverish grooming of Iran as a new "little Finland."

Particularly, one must view the appointment of the new cardinals against the political background afforded by the Pope's Christmas Eve radio speech and his address of February 25 before the College of Cardinals and the diplomatic corps.

The speeches were both calls for mobilization against the Soviet Union—first by innuendo, then blatantly. The Pope has signaled to the world that the Church

Spiritual is not only the Church Militant, but also the Church Militarist.

It was in preparation for the task of mobilizing a new "Holy Alliance" that the Pope put repeated stress on the "universality of the Church," on the "supra-national" character of the Church. This alliance is directed at the Soviet Union, at the peoples' democracies that have arisen in Europe out of the struggles against fascism, and at every advancing coalition of labor-democratic forces anywhere in the capitalist world.

We should, however, be deceived if we assessed the strength of the Vatican by its bluster. The drum-roll of the Romish reveille betrays desperation.

The Catholic Church is in crisis. This crisis of today is deeper than any other in its long history. The ravaging schisms of the past—even the Protestant Reformation—left the Church, though truncated, with a basis for further consolidation and a prospect for existence in "time without end."

Today, such a basis is greatly undermined and such a prospect narrowed by the weakened state in which world capitalism as a whole came out of the war and by the general crisis of its system, which has been chronic since the First World War.

The waning influence of the Catholic Church in many European countries is paralleled by the rise of the democratic forces who, in their struggle against fascism, saw the col-

laborationist role of many Church leaders and especially the pro-fascist policies of the Vatican during and preceding the war.

The Church of Rome was greatly reduced in power during the Anti-Axis War, sustaining terrific losses on the European continent. Pius XI's plan for a Catholic union extending from the Adriatic to the Baltic is utterly shattered. Although still fighting to regain power, the Vatican has forfeited its most prized sphere of influence in Eastern Europe—Poland; it has lost its dominion over the millions of Catholics in Lithuania, Yugoslavia, Ruthenia, and Bessarabia. It has lost much of its power in Hungary; and the grand Papal plan nurtured during the war (with British support), is now blasted—the plan for a restored Austro-Hungarian monarchy, under Hapsburg rule, linked with Italy and Poland in an anti-Soviet combination.

In France, despite the strategic advantage it had in the presidency of General de Gaulle, and notwithstanding the rise of the Christian "Socialist" *Mouvement Republicain Populaire* (M.R.P.), the Vatican's position is critical. This is attested by the wide opposition to Catholic encroachment upon the French educational system, begun under the Vichy regime, and, most manifestly, by the anti-Franco stand of popular and official France.

In Spain, the existence of the fascist regime is precarious, and with

it, that of the Church which is wedded to it. We must face the likelihood that the British Social-imperialist government, together with American imperialism, will in Spain, as in Italy, Bavaria, and elsewhere, endeavor to protect the ideology and power of clerical fascism, even after the regime of fascism is ended. It is far from likely, however, that the Spanish people of '36-'39, once liberated from the Franco who was brought to power on foreign fascist bayonets, will remain subservient to his "spiritual" aides.

Alarmed at its diminishing base, the Vatican is seizing on the post-war situation in the hope of re-establishing its power. The Church Hierarchy knows well how to exploit for reactionary ends the postwar moods of disillusionment, distress, and despair.

In doing so, it receives every support from monopoly capital, which, weakened on a world scale by the war, is more desperately than ever in need of the aid of the Vatican. With Social-Democracy, its main social buttress, now greatly diminished in strength as compared with the period following World War I, imperialism leans increasingly upon the Vatican. And more and more the Catholic Church functions as an *open and direct political force*. Today the Vatican shares with Social-Democracy the task of ideological mobilizer of the masses on the side of imperialism and its anti-Soviet crusade.

What franker admission of this

Papal-"Socialist" united front could one demand than the following statement in the Social-Democratic *New Leader* (March 2, 1946) by its editor, William E. Bohn:

... whereas I found the address of Stalin [to his constituents] alien and inhumane, I found that of the Pope [to the new College of Cardinals] humane and decent and close to the things which lie in the minds of Protestants and rationalists and other varieties of non-Catholic people of good will we have in this country.

And, continues this voice of Social-Democracy, "we find the Catholic Church, as officially represented by a solemn pronouncement of the Pope, lined up on our side!"

The Vatican is further aided by the dominant policies of the A.M.G., whose favorable disposition to the anti-democratic elements in the Allied zones of occupation is notorious.

Now that Truman has appointed Hoover to "survey Europe's hunger," we shall witness the second command performance of this Santa Claus of reaction. The role the G.O.P. chieftain played with such notorious success on the stage of Europe in the political crisis following World War I is not forgotten.

In Italy, France, Belgium, Austria, Bavaria, and in other countries on the continent, the Vatican has set up or strengthened its political parties. These are catch-all parties both for the most backward social strata and for the conscious reactionaries who cannot now band

together in open fascist or pro-fascist formations. Sensitive to the popular hatred of fascism, the Hierarchy seeks to exploit the fact that some Churchmen (mostly lower priests close to their communities) served in the Underground.

Today, the broad masses of the peoples are moving forward in Europe, in the colonial and semi-colonial world; and in the United States, along with the rising struggles of labor, the people are evidencing (even though inadequately) their desire for peace and democracy. But the Vatican is striving to regain its position and to consolidate a world-wide imperialist-clerical alliance of reaction. Herein lies the political essence of the recent large-scale installation of new cardinals.

\* \* \*

The 1946 additions to the College of Cardinals represent the largest single appointment of Princes of the Church in its long history.

Thirty-two prelates were elevated to the College from nineteen countries and all the five continents.

For the first time in six hundred years the Italian cardinals become a minority, now constituting twenty-seven out of the almost completed traditional maximum of seventy (established by Sixtus V toward the end of the sixteenth century). And for the first time the United States component, including the previously appointed cardinal, Dennis J. Dou-



gherty, Archbishop of Philadelphia, was raised to a total of five.

The national allocation of the new College of Cardinals is as follows:

	<i>Newly Appointed</i>	<i>Previously Appointed</i>
Argentina	1	1
Armenia	1	
Australia	1	
Austria		1
Belgium		1
Brazil	2	
Canada	1	1
Chile	1	
China	1	
Cuba	1	
England	1	
France	3	4
Germany	3	1
Hungary	1	
Italy	4	23
Netherlands	1	
Peru	1	
Poland	1	1
Portugal		1
Portugese Mozambique	1	
Spain	3	1
Syria		1
U.S.A.	4	1
	—	—
	32	37
	Total 69	

An analysis of the new appointments, at the outset, shows the Vatican to be stretching out its tentacles to every continent, closing in especially upon France, Spain, Germany, Poland, and, with unprecedented force, upon the Western Hemisphere.

A closer view will reveal a direct correlation between the appointments and the main political task that the Vatican has set itself in the respective regions.

Thus, if France has the second largest number of Cardinals, this quota cannot be separated from the fact that in that country the Vatican's shares, so to speak, have fallen much below par. Vastly discredited among the masses for the backing it gave to Vichy and for its more than intimate relationship with Spanish fascism, the Vatican is naturally anxious to mend its French fences. The election outcome which gave the Communists the highest popular vote of any party threw the Catholic hierarchy into consternation. It would, however, be a mistake to underestimate the power of the Catholic Church in France. The fact that the clerical M.R.P., holding a close third place, has leaped forward to the position of a major party since its recent formation shows the Vatican's strength in postwar France to be far from insignificant. The 75 per cent increase in French cardinals is clearly designed to bolster the Vatican's political party, to influence French foreign policy, holding back the anti-Franco tide and sharpening French imperialist antagonism to the Soviet Union.

The choice for England, Archbishop Bernard Griffin of Westminster, fits in well with the anti-Soviet role which is the distinguishing feature of British imperialism's Labor Government. This worthy

earned his promotion by a wartime campaign of calumny against Britain's Soviet ally, waged traitorously even during the most trying stage of the struggle for the national life of his own country. Equally notorious is his support of General Anders' band of traitors to the Polish people.

The assignment of three additional cardinals to Germany is clearly a move to reinforce the pro-fascist Catholic groups in their attempt to hold together and reorganize the remnants of defeated Nazism on a new demagogic basis.

In this, the Vatican is seeking to repeat, under new conditions, the role it played after the First World War, when Pope Benedict XV advanced his notorious peace terms designed to save reactionary Prussianism from destruction. The Vatican sought then to preserve a Germany that would be the linchpin to hold together a reactionary Europe. It sought to build up a postwar Germany that would carry through—as it did carry through—an assault upon the Soviet Union. That peace offensive, in which Apostolic Nuncio Pacelli—now Pope Pius XII—was greatly instrumental, brought State Secretary Lansing to write to President Wilson of the Vicar of Christ that he “has become the agent of Germany.”\* When, six months after Hitler's accession to power, the Vatican concluded its concordat with Nazism, the Papal Chamberlain von Papen exulted:

“The Third Reich is the first power in the world not only to recognize but to translate into practice the ‘high principles’ of the Papacy.” In adherence to these high principles, the prelates of the Church in Germany, despite Catholic persecution under Hitler, declared in their pastoral letter of 1939:

In this decisive hour we admonish our Catholic soldiers to do their duty in obedience to the Fuehrer and to be ready to sacrifice their whole individuality. We appeal to the Faithful to join in ardent prayers that Divine Providence may lead this war to blessed success.\*

The new German cardinals may be counted on to work for the prevention of Germany's democratic reorientation. Cardinal von Galen devoted his Rome sermon of February 18 to what was in essence a denial of the basis for carrying through the Yalta and Potsdam agreements, which call for the extirpation of Nazism and the economic and military disarmament of Germany. His whitewashing plea, “equal wrongs have been done to the Germans themselves,” voiced similarly on repeated occasions by his fellow-cardinal, Konrad von Preysing, is an absolution given to Germany for her war guilt. Well, indeed, can the clerico-fascist weekly, the *Brooklyn Tablet*, comment on the appointment of these two cardinals: “Both will be worthy

\* See Heinz Pol, “Pius XII and World War II,” *The Protestants*, May, 1945.

princes of the Church and both have a great role to play in the reconstitution of Germany."

The appointment of Archbishop Sapieha of Cracow as the second cardinal for Poland is doubtless a face-saving move designed to neutralize the discredit brought upon the Catholic Church by Cardinal Hlond's desertion of the Polish people in their heroic struggle against the German invaders. Sapieha remained in Poland during the occupation. But his dependability, from the Vatican's standpoint, is attested by the revelation in *Izvestia* of January 27, 1946, that he "stands behind clerical circles defending Polish reaction and opposing the democratization of Poland."

Troops of the fascist Polish General Anders, which are kept in Rome by British government subsidy, accorded due homage to their new cardinal on the occasion of his elevation, although, as a dispatch to the *Tablet* reported, "he was greeted with affectionate but subdued salutes by Polish soldiers, who had evidently been warned not to make his return to Poland more difficult by a too-open display of fidelity."

Significant is the assignment of a cardinal to Armenia. The luxury of having a Prince of the Church is hardly warranted by the negligible number of Armenian Catholics, of whom there are scarcely any in Soviet Armenia and only a scattering in the Levant and Turkey. The appointment reveals itself as a move

directed at Soviet Armenia. Cardinal Agagianian's assignment, one can well assume, includes the job of aiding to thwart Soviet Armenia's claim for the restoration of her former territories, now held by Turkey. Turkish anti-Sovietism, spurred on by British imperialism, will thus receive impetus to greater insolence. Implicit in the appointment, too, is a possible Anglo-Vatican attempt to foment an Armenian separatist movement to set up a buffer State in the Armenian provinces now under Turkish rule. Such a "State" would be useful only as a counterweight to Soviet Armenia and as a center of agitation for Soviet Armenian secession from the U.S.S.R.

In view of the existing cardinalate in Syria, the Armenian assignment points, further, to the Vatican's attempt to strengthen its base in the Middle East by consolidating all the Catholic congregations in that region under a tighter reactionary sway. This would further its anti-Soviet and pro-imperialist operations. In addition, the calculation no doubt includes the hope of playing its well-tried game of maneuver and intrigue in the growing Anglo-American rivalry for oil resources, military bases, and trading advantages in that highly strategic zone.

The pattern becomes clearer when we note the Vatican's current concentration on the sphere of the Oriental Church. Revealing is the Rome dispatch of February 22 to

the *New York Times* by Herbert Matthews, which reported:

In making the assignments of Congregations, Pope Pius XII gave one of the most striking evidences that this Consistory is among other things a strengthening of the Catholic Church against Communism, for eight of the twenty-eight Cardinals present were assigned to the Congregation for the Oriental Church. This congregation has exclusive ecclesiastical powers in the whole Middle East, the southern part of the Balkans, Egypt and Ethiopia.

There are only sixteen Cardinals of previous creation in the Oriental Congregation, which means that the Pontiff has enlarged it by 50 per cent.

The naming of Cardinal Spellman as a member of the Vatican Congregation of the Oriental Church is clearly not without significance for U.S. aspirations in the Middle East.

The "universality of the Church," requiring for its expansionist program new claims to the allegiance of Africa and Asia, has brought ecclesiastical princes to Portuguese Mozambique and China. As regards the former appointment, we have both a bow to the colonial world (although, significantly, a non-Negro was selected) and a helpful tribute to Portuguese fascism. With the appointment of Chinese Bishop Tien, the Vatican seeks to round out its embrace of the globe, hoping with its spiritual arm to help strangle the peo-

ple's anti-feudal and anti-imperialist forces on the Asiatic continent.

\* \* \*

Most outstanding in the new appointments is the unprecedentedly large quota for the Western Hemisphere—fourteen cardinals, allotted in equal number to North America and Latin America.

Canada, formerly with a Cardinal only for Catholic French-speaking Quebec, is now doubly secured to the Holy See through the promotion of the Archbishop of Toronto. Thus, we see the Vatican penetration of English-speaking Canada. Canada's role of pawn in the anti-Soviet game of British and American imperialism cannot be considered apart from this new Papal honor.

The appointments for Latin America will give added strength to U.S. imperialism for consolidating a hemisphere bloc in the UNO to further monopoly's expansionist and anti-Soviet designs.

Light is shed on the choice of cardinals for Latin America by the revelation in the *Spanish News Letter* of London, as quoted in the issue of *Izvestia* already cited, that the list of Spanish Cardinals-designate was drawn up by an agreement between the Vatican and Franco in 1941.

Of particular significance is the appointment, for the first time, of two cardinals to Brazil. Basically, the intent of this move can only be to hold back the democratic advance

of the people, to reinforce reaction in the second largest State and second greatest Power in the hemisphere, and to prepare the country for a leading pro-fascist role in Latin America. The alarm of reaction is particularly great in view of the significant showing made by the newly legalized Brazilian Communist Party in the 1945 Presidential election.

The wholesale appointments of cardinals on both sides of the Rio Grande are designed to tighten the "spiritual arm" in the joint pressure of foreign finance capital and the Vatican on the people's forces in the Latin-American countries. Spain is a golden apple in the Papal orchard. It also emits falangist rays upon the political, ideological, and cultural life of the countries of Latin America. This was unmistakably seen at the celebration, last October, of the 50th anniversary of the Coronation of the Virgin of Guadalupe, which was turned into a mass political mobilization of Mexican Catholicism for Church and Franco.

The significance of that gathering is especially attested by the fact that the celebration was opened with a special radio address by Pope Pius XII.

On that occasion, the Archbishop of Mexico declared:

Our Virgin asks more than a temple in Mexico. She wants as her temple the whole American continent. This we did not understand until now.\*

\* Quoted by J. A. Del Vayo in *The Nation*, December 15, 1945.

Among the Hierarchical participants that day was the Archbishop of Quebec, Cardinal Villeneuve, who spoke as the Legate of the Pope. Criticizing the opponents of the corporative system, the Cardinal said:

Such people do not understand the true corporativism sponsored by the Church. Pius XI held that the reign of justice and charity may be achieved in economic and social relations by setting up professional or inter-professional groups or corporations, founded on genuinely Christian bases. Each corporation would be the legally constituted association of all members of the profession; and their activities, within it, would converge in search of the common welfare of all members of society. Thus, corporate professions would produce a triple benefit, that is, economic, professional, and social. *Politics, in the electoral sense of the word, would be excluded.\**

Symbolically, the arrows of the Spanish Falange were placed beside the Mexican flag on that occasion.

The character of the Vatican aspirations is more clearly indicated by the considerable Catholic support enjoyed by the fascistic Sinarchist movement, which was launched in Mexico in 1934, with direct Nazi cooperation, as a terrorist, subversive organization directed at the Republic. According to an Allied Labor News dispatch of February 25 from Mexico City, this camp is financially supported by the Spanish Falange in Mexico, by employer organizations,

\* Quoted by O. I. Roche in *The Protestant*, November-December, 1945.

by foreign investment companies, and, through frequent donations, by the National Catholic Welfare Conference in the United States, on the grounds that the Sinarchists favor "Catholicism." Claiming to have a membership of nearly half a million, the National Sinarchist Union announced in February its intention of participating as a political party in the national elections to be held in July. The "Union" is known to have the blessing of the Rome Hierarchy, and, to no little advantage, the protecting friendship of U.S. Ambassador George Messersmith.

No doubt, the Vatican hopes, by these Western Hemisphere appointments, to take greater advantage of the deep-seated Anglo-U.S. imperialist rivalry in Latin America, the focus of which is the Argentine. In the main, with the Vatican's decided orientation toward the most powerful imperialist country, the United States, it can be assumed that the weight of the Church will be behind the U.S. imperialist interests, which are determined to eliminate Britain as an economic power and a political influence from the Latin-American sphere. However, the Vatican well knows how to give itself ample elbow-room for maneuver and intrigue, and its policy therefore may not be identical in every Latin-American country.

\* \* \*

Let us now turn to the appointments for the United States.

It is significant that three of the four new cardinals were selected from the Middle West—Archbishops John J. Glennon (now deceased) of St. Louis, Samuel A. Stritch of Chicago, and Edward A. Mooney of Detroit. Viewed politically, the reason for these selections is not difficult to trace. By this gravitation to the Middle West, the Vatican broadens out its base beyond its previous main concentration on the Irish Catholic communities of the Eastern seaboard States. With this shift, too, the Vatican connects itself with the center of "isolationist" America. The Middle West is the terrain of the clerico-fascist offensive in the country. It is the spawning-ground of Father Coughlin and Gerald K. Smith, of pseudo-Christian hate-publications and hoodlum formations; the hatchery of the reactionary Association of Catholic Trade Unionists; and a main field of anti-Soviet concentration among national groups by Vatican-directed agencies.

The "temporal" interests underlying these appointments come to light when, for instance, we view at close range the choice of the Archbishop of Detroit.

The elevation of Archbishop Mooney is noteworthy. It is an appointment in the main center of the United Automobile Workers Union, largest single trade union in the world; in one of the key strongholds of basic industry—the kingdom of General Motors, Ford, and Chrysler; in the city where there are hundreds

of thousands of solidly organized militant workers.

Archbishop, now Cardinal, Mooney was and is Charles E. Coughlin's superior, directly and fully responsible for that fascist priest's activities, which he was a long time in reproving with a slap on the wrist, when they were most embarrassing to the Church. Even more significant is Mooney's role in inspiring the labor-splitting, reactionary A.C.T.U. This clerico-fascist "labor" outfit has now insinuated itself, with some harmful effect, locally or nationally, into a number of unions, among them the steel, auto, shipyard, rubber, textile and electrical workers' unions (all, significantly, C.I.O.). Its Chaplain is Rev. Raymond S. Clancy, appointed by Mooney as Director of Social Action in his archdiocese. Mooney's own newspaper, *The Michigan Catholic*, constantly quotes from *The Wage Earner*, official paper of the A.C.T.U.

Significantly, the "liberal" Catholic weekly, *Commonweal*, in commenting on the new cardinals, said editorially (Jan. 4, 1946):

Archbishop Mooney . . . has been especially notable in his support of Catholic concern for the labor movement.

\* \* \*

The most outstanding and spectacular elevation of all, in the Americas or elsewhere, is that of Archbishop Francis J. Spellman, "Military Vicar of the United States," and

"Pope Pius XII's right hand man," whose See, New York, is the most powerful, in economic strength and political influence, in the world today.

The special significance of Spellman's appointment is summed up, almost in programmatic form, by *Time* (Feb. 25, 1946), as follows:

The Church . . . looks to the U.S. as an example of the form of government which today promises the most for the Church's survival. It looks to the U.S. as an idealistic people who have at last chosen, or been forced, to take their place in international affairs. And it looks to Francis Cardinal Spellman as the practical idealistic American who can best advise and guide its efforts to utilize these forces in its favor.

Spellman is even spoken of as the possible successor to Pius XII. (Not without meaning perhaps is the news item that the emblematic red hat conferred on Cardinal Spellman at his elevation happens to be Pius' own, which he received on becoming Cardinal Pacelli.)

And if Spellman is not given the Secretaryship of State in Vatican City, it is because, informed Vatican officials are reported to have said, the Pope considers him at present more valuable in the United States.

The value of Spellman's services as New World pillar of the Church of Rome was made evident in the past by his liaison role which was instrumental in Roosevelt's appointment, in December, 1939, of a "per-

sonal representative" at the Vatican. That step was, of course, in complete violation of the Constitutional principle of separation of Church and State. Not long afterward, American finance capital, with its Administration, was aligned in the general imperialist anti-Soviet front which was preparing to "switch the war."

In Spellman the Vatican has continuously had an active agent for its policy of "selling" Franco to the American people. The political essence of his role was clearly reflected in his statement, made in 1943, when, after visiting Franco-Spain, he wrote in *Colliers*:

Whatever criticism has been made of General Franco (and it has been considerable), I cannot doubt that he is a man loyal to his God, devoted to his country's welfare, and definitely willing to sacrifice himself in any capacity and to any extent for Spain.

It was quite consistent for Spellman's diocesan organ, the *Catholic News*,\* in commenting on the Spanish Civil War, to beatify Franco: "He was fighting on the side of the angels."

The angels!—whose earthly shapes the whole world saw, in black shirts and brown.

Spellman's friendship for fascism, if single instances were further needed, was most blatantly displayed in February of this year by his attendance at a banquet at Franco's embassy in Rome. This feast took place

immediately after Franco's execution of ten Spanish anti-fascists—an act that outraged all progressive mankind, Catholics and non-Catholics, and aroused wide-scale demands on both sides of the Atlantic for an end to fascist tyranny in Spain. By his presence, Cardinal Spellman lent the aura of the Catholic Church to a celebration of the enslavement of Spain.

It was this same Cardinal Spellman, fresh from fascist banquets, that the New York City Council greeted upon his return in a resolution expressing "a great deal of satisfaction and pride" in his elevation, and offering "congratulations to the Catholic Church." This homage paralleled the civic honors soon thereafter heaped upon Churchill, fresh from his Fulton, Missouri, speech.

The anti-fascist people of America, regardless of church or denomination, whether Protestants, Catholics, or Jews, have reason to honor the two Communist members of the New York City Council for their courageous stand against the resolution introduced on March 5 to extend the city's official welcome to this lover of fascism. History will record that the votes of Davis and Cacchione alone on that day were on the side of the people.

\* \* \*

In shifting its main base of support to the United States, the Vatican is in reality consolidating a base that is already established and that has in

\* Issue of August 11, 1945.



recent years become increasingly important to it.

In the '20s it was still possible for a historian to write: "The Catholic Church is . . . a thing apart in the heart of the American body politic." Today no anatomy of America's political life can fail to reveal the Catholic Church fastened upon its heart. There is not a sphere of the nation's life in which the Catholic Church, and through it, the Vatican (directly or indirectly), does not intervene. It is an irony of history that the most powerful Protestant capitalist State in the world, the U.S.A., is today the greatest source of power of the Roman Catholic Church.

It is all the more ironical in that Rome has traditionally viewed the United States with misgivings since our country gained its independence. The Jeffersonian democratic principles, with their philosophic background in XVIII Century French materialism, expressed in the Constitutional separation of Church and State, caused the United States to be regarded by the Vatican as an erring nation. Thus, the English Catholic author, Hilaire Belloc wrote:

The culture of the U.S. is, from its original religion and by its momentum and whole tradition, opposed to the Catholic Church.

Today the same Vatican which rushed to make its Concordats with the corporative States of fascism and which struggles to perpetuate feudal-landlord tyranny in Poland, the Bal-

kans, Spain, and Latin America—the same Vatican professes to look to the United States, in the words of *Time* (Feb. 25, 1946), as: "the world's greatest embodiment of the form of government which offers the Church its best milieu for survival—democracy!" What it really courts is American imperialism (still to quote *Time*): "the world's most effective counterweight to the newly emergent power of Russia."

Politically and diplomatically the Vatican was able to make considerable inroads in the United States during the struggle for collective security. Roosevelt's "quarantine the aggressor" slogan, which was in response to the needs and desires of the people, met with well-organized opposition from the reactionary and directly pro-fascist forces, who, in conjunction with the Vatican, waged the fiercest fight to keep up the tragic farce of "non-intervention" in Spain. Roosevelt's concession upon concession to the Vatican led inevitably to the betrayal of Spain, which touched off World War II.

The Administration's part in that betrayal was directly connected with its policy of accomodating clerical reaction. Clerico-fascism increasingly came to permeate the State Department, its Washington personnel, its ambassadors, and its silent envoys, such as Jefferson Caffery, Joseph P. Kennedy, Carleton Hayes, Robert Murphy, and Admiral Leahy, behind-the-scenes instigator of many an infamy. Munichism, pro-Vichy-

ism, and Darlanism became the pattern of the State Department's policies.

And we, with our Browderite tail-ending, and with our Browderite expediency-mindedness, were all too ready to find excuses for the Administration's policy of yielding to the pressures of the reactionary Hierarchy. Thus, we saw "necessity" in each act of capitulation—because of Catholic Boss Flynn of New York . . . because of Catholic Boss Kelly of Chicago. . . .

\* \* \*

The Vatican's westward expansion of its spiritual domain cannot but help to increase the worldly riches it

has long derived from the United States. In view of Europe's dwindling Peter's pence, apart from all political considerations, the shift of the Papal center of gravity to the great wealth and economic power of the Catholic Church in the United States has become a materialist necessity.

While the Catholic Church is careful not to disclose the extent of its fabulous wealth in real estate (tax exempt), investments, and various holdings, its economic strength can be seen in such available data as the following, relative to church expenditures and the value of church edifices:

#### STATISTICS FOR 1936

##### *Value of Church Edifices Expenditures During Year*

	<i>Churches Reporting</i>	<i>Amount</i>	<i>Churches Reporting</i>	<i>Amount</i>
All Churches . . . . .	173,754	\$3,411,875,467	188,766	\$518,953,571
Catholic Churches . . . . .	15,661	787,001,357	15,720	139,073,358

(*Statistical Abstract*, 1943, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington.)

It can thus be seen that, while Catholic churches represented only 9 per cent of the total reporting, the proportionate value of their edifices was 23 per cent, and, while they constituted only 8.3 per cent of the total reporting, their expenditures were 27 per cent.

The power of this wealth is reflected in the marked increase in Catholic publications and readers. According to the 1945 *Catholic Press*

*Directory*, the number of Catholic publications in the United States has in the past three years increased by 35 to a total of 367, with a combined circulation of 10,600,000, representing a gain of over a million and a half readers, or 14.4 per cent, since 1942.

It is obviously not possible to point directly to subsidies by monopolies to the Catholic Church or to political pressures on their part in its behalf.

Such undoubted practices are, needless to say, facilitated by the fact that key captains of industry and finance are members of the Catholic Church. But they are increasingly adopted by non-Catholic industrialists and financiers as monopoly reaction, seeking more anxiously direct and open political support in all churches and denominations, sees in the political role of the Vatican a major weapon.

Thus, a high representative of the House of Morgan is known to have expressed himself recently: "We're playing ball with the Vatican."

\* \* \*

The desperation with which the Vatican is working to keep firm the imperialist base of its own existence impels it more and more to reveal the political essence hidden beneath the spiritual guise. None but the politically innocent can look upon the Vatican as not being designedly and to the full extent of its influence a political power.

The claim to the Vatican's right of political interference was officially made by Pope Pius himself in his declaration of March 16, 1946, in which, according to a Rome dispatch of that date to the *New York Times*, he "defended the right of a parish priest to counsel his flock in matters of politics—which a new Italian election law would make a punishable offense." The Pope stated: "It is the concern of the church to explain to the faithful their moral duties which derive from

this electoral right." What the Vatican conceives these "moral duties" to be was made clear in an A.P. Rome dispatch of February 23 which reported the "recommendation by the Italian Consultative Assembly for a Law to penalize clergymen who try to influence Italian voters to a Fascist rule." (*New York Times*, February 24, 1945.)

True, whenever the Vatican finds itself trapped politically, we shall continue to witness the old attempt at refuge in religion. Thus, the Vatican City daily, *Osservatore Romano*, sought to explain away *Izvestia's* exposé of the reactionary appointees to the College of Cardinals by complaining: "As usual, *Izvestia* confuses religious moves with political ones." But the religious pretext is by now worn so threadbare as to be more embarrassing than protective.

This dilemma brought Archbishop James H. Ryan of Omaha to write, in a letter to the *New York Times* (May 12, 1940): "Though conscious of the religious power of the Pope, head of the Catholic Church, we have chosen to remain blind to the political power of the Pope who is King. But is it the part of wisdom not to recognize the Papacy for what it is . . . ?"

Of course, words like Archbishop Ryan's are not uttered as a criticism of the Vatican's meddling in politics, but rather as a suggested means of avoiding the repeated embarrassments of such criticism by removing its basis. Those words are, in effect,

a declaration: It is now safe to admit openly that we are in politics; it will give us more freedom to operate.

The Vatican must be exposed and fought as a *political* power. Not the religion of the Church of Rome is at issue, but its political role. We Communists base ourselves on the principles of Marxism, on dialectical materialism and its application to history. At the same time—indeed, on the very basis of these scientific principles—every Communist defends freedom of religious belief and practice as a democratic right. But religion used to cloak political reaction challenges every democratic right. When, in the guise of moral force, the Hierarchy cries out for “justice” to the small nations in the U.N.O., we must expose its reactionary design of securing a pro-Vatican balance of power with a bloc of small Catholic States like Austria, Belgium, Ireland, Spain, Portugal, and the countries of Latin America. The Vatican cannot commit political crimes against the democratic interests of the peoples and against the peace of the world, and escape arraignment by pleading “religious” motives before the court of world opinion.

By presenting the issue as Christianity vs. Communism, the Vatican seeks to win the Protestant masses also to its side. We should be nurturing illusions if we held that this policy cannot and may not score successes. The Protestants in the United States noticeably resent the

encroachments of the Catholic Church. Yet, despite “straws in the wind,” it does not necessarily follow that there will be a strong and effective Protestant counter-action. Even the current epidemic of conversions among notables (which only the superficial will ascribe to Father Sheen’s “talented persuasion”) requires to be seen in this light. Vandenberg and the Vatican are playing one game. We must be mindful of the very subtle Vatican-inspired propaganda designed to make the Pope appear today the spokesman of all “Christendom.”

This propaganda is clearly traceable, for instance, in the Luce-controlled *Time’s* interpretation of the Pope’s turn to the United States as “the greatest reorientation in Church policy since the Council of Trent” (cited issue).

The full significance of the statement is brought home to us when we remember that the Council of Trent (1545-1563), which the Protestants refused to attend, marked the decisive doctrinal and organizational split between Protestantism and Catholicism. The current “reorientation” propaganda is manifestly designed to neutralize Protestant American opposition to the Vatican and its policies, to give the impression that the fundamental cleavage registered at the historic Council of Trent is healed, and that all Americans may now combine on the political platform of the Church of Rome.

\* \* \*

The orientation of the Vatican to the United States puts greater responsibility on us in the struggle against fascism and its clerico-fascist arm.

The struggle must be waged so as to drive a wedge between the reactionary Hierarchy and the masses in the Church.

The bulk of the Catholic workers in the United States are in the trade unions. The masses of Catholic workers in the C.I.O. are supporting the general line of this great progressive trade union center. In this country the attempt to organize clerical trade unions is more assailable than perhaps anywhere else. For here clerical trade unionism goes against the very grain of labor tradition. Here there is the strong and healthy tradition of the One Union and unified struggle. Organized labor can build firmly on this tradition and launch a powerful appeal and counterdrive against the divisive and destructive attempts of clerical reaction. And in this struggle, Catholic workers will take their place in the forefront.

We must avoid our error of the past in which we told ourselves that we were extending the "outstretched hand," when clerical reaction was offering us a mailed fist.

The outstretched-hand policy, as we applied it, was not a policy of alienating the Catholic masses from the reactionary Hierarchy as a means of winning them for the anti-fascist struggle; rather, it amounted to a

gesture of friendship to the Hierarchy, in which, illusorily, we saw a "progressive wing." Much of the confusion surrounding our outstretched-hand policy proceeded from an outlook that the Church would, if not play a progressive part in world affairs, at least be neutralized by the "progressives" among the Hierarchy. That illusion was part of the Browderite roseate prospect of the progressive postwar role of "enlightened imperialism."

Certainly, as Marxists, we must constantly remember that our program calls for the unification of all sections of the people's forces that can be rallied round the banner of progress. As Marxists, therefore, we should know that we must always seek ways to unite with the Catholic masses, wherever possible, on issues however moderate—and *always with sensitive regard for their deep-going religious feelings*—in order to win them against the Hierarchy and for democratic advance. In this sense, the policy of the outstretched-hand, far from being abandoned, must be vigorously re-directed. We must bring the Catholic masses to understand that ours is not an anti-clerical position, but a position against clerical reaction. We must bring them to see that the issue is not Communism vs. Catholicism, as the Vatican would have it appear, but the united democratic forces of the people—including Catholics and Communists—against reaction wherever it manifests itself, in the Church and

outside. We can succeed in this task only when we connect the struggle against the Vatican's policy with the general struggle against fascism, reaction, and imperialism, and only when we find the proper approaches to achieve unity of action with the broad Catholic masses.

The issue is the struggle against the Vatican's war on peace. The issue is the struggle against imperialism's drive for a third world war. The issue is the continuing struggle for the total destruction of fascism.

On the one side is the camp of finance capital with its material forces and ideological and "spiritual" de-

fenders. On the other side is the camp of the peoples with their social resources in the democratic masses, primarily the working class, with its organized movement and Communist vanguard; in the independence movements of the colonial peoples; in the newly forged peoples' democracies of Europe; in the Socialist Soviet Union—in whose existence, power, and world role increasing millions world role increasing millions throughout the capitalist and colonial world have come to recognize their own fortress of strength as they advance in the struggle for world peace and social progress.

# THE IRANIAN SITUATION\*

ACCORDING TO THE AGREEMENT of Feb. 26, 1921, the Soviet Union rejected its rights to mines, oil, roads and other concessions in Iran which had in the past been given to Russia. This rejection was made with one very essential condition: That the Iranian government was taking on an obligation not to give these concessions "to the supervision, disposal or use of any third state or its citizens." (Article 13 of agreement of 1921.)

Such condition was dictated by the security interests of the Soviet Union. As is known, territories of former Russian concessions are located adjacent to Baku and the oil district of Soviet Turkmenia.

Therefore, they are of primary significance to the defense system of the U.S.S.R. The vitally important strategical significance of these territories became especially obvious during the intervention of British troops against Soviet Azerbaijan and Soviet Turkmenia in 1918-20. Troops of the interventionists invaded Baku and Ashkabad from Iran, using exactly those communications which passed through the territory of former Russian concessions.

The memory of this was still fresh at the moment when the agreement of 1921 was concluded.

\* An article published in *Izvestia*, Moscow, March 16, 1946.

Therefore, it is entirely natural that the Soviet government, reckoning that Iran is located in the neighborhood of vitally important centers of the Soviet Union and the place which served as a base for foreign intervention against the Caucasus and Turkmenia, insisted that the concessions returned to Iran not be given to foreigners.

It rightly regards this condition as a known guaranty of the security of its southern frontiers. The Iranian government took upon itself this obligation. Very shortly afterward, however, it was discovered that the Iranian government was not inclined to keep it.

## TREATY VIOLATION

Immediately after signing the treaty of 1921, it proceeded in the direction of giving the former Russian concessions to foreign oil companies, thus violating the treaty of 1921 and inflicting damage to the interests and security of the U.S.S.R.

The ink had not time to dry on the text of the Soviet-Iranian treaty when the Iranian government introduced into the Majlis (Parliament) a bill for granting oil concessions to the well known American Standard Oil Company in November of the same year, 1921.

This concession was given for a fifty-year term and embraced territories of the northern provinces of Iran—Horosan, Gorgan, Mazandaran, Gilan and Azerbaijan—that is, the provinces located along the southern frontiers of the Soviet Union. The northern frontier of the

concession passed immediately to Baku. By this concession, Standard Oil entered into territories of many former Russian concessions. Therefore, granting of this concession was regarded as a threat to the Baku oil district and a collision of interests of the Soviet Union and the United States.

Only the energetic protests of Soviet representatives in Teheran caused the Iranian government to annul the agreement with Standard Oil in 1922.

In December, 1923, the Iranian government again violated Article 13 of the 1921 treaty, giving the American company Sinclair Oil the concession and right of exploration and production of oil in the northern provinces of Iran, namely Azerbaijan, Mazanderan, Gorgan and Horosan. Agreement on the concession did not materialize only because the company was not able to secure an American loan for Iran for \$10,000,000 predicated in conditions of the agreement.

These oil concessions were obtained by Standard Oil and Sinclair with the active participation of American advisers to Iran—the well known Schuster and Millspaugh, who gave all kinds of aid to these companies and their activities in Iran.

The third time the Iranian government violated Article 13 was January, 1937, when it gave a concession to the American company Delavar in a territory of about 500,000 square meters of ground in the

northeastern part of Iran. The concession also included territory of the former Russian concession in Gorgan. In the north the new American concession had an immediate boundary with an oil district in Soviet Turkmenia.

#### THREAT TO BAKU OIL DISTRICTS

All this created a threat to the Soviet oil district and another danger of a collision of interests of the Soviet Union and the United States. It was natural that the Soviet Union could not ignore this violation of the 1921 treaty by the Iranian government. As a result of the protest of the Soviet government, the agreement with the American firm Delavar was nullified the following year.

In March, 1939, the Iranian government again—now for the fourth time—violated the treaty of 1921, giving oil and mining concessions to the Dutch firm Elgemeine Exploratsie Machapai. One should bear in mind that this firm was a daughter company of the Anglo-Dutch concern Royal Dutch Shell, whose head (Sir Henrik Wilhelm Deterding) was widely known as one of the most influential inspirers of interventionists' plans against the U.S.S.R., and who aided the most hostile clique of English imperialists.

The agreement for exploration was concluded for a three-year term and the agreement for the exploitation of layers for a sixty-year term. The total area of the concession made about 300,000 square kilometers. The north-



ern section of this concession was in immediate proximity to Baku.

According to the agreement on the concession, this firm had the right to erect on the concession railways, airdromes, telephone and telegraph lines, radio stations, additional bases for fuel, etc. All this looked like preparations for a base, camouflaged under a concession and directed against the security of the U.S.S.R.

There is no doubt that, by giving this concession to the Anglo-Dutch firm, the Iranian ruling circles had the desire or inclination to create a threat to Baku's oil districts and agitate a sharpening of relations between the Soviet Union and Britain. This concession was nullified only in 1944—that is, five years after it was given—and only as the result of the persistent protest of the Soviet Union.

#### MANEUVER IS CHARGED

In giving former Russian concessions to foreign companies, the Iran authorities usually cited that Iran did not have at its disposal financial means, the technique and the specialists for the exploitation of the oil deposits with its own forces. But in reality this was only a maneuver which was finally exposed by the Soviet proposal for a concession made one and one-half years ago.

In September, 1944, the Soviet government approached the Iran government with an official proposal to give the U.S.S.R. an oil concession in northern Iran. This important and

fully natural step from the side of the Soviet Union had as its aim the removal of one of the serious obstacles in the way of improving Soviet-Iran relations, and for creating a basis for broadening economic collaboration between the U.S.S.R. and Iran.

Such a concession would undoubtedly be found to be a cooperation in the use of natural riches and for the industrial development of northern Iran, enlivening all the economic life of Iran and strengthening her finances and personnel and avoiding postwar unemployment.

But this proposal from the Soviet side, which also corresponded with the economic progress of Iran, was met with raving resistance by the Iranian ruling upper crusts. The Iran government not only rejected the Soviet proposal. A special law of the Majlis forbade, under penalty of severe punishment, the carrying on of any kind of negotiations on this question.

Such a measure was witness to how the Soviet proposal upset all plans and political calculations of the Iranian ruling circles and their foreign masters.

The inimical attitude of the Iranian ruling circles toward the U.S.S.R. is most clearly of all exposed by the following facts:

In southern Iran functions the broad English oil concession given by the Iran government to the Anglo-Iran Oil Company. The territory of this concession comprises more than 250,000 square kilometers.

The oil output at the enterprises of this concession in 1945, according to statistics of the oil bulletin of the Petroleum Press Service, consisted of 17,000,000 tons. The Anglo-Iran Oil Company has the world's largest oil-cracking plants and oil refineries and oil pipe lines. The ramified system of gasoline reservoirs is spread over the entire territory of Iran. The general number of workers and employees comprises 60,000 persons. The company owns its railways, ships, airdromes and aviation, and even its own police and gendarmerie, the number of which is always increasing.

#### IRAN DISCRIMINATES AGAINST SOVIET UNION

Under such existing conditions of this kind in southern Iran, the refusal to give the Soviet Union the right to a concession in the northern districts of the country in reality is nothing other than a defense of the monopoly position of the English oil concession in Iran. Those deputies of the Majlis who spoke in favor of rejection of the Soviet proposal acted in the given case as simple advocates of the Anglo-Iran Oil Company.

An Iran statement some time ago stated that the concession of the Anglo-Iran Oil Company was given long ago during a "pre-constitution" period, and that at the present time Iran is refusing concessions to foreign firms. But this assertion does

not stand up under the slightest criticism:

First, the new concession agreement with the Anglo-Iran Oil Company was signed in 1933 on the basis of the now existing Iran constitution.

Second, the government and Majlis of Iran eagerly presented oil and ore concessions to foreign companies during the recent period right up to 1944. During 1944 the Iran government carried on negotiations with representatives of American and English firms about giving them new oil and ore concessions in Iran, whereby, in principle, the Iran government agreed to giving them these concessions.

Thus Iran ruling circles did not desire to take into consideration the interests of the Soviet Union in the given question, and placed the Soviet Union in the position of being the side discriminated against.

All these facts bear witness that during the last two decades the politics of the Iran ruling circles on the question of oil concessions in Iran were directly inimical toward the Soviet Union. What is more, this policy was directed toward inspiring clashes between the great powers. Wherefore Iran reactionaries did not desist even from often violating the Soviet-Iran treaty.

It is not permissible to forget about all these facts, which have a serious meaning in the development of relations between the Soviet Union and Iran.

# THE NEW POSTWAR TASKS OF THE U.S.S.R.

*Address delivered at an electoral rally in the Molotov Electoral Area, Moscow, February 6, 1946.*

By V. M. MOLOTOV

COMRADES!

YOU AND THE ELECTORS represented by you have nominated me as a candidate to the Supreme Soviet and the Election Commission of the Molotov Electoral Area of Moscow has registered my nomination. Permit me to express my deep gratitude for the confidence you have accorded thereby to the Communist Party, for the confidence and honor you have accorded me personally as a representative of the Party. I thank you for the kind words you have said here about me and my work.

On my part I wish to assure you and all the electors that I remember well what Comrade Stalin said about a Deputy's prime duty: to have the great image of great Lenin before him and to emulate Lenin in everything. To emulate Lenin means at the same time to emulate great Stalin, the continuer of Lenin's cause. There can be no nobler task for a Deputy

than to emulate Lenin and Stalin and to be worthy of this in fact. Rest assured, Comrade electors, that I shall always and with all my heart strive toward this goal.

## TEST OF LEADERSHIP

We are on the eve of new general elections. The entire adult population of the country is taking part in these elections. The attitude of all the many millions in the Soviet Union toward the leadership of the Communist Party and toward the policy of the Soviet Government is now being put to the test. Well, we have reason to look confidently ahead. Proof of this is also supplied by the fact that the bloc of Communists and non-Party people has gained still greater strength and pursues its work with concerted efforts.

Perhaps some persons abroad still dream that it would be a good thing if some other party, not the Communist Party, were to assume the leadership of our country. To these persons one could reply with a simple proverb: "If ifs and ands were pots and pans." There is not much to be said about such persons, persons, so to say, "from another world." As for our people, they have their own opinion on the subject. How can it be helped if the Soviet people have formed bonds of close kinship with their Communist Party? And if some persons abroad still do not like it, we can console them: in other countries, too, it is no rare thing nowadays to find that the Communists as leaders enjoy the confidence

of the broad masses of the people. This only goes to show that the lessons taught by life are not in vain. So the earth does not merely go round; we may say that it does not go round for nothing and that it is pursuing its course forward to a better future.

Four years of war with Germany and later with Japan was the supreme test for the young Soviet State. This war, which placed a strain on all the spiritual and material forces of the nation, was an exceptionally grave test of the policy of the Bolshevik Party. More than that, it was a test of the stability of the very state system of the Soviet Republic. Now no one can deny that the Soviet State has passed this test with flying colors.

#### COMPARISON WITH PAST

Compare Russia before the October Revolution with what the Soviet Union is now. It is a well known fact that the Russo-Japanese War of 1904-1905 caused an upheaval in tsarist Russia. Everyone remembers the first Russian revolution when the first thunderbolt burst over tsarism. The war with Germany in 1914-1917 undermined tsarism at its roots and ended with the abolition of the bourgeois landowners' regime in Russia.

At the time of the war with Japan, the tsarist government hastened to end the war, admitting its defeat. In the war with Germany, tsarist Russia was not able to survive, demonstrating how utterly rotten and obsolete the old regime was.

Compare this with the present position of our country after the most difficult war with Germany and then a war with Japan as well. Both aggressors, together with their satellites, have been routed, chiefly owing to our Red Army.

The Soviet Union achieved victory in the West and then in the East as well, which as you see is quite unlike the old pre-Soviet times. Having passed these supreme tests, the Soviet Union has made still greater advance as a major factor in international life. The U.S.S.R. ranks today among the world powers, enjoying the highest prestige. Important problems of international relations cannot now be settled without the participation of the Soviet Union or without heeding the voice of our homeland. The participation of Comrade Stalin is regarded as the best guarantee of a successful solution of complicated international problems.

#### NEW POSITION

Without indulging in self-complacency, always remembering how stubbornly reactionary forces still cling to life in capitalist countries, we must, nevertheless, recognize that the new position the Soviet Union now occupies in international relations is not the result of some fortuitous circumstance, that it meets the interests of all peace-loving nations and also the interests of all countries advancing along the road of democratic development and as-

sertion of their national independence

Credit for all this goes primarily to the heroic Red Army. Our Red Army and Red Navy men, officers, commanders, all services, have given the most devoted service for the glory of our Motherland. Our Generals and Marshals, with Generalissimo Stalin at their head, have brought the Soviet Union glory and renown. The enemy was checked at the gates of Moscow, and this was the beginning in the turn of the tide of the Soviet-German front. The enemy surrounded Leningrad but proved powerless to carry out his plan of capturing that city. The enemy was routed at Stalingrad, and from then on the utter rout of the German army began on our front. These tasks were accomplished on a strategic plan and under the immediate guidance of Comrade Stalin, our great Army leader.

The defeat of the enemy came as a result of the efforts of the entire Soviet people who ensured the victory. We had to lengthen the working day. Millions of women replaced men on the collective farms, at the factories and plants. Youths self-sacrificingly did the work of adults. We had to reconcile ourselves to serious restrictions in supply of the most vital necessities, to grave housing shortage, to evacuation to distant parts and to other wartime hardships. And in spite of this our national economy has coped with its main tasks. The needs of the front

were satisfied without fail or delay. The urgent needs of the rear were also met, although with great restrictions. Comrade Stalin's call, "Everything for the front!" was unanimously taken up by the entire Soviet people and this ensured victory.

We arrived at victory, having overcome all the difficulties at the front and in the rear. We were able to do this because not only during the war, but in the years preceding it, we followed the correct path. We swept from our road internal enemies, all those saboteurs and subversive elements who in the end turned into a gang of spies and wreckers in the employ of foreign masters. It is also known that the Soviet people have long checked any ambition for direct foreign intervention into our internal affairs. In spite of all those who put spokes in our wheel, our people transformed their country and created a mighty socialist state.

The foundations of our victory were laid by the creation of the Red Army, industrialization of the country, reconstruction of agriculture on the basis of collective farming, intensive work for raising the cultural level of the population, and the persistent training of engineering and other skilled personnel. And now we are able to sum up the splendid results: we have routed a most dangerous enemy, scored a glorious victory, rallied the family of Soviet peoples still closer, and raised the international prestige of the Soviet Union to unprecedented heights. What bet-

ter test could there be of the correctness of the policy of the Bolshevik Party? After this, it is not difficult to understand why the confidence in our Party has grown so much, why the confidence in Comrade Stalin's leadership is so unshakable.

### NEW TASKS

The termination of the war confronted us with new tasks, imposing also new obligations upon us. The time has come to set about the work interrupted by the war. We shall need some time to raise socialist industry to the level it had reached before the war. But in a couple of years we shall accomplish it, which is more than any capitalist country could do. This task will be an integral part of the new Five-Year Plan which we are launching this year and which in many respects will enable us to surpass our prewar level of economic development. We are again developing branches of industry which will provide agriculture with tractors, farm machinery and fertilizer in the amounts it needs, and also those industries which will furnish locomotives, rolling stock and everything else needed for railways and other important forms of transportation, sea and river shipping and automobile traffic. Another task on the order of the day is an all-round improvement in the supply of consumer goods for the population of town and country. For that a number of our industries will have to be expanded. The problem of overcom-

ing the housing shortage is particularly acute now in view of the ravages which the war against the German invader has left behind it. We must raise to proper standard the construction of schools and hospitals, institutes and laboratories, cinemas and theaters and many other cultural and social institutions everywhere, taking account of the shortcomings in the past and of the need to draw more extensively on the experience of other countries. The people of Moscow will again take up plans for the reconstruction of the Capital, and all of us will actively participate in this major state undertaking.

### THE MAIN TASK

You will remember that shortly before the war the Party and the Government acknowledged that the time had come to undertake and accomplish in practice the main economic task of the U.S.S.R. This main task was formulated as follows: to overtake and surpass economically the most highly developed capitalist European countries and the United States of America, and to accomplish this task fully in the nearest future. Our country must produce no less industrial goods per capita of the population than the most developed capitalist country—that is the task.

We launched this work successfully. But Germany's attack interrupted the great work we had begun. Now we shall take it up anew with still more profound realization of its importance, and we shall try to

make the pace of our work commensurate with the greatness of this task. We do not know and shall not know crises when industry slumps, as is the case in capitalist countries. We do not and shall not know unemployment, for we have long discarded the fetters of capitalism and the rule of private property. Conscious endeavor and socialist emulation in our factories and mills, on collective and State farms, on railways and in the offices are bringing us economic progress.

We must especially strive to make the labor of each worker more productive, for that is not only in the personal interest of every working man and woman, but in the common interest of the State. The time has passed when work was done to the strains of "Dubinushka." Of course "Dubinushka" is a good song and is the song of the Volga boatmen. But there is a proper time for everything.

In our age, the age of machinery and highly developed technology, and especially when we are out to "overtake and surpass"—new machinery must be introduced more extensively and effectively in all branches of our national economy so that the latest achievements of technology and science may play an ever greater part in the development of our industry and of the entire national economy. Then we shall accomplish our task—the task of overtaking and surpassing economically the most developed capitalist countries with that success which is re-

quired by the interests of our country and interests of communism.

### PEACE ESSENTIAL

Naturally, in order completely to accomplish this titanic task, we need a lengthy period of peace and ensured security of our country. The peace-loving policy of the Soviet Union is not something transient, it follows from the fundamental interests and vital needs of our people, from their desire to raise their living standards as speedily as possible, from the tremendous urge felt by Soviet men and women to fashion their own way of life—the new cultured socialist way of life, and from our people's deep-seated conviction that the Soviet Union will successfully accomplish all these tasks, provided the aggressor pack is kept chained. That is why the Soviet people are so vigilant when it comes to possible centers of violation of peace and international security or to any intrigues along these lines.

### DISTURBING FACTS

Today, too, our people are alert when circumstances require it. Should we, for example, pass by such facts as, say, the preservation in one form or another of hundreds of thousands of German troops of Hitler's defeated army on territory administered by one of our Allies? One cannot fail to acknowledge the positive value of our Ally's admission that this state of affairs must be ended.

Or take another fact. To this day there are maintained in Italy at the expense of the Allies tens of thousands of troops of the Polish fascist General Anders who is notorious for his enmity to the Soviet Union and is ready for all kinds of adventurous undertakings against new democratic Poland.

Facts like these certainly cannot be explained by the interests of peace and security for nations. Or take this instance. On the territory of Austria, outside the Soviet zone, there remained in existence a Russian White Guard infantry corps under Colonel Rogozhin, which during the war had been in Hitler's pay and service. Naturally, we demanded that this crew of outcasts should be eliminated again in the interests of peace and friendly relations among the Allies.

The Soviet Union has made no mean contribution to the building of a new and more effective organization to safeguard the peace and security of nations.

The United Nations Organization has already set to work and we wish it success in its important tasks. Our participation in this organization's work is aimed at making it effective in preventing fresh wars and curbing all and every imperialist aggressor and violator of the will of other nations.

#### VIGILANCE CONTINUES

In the interests of universal peace the Soviet Union is always prepared

to work in concord and harmony with peace-loving countries, great and small. In the Soviet Union there are no jingoistic adventurist groups, such as there are among the ruling classes of certain other countries where the insatiable imperialists are already encouraging rather dangerous prattle about a "Third World War." True friends of peace and security for nations will continue to find the Soviet Union a faithful ally and reliable bulwark.

That does not mean that we are complacent as regards the might of the Red Army and of our Navy. No, our concern for our armed forces is not relaxing. Our Army has accumulated fighting experience, has grown strong and steeled as never before. During the war it underwent great reorganization and geared itself to meet the demands of modern warfare. The fighting spirit and Soviet patriotism of our troops are well known. The Government and the leadership of the Red Army are doing everything to ensure that as regards the very latest types of armaments, too, our Army may be in no way inferior to the army of any other country. It is enough to say that through all these years the armed forces of the Soviet Union have been headed by Generalissimo Stalin, a great army leader, the helmsman of our land.

All this determines our new post-war tasks.

These include both major problems, domestic and foreign, which



determine the future of our country and of our cause, and the tasks that are urgently awaiting their solution. The Bolshevik Party teaches us the art of combining these tasks. Unless we concentrate the necessary forces and means on coping with the fundamental tasks of the State we shall not be able to look ahead with confidence; and this is quite apart from the fact that the war has borne out with tremendous force the correctness of this Bolshevik policy pursued throughout the past period in the construction of our State. As for our Party's major achievements, we may regard the indisputable fact that our people have long grasped the profound meaning of this general line of the Bolshevik Party. But the Party has always demanded that the opportunities available, and we have no few of them, should be used more freely and persistently to meet the urgent needs as regards raising the population's standard of living.

#### SELF-CRITICISM

The Party has always fought ruthlessly against bureaucratic disdain for what are known as "minor" problems. It has urged not only Bolshevik self-criticism, but active public criticism of the work of inefficient executives. And now that the war has left many of these "minor" problems unsettled, it is fitting to call this to the minds of the executives of our organizations and institutions.

Much depends, of course, on the ability to work and still more on a

genuine desire to learn how to work. You know that it is never too late to learn. This applies both to local and central officials in authority. Comrade Stalin has told us more than once how useful it is for people in authority to take stock of their work every day, to delve more frequently and more deeply into the results of their activities. After all, nowadays, a good deal depends in every sphere of activity on the executives. The same factory, the same collective farm, the same organization or institution yields certain results under one manager, and much better results under another more efficient manager. The factory worker, as you know, takes stock of his or her work every day. Factory workers want to know and do know how much they have produced in the course of a day, and what are the results of their work.

The same thing may be said about the collective farmers. The results of their work are expressed in the number of collective farm workday units; and we know what good care our collective farmers take to have as many of these units to their credit as they can, and how deeply rooted this is by now in the life of the collective farms. The people in authority, too, must develop the habit of taking stock of their work every day and must learn to treat the results of their activity in the proper spirit of self-criticism. Then there will be fewer shortcomings in the work of many of our respected com-

rades, and we shall achieve the modern Bolshevik tempo we need in the solution of all urgent problems.

In its policy the Party sets us the correct course for our work. And we in authority in local and central organizations must prove by our deeds that we know how to work. We must prove our Bolshevik desire to work better, more productively, with maximum benefit for the people. You will probably agree that this is the thing which all our electors want.

We have every ground to expect that at the elections to the Supreme Soviet, our people will again show

confidence in the Bolshevik Party and will unanimously support the candidates of the Stalin bloc of Communist and non-Party workers, peasants and intellectuals. That only increases the responsibility devolving on the Deputies; they must prove themselves worthy of the confidence of our great people and must justify the confidence of their electors. So let the new elections serve to cement our peoples' unity still further and to promote our further advance under the tried leadership of the Bolshevik Party and our great beloved Stalin.

ON  
OF

THE  
CON  
BRO  
FEL  
TATI  
SON  
BRO

T  
side  
tion  
den  
org  
exp  
gro  
dec  
pol  
Pa  
an  
Ma  
sid  
me

by  
ex  
in  
Pa  
in  
be  
or  
of  
it  
fi

# ON THE EXPULSION OF BROWDER

By WILLIAM Z. FOSTER

THE RESOLUTION of the National Committee on the expulsion of Earl Browder, adopted unanimously on February 13, 1946, after its presentation by Comrade Robert Thompson, summarizes the reasons for Browder's expulsion as follows:

The National Committee has considered and approves the recommendation of the National Board, and the demand from the ranks of our Party organizations, that Earl Browder be expelled from the Communist Party for gross violation of Party discipline and decisions, for active opposition to the political line and leadership of our Party, for developing factional activity and for betraying the principles of Marxism-Leninism and deserting to the side of the class enemy—American monopoly capital.

These findings are fully borne out by the record in the case. Browder's expulsion was both imperative and inevitable in the building of our Party. It is now being overwhelmingly supported by the Party membership. Browder would like to subordinate our Party to the interests of his allegedly progressive big capitalists, and the bourgeois press is filled with charges that he was un-

justly expelled. But, as Comrade Thompson stated, "If our Party is to be criticized for anything, it is for allowing this alien element, this representative of the class enemy, to remain too long and do too much damage to our Party while in its ranks."

What the Communist Parties in Latin America think of Browderism, with which they have had bitter experience, was illustrated by Luis Carlos Prestes, Secretary General of the Communist Party of Brazil, who stated at the January 4, 1946, plenary session of that Party's National Committee: "In the United States, the reorganization of the Communist Party, after severe self-criticism of the opportunist line followed by Browder, is another positive and important factor in the people's fight for the maintenance of peace and against the aggressiveness of imperialism." The Chilean Communist Party, at its convention in Santiago, December 8-15, 1945, also sharply condemned Browderism as rank opportunism. And Blas Roca, General Secretary of the Popular Socialist Party of Cuba, during its convention held in Havana, December 24-28 1945, stated the position of the Cuban Communists as follows:

I hope that the North American Party will very soon complete the expulsion of this tumor, which has already become a malignant tumor, which calls itself Browder. . . . We are expelling Browder from our Party. The physical person of Browder was not a

member, never was a member of the Popular Socialist Party, but Browder's ideas, Browder's revisionism, the Teheran of Browder, Browder's books, Browder's line were members of the Popular Socialist Party. . . . Now we not only expel Browder's Teheran, we not only expel his revisionist speeches. Now we have another task, that of completely smashing this Browder Teheran and his revisionist books. And we do not limit ourselves merely to crushing them. We must go to the masses to explain to them why this revisionist line of Browder is false, why we cannot follow in the lying and traitorous path of his writings and his revisionist line.

Let us briefly review the phases of the struggle against Browder leading up to his expulsion.

At our National Convention, held in July, 1945, following the most extended and profound political discussion in the life of our Party, the delegates concluded unanimously that the assertion of Jacques Duclos, Secretary of the French Communist Party, that Browder was practicing "a notorious revision of Marxism-Leninism," was completely justified. The Convention resolution, in rejecting Browder's whole conception, stated:

In the recent period, especially since January, 1944, these mistakes consisted in drawing a number of erroneous conclusions from the historic significance of the Teheran accord. Among these false conclusions was the concept that after the military defeat of Germany, the decisive sections of big capi-

tal would participate in the struggle to complete the destruction of fascism and would cooperate with the working people in the maintenance of postwar national unity. . . .

This revision of Marxist-Leninist theory regarding the role of monopoly capital led to other erroneous conclusions, such as to utopian economic perspectives and the possibility of achieving the national liberation of the colonial and dependent countries through arrangements between the great powers. It also led to tendencies to obscure the class nature of bourgeois democracy, to false concepts of social evolution, to revision of the fundamental laws of the class struggle and to minimizing the independent and leading role of the working class. . . .

Furthermore, the dissolution of the Communist Party and the formation of the Communist Political Association were part and parcel of our revisionist errors, and did in fact constitute the liquidation of the independent and vanguard role of the Communist movement.

#### BROWDER HOLDS TO HIS OPPORTUNIST LINE

Browder fought every aspect of this Marxist analysis of his political conceptions all through the Party discussion, and he especially combated the main Convention resolution. Then, fearing he might otherwise be expelled, he stated vaguely that he would abide by the decisions of the Convention. Browder made no mention of error, however; he did not repudiate his book *Teheran*; he did not accept the Duclos article, nor

did he express support for the Convention Resolution. Later, on August 3, the National Board wrote to him, demanding that he explain what he meant by his vague statement about obeying the Convention's decisions. The Board's letter to Browder said, "You still do not repudiate your former position; you evade expressing either agreement with or taking a direct position on the Resolution. . . ." But Browder, with characteristic arrogance, ignored the letter, making no reply whatever.

In the period following his utter defeat at the National Convention, Browder adopted an attitude of surly passivity. He refused assignments to Party work that were offered to him, stating that he preferred to find private employment. The Party offered to help him find such work, but Browder said he was exhausted and wanted time to think things through. In the next period he stayed away from the Party headquarters entirely. Meanwhile, he was kept on full Party wages, right up to the time when he was about to launch his *Distributors' Guide*. Hence, his present insinuations in his so-called *Appeal* that he was left without a job or money by the Party are contemptible lies and a fair measure of his unprincipledness.

Then came the disgraceful incident of Browder's Washington appearance at the hearings of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, headed by the notorious Negro-baiter and anti-Semite John

Rankin. Before this committee, with the nation's eyes upon him, Browder betrayed our Party by refusing to defend it against Rankin's attacks. He assumed a sort of Pontius Pilate attitude, washing his hands of responsibility for the Party's activities. In violation of Party instructions, he stated that he was a private citizen and had nothing to do with developing or applying the Party's line. Moreover, he played directly into the hands of the Rankin Red-baiters by making insinuations to the effect that somewhere abroad there was an international Communist authority, higher than our Party, to which he could and would appeal his case. The Party membership was indignant at this treachery on the part of Browder and at the ensuing National Committee meeting in November there were many who demanded his expulsion forthwith.

#### BROWDER OPENLY ATTACKS THE PARTY

Browder learned nothing from the pre-Convention Party discussion, nor from the course of postwar events. Instead, he became more stubborn than ever in his opportunism. When, before appearing at the Rankin Committee hearings, he was asked by the Secretariat if he had come to see the correctness of the Party's new line, he said that he had not. On the contrary, he stated that he had become convinced that the line of the French Party was also wrong.

Browder's adherence to his revi-

sionism and his determination to fight the Party became quite obvious when he finally went over from passive to active opposition, which he did by publishing the *Distributors' Guide*. The first number of this weekly "economic analysis" appeared on January 5, 1946. The five issues that have been published (up to this writing) make it clear that Browder is not only clinging to his "notorious revisionism," but developing it further. The significance of the appearance of this weekly letter, which Browder is circulating widely among key people in the Communist Parties throughout this hemisphere, is that he now feels he has sufficient resources in hand to make a direct attack upon our Party and its leadership.

Browder's writings and activities show that he has completely abandoned Marxism-Leninism. He has accepted the bourgeois-liberal Keynesian (New Deal) conception that capitalism, by a little economic patching here and there, can overcome its basic economic contradictions and can continue on indefinitely as an expanding social system. He sees no deepening general crisis of capitalism and no need for Socialism either in the near or distant future. The substance of his theorizing is that the big bourgeoisie, especially that of the United States, has become progressive. Browder is a shameless advocate of American imperialism, and, by prostituting the name of Lenin, he portrays American im-

perialism as playing a world-wide progressive role. He also clings to his theory that the "intelligent" capitalists will voluntarily increase the living standards of the workers, and bring prosperity and democracy to the peoples of the world.

The danger in all this bourgeois utopianism is that it denies the progressive role of the working class and of the world democratic forces generally, and that it would demobilize these forces in the face of the onslaught of the rapacious monopolists, especially those of the United States. Browder's is a path of working class surrender to monopoly capital, one that would lead straight to fascism and another world war.

Browder's entire opportunist conception was shattered theoretically in our Party discussion. It has been further repudiated by the course of events since the end of the war. The rampant drive for world domination of American imperialism, with its atomic bomb policies, and the tense international situation that has resulted from it, explode Browder's criminal nonsense about the beneficent world role of American monopoly capital and its determination (in response to its "true class interests") to live in peace with the U.S.S.R. The present bitter strikes and wage struggles also demonstrate the idiocy of Browder's postwar no-strike policy, of his expectation of an all-inclusive class peace after the war, and of his drivel about the em-

ployer  
wages  
Bo  
to Bu  
repud  
He g  
his D  
them  
cal d  
contin  
expre  
the a  
first  
critic  
also  
Party  
BRO  
AN  
TH  
have  
utor:  
with  
Thu  
Janu  
fesse  
deve  
nom  
that  
from  
and  
(K  
prop  
can  
task  
pos  
not  
car  
rea  
say  
of

ployers voluntarily doubling the wages of the workers.

But Browder is quite impervious to both the theoretical and practical repudiation of his bourgeois theories. He goes right on repeating them in his *Distributors' Guide* and applying them to current economic and political developments. It is a full continuation of the gross opportunism expressed in his book *Teheran*, with the addition that he now, from the first number of his sheet, openly criticizes the policy of our Party and also that of the French Communist Party.

#### BROWDER, BOOSTER OF AMERICAN IMPERIALISM

The dozen or more articles that have so far appeared in the *Distributors' Guide* are thoroughly saturated with Browder's bourgeois outlook. Thus, in the first number, that of January 1, in polemizing with Professor Slichter of Harvard, Browder develops his whole Keynesian economic line. He assures the professor that if the capitalists can get away from "horse and buggy" thinking and will adopt the economic reforms (Keynes type) which he, Browder, proposes, the capitalist cyclical crisis can be overcome indefinitely. "The task is not insoluble, it is not an impossible one . . .", he states. "It is not impossible to formulate and carry through policies which will realize an extended [his sly way of saying "permanent"—W.Z.F.] period of high productivity of American

economy with approximately full employment, without recourse to revolutionary measures." In this "progressive" Chamber of Commerce conception, Browder, of course, sees no inevitable cyclical crisis, no deepening general crisis of capitalism, no perspective whatever for Socialism. It is a complete surrender to Keynesian capitalist utopianism.

Browder, in the various articles in his weekly, especially glows with pride at what he describes as the progressive role of American imperialism. He is pleased at the terms of the Anglo-British loan, which, among other negative features, gives American imperialism decided advantages. He displays no fear whatever of the evil consequences of American imperialism, with its massive industries and low production costs, grabbing the lion's share of the world's markets. Indeed, he repeats his oft-stated perspective of the United States securing, as a national and world necessity, exports of some 40 to 50 billion dollars a year (which would mean American imperialist domination of world trade), and he outlines plans by which this can be accomplished. The blueprint for all this can be found in his book, *Teheran*.

Browder actively takes sides with "progressive" American imperialism against "reactionary" British imperialism. He makes this differentiation on the grounds that Great Britain is a colonial power, while the United States primarily is not. He even has

the brass to state that American imperialism is opposed in essence to colonies. Browder knows, but is not at all alarmed at the fact that American economic and political penetration into British, French, Belgian and Dutch colonies, under its general slogan of the "Open Door," is a powerful means for furthering American imperialist expansion. Yet he calls this imperialism "anti-colonial" and "progressive." The whole implication of his writings on this subject is that our Party and the working class should tail after and actually support the international marauding of American imperialism. He tries to cover up the fact that American imperialism, the present-day mobilizer and leader of reaction in all corners of the capitalist world, is far more dangerously reactionary than Great Britain because it is more subtle, more flexible, more modern, more ruthless, and more powerful. Browder's attempt to paint American imperialism, which is now the greatest threat to world peace, as "progressive" is a monstrous crime against the working class and the democratic forces of the world.

So far as the U.S.S.R. is concerned, Browder has the insolence to assert that, if that country will adjust itself to the imperialist policies of the United States, all will be well with the peace of the world. Browder, who for two years or more studiously avoided all mention of the term and concept of imperialism in relation to American foreign policy, now speaks

of imperialism but, in line with his Teheran thesis, gives a progressive connotation to it. He says (January 19), "Peace, therefore, depends upon the firmness with which the United States holds to its policy of liberation and independence for the subject peoples (sic!), and upon the question whether the Soviet Union can find the grounds for continuous collaboration with such a policy, which on the part of the United States is manifestly an imperialist policy even though it is anti-colonial." Here you have the policy of Byrnes, Vandenberg and Dulles (and now Churchill) stated by the pen of Browder—that the U.S.S.R., if it wants peace in the world, must conform to American imperialist policy. According to Browder, American foreign policy is "progressive" and the U.S.S.R. must bow to this policy, *or else*. Such apologetics for imperialism have nothing in common with our Party's policy, which calls upon the American people to curb American imperialist policy and to work out a common democratic program with the U.S.S.R. How dangerous is Browder's conception that the imperialist United States is the progressive world leader and that the Socialist Soviet Union must follow its lead, is vividly demonstrated by the present war crisis precipitated by the speeches of Byrnes, Vandenberg, Dulles, and Churchill against the U.S.S.R.

Browder would surrender China, as he would the U.S.S.R., to the

merc  
alism  
Chin  
the  
Gove  
strat  
acter  
tuall  
that,  
Chia  
the a  
State  
parts  
Japa  
arm  
Chin  
alert  
larg  
by  
from  
civil  
of s  
cont  
peri  
Her  
bass  
hon  
shal  
cha  
ord  
form  
Am  
auc  
Hu  
per  
do  
Go  
the  
im  
con



mercy of ruthless American imperialism. He hails present events in China, the halting of civil war and the proposed reorganization of the Government, as a striking demonstration of the "progressive" character of American foreign policy. Actually, what happened in China was that, upon the end of the war, the Chiang Kai-shek Government, with the active military aid of the United States, attempted to grab all those parts of China then occupied by the Japanese. But the Yen-an People's armies, the real defenders of the Chinese people, were strong and alert and they managed to occupy large sections of the territory held by the Japanese. Whereupon, confronted with the certainty of a long civil war if the Hurley-Chiang policy of seizing everything in sight was continued, a shift in American imperialist tactics had to be made. Hence, Mr. Hurley, American Ambassador to China, was brought home in disgrace and General Marshall sent to China with the present changed tactical line. Browder, in order to make Chinese events conform to his theory of "progressive" American imperialism, even has the audacity to assert that Ambassador Hurley's activities were "his own personal policy" and had nothing to do with the line of the American Government.

The deadly dangers in Browder's theories of "progressive" American imperialism are (1) that in this country they would confuse the

workers and other democratic forces and lure them into supporting the warlike drive of American imperialism for world mastery, and that (2) on a world scale, these theories would create illusions among the peoples of the colonial and semi-colonial countries as to the predatory aims of American imperialism and thus tend to disarm them in the face of this grave danger to their national independence and to world peace. This imperialist position of Browder's is utterly alien to a Communist Party and it must be dealt with as enemy class propaganda.

#### BROWDER TAILS AFTER TRUMAN

Browder's lickspittle servility towards American Big Business is fully reflected in his unreserved support of the Truman Administration. This he has outlined in various numbers of the *Distributors' Guide*, particularly that of February 5, which deals with the President's recent message to Congress. It is clear to every serious-minded observer that Truman has moved far to the Right of the general political line followed by Roosevelt. He is much more amenable to the demands and pressures of the monopolists than Roosevelt was. His sharp turn to the Right is evidenced, among other measures, by his proposals for gigantic armed forces in the postwar period, including universal military training, his reactionary atom-bomb policy, the appointment of Hoover to manipu-

late American food supplies for imperialist ends, his "get tough with Russia" policy, his armed intervention in China, his cooperation with the reactionary Byrnes in developing a vigorous policy of American imperialist expansion, his proposals to Congress for anti-labor legislation embodying fact-finding bodies and cooling-off periods in wage disputes (which evoked violent denunciations from Philip Murray, William Green, and John L. Lewis), his abandonment of the F.E.P.C., etc. These reactionary policies have forced our Party, in common with other democratic elements, to adopt a much more critical attitude toward Truman than was used toward Roosevelt, to bring greater mass pressure to bear upon the Truman Administration, and to begin to give consideration to the necessity of building a mass democratic third party. Eugene Dennis, at the February meeting of the National Committee, outlined our Party's correct policy in these respects.

But Browder would have the people and the Communist Party blind their eyes to Truman's vacillating and reactionary policies and give him uncritical support. Browder attacks "certain left-wing commentators" (meaning the Communist Party) for criticizing Truman's imperialism, because of "some superficial and temporary phenomena in American conduct of foreign affairs." And he excuses Truman's well-known demagogic practice of making progres-

sive-sounding speeches on domestic issues and then refusing to fight for his proposals. Says Browder, "Truman is lacking in the Roosevelt glamor. But the substance of his expressions of policy contains as much firmness and consistency as that of the Old Maestro himself." He apologizes for Truman's failure to fight for pro-labor measures by saying, "It is within the Roosevelt tradition that Truman combines boldness in setting forth objectives, with caution in the precise formulation of means of attaining them." Browder brushes aside Truman's abandonment of the fight for full employment by assuring us of the President's alleged "emphatic restatement of Roosevelt's policy of full production and full employment." Browder thus winds up his belly-crawling adulation of President Truman:

Harry Truman will probably never hold his cigarette at the same jaunty angle that was characteristic of F.D.R. It is certain that his radio voice will never carry the same magic as that of his great predecessor. But in substance of policy and in basic appeal to the masses, it must be said that Harry Truman has won by his own strength of leadership in moments of crisis the full right to wear the Roosevelt mantle. He is truly F.D.R.'s successor, not only in office and time, but in the role of leader of the nation.

Such shameless tailing after Truman, stage manager for Churchill's call to war against the U.S.S.R.,

revea  
in h  
geoi  
the l  
Com  
trary  
icies,  
crati  
ever  
bear  
trati  
peop  
grea  
inter  
inate  
poli  
tion.

CLE  
O

Br  
Dis  
geoi  
the  
of h  
add  
Com  
enou  
a no  
Part  
vige  
whi  
ran  
ing  
tack  
ludi  
F  
den  
He  
spli

reveals how far Browder has sunk in his subserviency to the bourgeoisie. His is a line that would bring the labor movement, and with it the Communist Party, to disaster. Contrary to Browder's surrender policies, the workers and the democratic forces generally must bring ever greater political pressure to bear against the Truman Administration. Only in this way can the people fight successfully against the great monopolists and reactionary interests who more and more dominate both the foreign and domestic policies of the present Administration.

#### CLEANSE THE PARTY OF BROWDERISM

Browder's publication of the *Distributors' Guide*, with its bourgeois line and its open attacks upon the Party, as well as the circulation of his appeal to the Yonkers Club addressed "to all members of the Communist Party," indicated clearly enough that he was embarked upon a policy of open struggle against the Party. Therefore, the Party reacted vigorously against him. His present whines that he just wanted to be a rank-and-file member (while carrying on his anti-Party line and attacks upon the Party) are certainly ludicrous.

From many sections of the Party demands arose that he be expelled. Hence, in reply to these anti-Party, splitting activities of Browder, the

Secretariat summoned him to attend its meeting of January 29, to account for his anti-Party conduct. Browder, with his usual arrogance, refused to come to the meeting of the Secretariat. When he finally condescended to appear at a meeting of the National Board on February 5, he refused point-blank to answer the written charges made against him or to reply to the many questions directed to him by Board members. He even insolently challenged the Board's right to consider his case. On February 13, he was unanimously expelled by the National Committee. Browder made no attempt whatsoever to come before the National Committee for a hearing. Instead, with evident determination to split the Party, he sent a written appeal to the National Committee and is now circulating it broadcast inside and outside of the Party. In view of this record, Browder's charges that he did not get a fair hearing are sheer demagoguery.

Defeated in his earlier attempt to dissolve the Communist Party outright, Browder is now trying to break up our Party by an attack from without. But he will fail miserably in this, too. Browder's splitting attempt is being met by the Communist solidarity of our Party. This defender of American imperialism has no place in a Communist Party and he must not, under any circumstances, be allowed to build any factions or groups in our Party.

Browderism must not be tolerated in our ranks any more than we would tolerate Trotskyism. In fighting Browderism we must remember as the National Committee Resolution on his expulsion points out, that "It is now a struggle against a deserter from Communism, against an alien ideology and influence." We must put a halt to the serious damage Browder has done to the Communist movement.

The national and world situations imperatively demand that a strong Communist Party be built in the United States. This is a national necessity. If the American people are to smash the war plotting of the Anglo-American imperialists and

save the world from a new war; if we are to defeat the present efforts of the big monopolists to lower the living standards and destroy the democratic safeguards of the American people; if we are to beat back the present attacks upon the Negro people—in short, if we are to realize the democratic objectives of the great war, won at such a terrible cost in blood and suffering, there must be a powerful, mass Communist Party in our country. This kind of Party we are now setting out resolutely to build. And a first condition for success in this Party building is that our Party ruthlessly purge from its ranks every trace of Browderism.

PA  
AN  
NE

R  
the  
hel

AM  
gag  
the  
abr  
ard  
at  
bei  
pos  
per  
cra

is  
lay  
in  
af  
lic  
ho  
dr  
di  
w  
te  
ly  
n  
N

# PARTY TASKS AMONG THE NEGRO PEOPLE

By HENRY WINSTON

*Report to the Plenary meeting of  
the National Committee, C.P.U.S.A.,  
held on February 12-15, 1946.*

AMERICAN IMPERIALISM is now engaged in an all-out offensive against the democratic liberties of the people abroad, and against the living standards and civil liberties of the people at home. Fundamental issues are being raised by this attack, which pose sharply the future of the Negro people, as well as the labor-democratic alliance as a whole.

The attack upon the Negro people is particularly revealed in the mass layoffs of Negroes in basic industry; in the fact that only seven months after the war's end there are a million Negroes unemployed, with little hope in sight of employment; in the drive to wipe out the gains made during the war toward ending wage differentials between Negro and white workers; in the monstrous terror, exemplified by the fascist, lynch-law attack in Columbia, Tennessee; and in the drive to teach Negro veterans "their place."

On the morrow of the war in which the Negro people contributed its sons to achieve the smashing of fascism, there took place the disgraceful filibuster which resulted in the defeat of F.E.P.C. in the Senate. For in this fight, although it was led by the Southern poll-taxers, both Republicans and Democrats must share responsibility for the failure to enact F.E.P.C. This action signals not merely an attempt to wipe out the war-time gains, but to intensify the whole system of oppression of the Negro people.

The menace of this attack is expressed quite clearly in the drive to strip the Negro workers of the skills and discipline of industry; to split the working class by robbing the white workers of a basic Negro working-class ally. It is an attack which, if not stopped, can lead to the smashing of the unions and the alliance of Negro and white labor, and thus retard the development of a democratic people's coalition, a third party movement.

## THE NEGRO PEOPLE ACT

In the face of this onslaught of reaction, the splendid unity between the Negro and white workers on the picket line during the recent strike struggles everywhere is highly significant and encouraging. We would, however, be naive to close our eyes to the dangers ahead; for many Negro workers now employed or on the picket lines will face the prospect of mass-layoffs. And in many of the centers of large Negro

migration, with mass layoffs and no prospect of employment, the situation will become pregnant with the danger of possible outbursts provoked by the employers and their stooges.

Most significant is the militancy expressed by the Negro people, not only on the picket line, but in the communities. In Atlanta, Georgia, it was the Negro vote which, for the first time in the history of the South, elected a woman to Congress, a progressive backed by both the C.I.O. and P.A.C. In Texas, as a result of the persistent efforts of the N.A.A.C.P., C.I.O. trade unions, and the Communist Party, 250,000 Negroes have registered and will vote in the coming elections. In Birmingham, 100 Negro veterans fearlessly marched to the Board of Registrars, demanding the right to vote. In Mississippi, an area where the trade union movement is almost non-existent, 100 Negro organizations have banded themselves together in growing unity, demanding the abolition of the poll tax, equality of educational facilities, and other democratic measures. Important, too, was the wide Negro response to the people's delegation organized around F.E.P.C. to Washington on January 17th. Of special significance is the unity displayed by the Negro and white pickets of the struck tobacco factories in South Carolina.

In every community the Negro people are on the move, beginning to fight and solidify their ranks. Espe-

cially in the South the Negro people are playing a vital role. It is our task to further this struggle, to help strengthen the inner unity of the Negro people, and on the basis of a fighting people's program to strengthen the Negro-labor alliance. Labor as a whole must support the struggle of the Negro people; for it is an integral part of the struggle of the entire working class against the offensive of monopoly.

The progressive trade unions, which have played a vital role in defense of the interests of Negro workers, must now evaluate their task in the light of new conditions. In this respect they must recognize their weaknesses in order to strengthen the fight against the monopolies. A first consideration is the weakness of the fight against national oppression and chauvinist ideology and the failure to meet the special demands and needs of the Negro workers. Under present conditions, it must be said that failure to react correctly to these questions can only lead to development among the Negro people of a deepening reactionary nationalism, possible acts of desperation, the very opposite of class or trade union solidarity.

#### THE TWO MAJOR PARTIES

The leading role of labor will not assert itself automatically; for many forces contend for leadership of the Negro people. Truman's pose of friendship for the Negro people typifies his entire policy of sweet words

and bitter actions, for Truman's appointment of two progressive Negroes, Dean William H. Hastie and Dr. Raphael O'Hara Lanier, respectively, as Governor of the Virgin Islands and Minister to Liberia, is a gesture to the Negro people; but it will not clear him of responsibility in their eyes for the defeat of F.E.P.C. For, while giving lip-service to the need for the measure, his every action encouraged the Republican-Bourbon bloc in fighting against it. In the Capitol transit strike, he refused to take action forcing the employment of Negro workers; he took away the power of the F.E.P.C. to issue directives; and failed, on this issue, to invoke discipline in his own party. The result is the increasing dissatisfaction of the Negro people with the Truman Administration.

The Republican Party is demagogically taking advantage of this dissatisfaction, and is making a renewed bid to regain its former position of leadership among the Negro people. It is preparing a special campaign to replace the progressive Negro Congressman Adam Clayton Powell, from New York and William L. Dawson from Chicago with Republican Negro Congressmen who will play the G.O.P. game. It is out to corral the Negro vote under the leadership of the most reactionary section of the imperialist bourgeoisie.

Neither of the two major parties represents, or in any way really

fights for, the special demands of the Negro people—F.E.P.C., abolition of the poll tax, anti-lynch law legislation, etc. Paramount, therefore, today is the question of forging the democratic people's coalition, a third party, of which the Negro people can and must be an integral part.

The present period with respect to the Negro people's movement, differs greatly from that which immediately followed the First World War. Then there were no mass trade unions, no Negro and white organization in the basic industries, no Communist Party; there did exist the powerful Garvey movement—a trend that reflected the basic national-freedom aspirations of the Negro masses, but which channeled these strivings into a reactionary-nationalist utopia.

Now, however, in this postwar situation, the struggle and the organizational strength of the Negro people's movement and of its allies are greatly enhanced. Negro and white are united on the picket line. To help meet the organizational needs of the Negro people, there is the N.A.A.C.P., with a membership of half-a-million; there are the National Negro Congress and many other organizations of utmost political importance to the struggle of the Negro people; there is today in existence the Communist Party, whose contributions, in theory, program, and fighting leadership to the struggle of the Negro people, have won for it wide appreciation

and support among the Negro population throughout the land.

The general attack of reaction upon the Negro people, the importance of uniting Negro and white in common unity against monopoly's offensive directed against both, raises important questions, political, tactical and organizational. The purpose of this report is to discuss some of the more salient of these problems.

In keeping with their general post-war offensive against the working class and with their intensified campaign of oppression directed at the Negro people, the big monopolists would like to create a large Negro labor reserve. Their calculations are: (1) To use such a reserve as a club over the labor movement, as a weapon in its general drive against progressive trade unionism, with the aim of sapping the vitality of the unions; (2) to threaten the white workers with the idea that this Negro labor reserve will be able to man the machines and make it possible for the employers to use this threat to hold back the workers' demands and prevent strikes for wage increases.

The employers not only hope to have a large Negro labor reserve as such, but rather an "anti-union Negro labor reserve." They hope to bring about a basis for dissatisfaction among the Negro trade unionists.

#### GROWING SOLIDARITY

Despite the mass layoffs and de-

spite the terror to which Negro workers are subjected, there exists complete solidarity among Negro and white workers in the current strike struggles. This is true, not only in Northern industrial communities, but also in the South. The Negro communities are rendering support to the strikers in the form of food, money, and picketing. Many Negro churches, the N.A.A.C.P., the National Urban League, and the Negro press in the main give material and moral aid to the strikers.

The splendid unity shown during the strikes augurs well for the future. Negro workers played an important role on the picket lines as leaders of Negro and white labor. In one mill in Buffalo, a Negro worker became a general picket captain. Some attempts were made to bring in scabs, but not a single response came from Negro workers. Many of the Negro workers in the shops, with high seniority, having been in the plant from ten to twenty years, performed duties as picket captains on the line and held the unity of the workers. Industry after industry can give similar examples. Nevertheless, vicious propaganda, with an anti-Negro tinge, was spread by the employers to undermine this unity. But the significant fact is that not in a single case was a divisive tactic successful.

This widespread demonstration of unity and solidarity is historic, quite different from the situation following World War I, when there were "race" riots which contributed to the



delay of trade-union organization of the basic industries.

The solidarity in today's struggles is the result of the fact that larger and larger sections of labor have fought the employers in behalf of the needs and interests of the Negro people. These struggles, which were waged for the organization of Negro workers into the unions, for wage increases which boosted the income of the entire Negro community, for wartime jobs which registered victories in the elimination of many "lily-white" industries, helped to break down discriminatory barriers and to win new positions for Negroes in many new skills. The Negro workers increasingly see the union as a force through which their immediate economic problems can be solved.

#### TASKS OF TRADE UNIONS

We are entering a period in which the solidarity established between Negro and white workers will be put to a test. There are conscious forces working to undermine this unity. The fight to maintain it takes on added significance today. It would be fatal merely to rely upon the momentum of the past. The aggravated situation, a result of the strike of big capital against a human reconversion program, with consequent unemployment, creates a host of new problems which can be solved only if the alliance of the Negro people and labor is maintained and strengthened.

Marxism teaches us that the working class cannot free itself without liberating all those exploited and oppressed by capitalism. Hence, in the struggle against imperialist reaction, the working class marshals its reserves from all the toiling and oppressed strata of the population on the basis of championing their special demands. In our country this means, particularly, waging a fight for the special demands of the Negro people, one of the most important allies of the American working class.

Failure of Communists to act on this front can mean disaster to the working class at a moment when the unity must be raised to a higher level. For Communists this means that they must make the struggle for jobs a central task. The Party must win the trade union movement for the following:

1. An intensive fight for the passage of F.E.P.C., which establishes by law equality in job rights for Negro workers and other minorities. With the defeat of the bill in the Senate, the fight is now transferred to the House and the next task is to secure the remaining signatures for the discharge petition and take it out of the hands of the Rules Committee. The fight for F.E.P.C. can be won in this session of Congress. Its success will depend to a great extent upon the ability of the unions to move from the resolution to the action stage. The unions and all progressive forces must press for Congressional appropriations for F.E.P.C.

and demand that the President restore to F.E.P.C. the power to issue directives.

2. In a number of states, like California and Massachusetts, efforts are being made for state and local F.E.P.C. ordinances. These efforts must be extended to all communities as part of the effort to break down job discrimination in public utilities and other fields.

3. The proposed housing program, on the basis of which more than 2,000,000 units are to be built and some 1,500,000 construction workers are to be employed, must receive the active support of the unions. In this respect, a concerted drive is necessary to break down the discriminatory barriers in the A. F. of L. Building Trades Union to the end that Negro workers will be hired on all levels of skill.

4. The Party must win the union membership as a whole for a fight against discrimination in rehiring, as well as for the fight to admit Negro workers into the training-within-industry program and to broaden occupational qualifications for Negro workers.

#### "LILY WHITE" SHOPS

While we develop the fight for jobs for laid-off Negro workers, the Communists have the special task of helping to check the mass layoffs of Negro workers from shops because of low seniority. It is our view that the labor movement, given an understanding of its special role in

the present situation, can be won for this fight to prevent the restoration of the "lily white" shop.

A good example in this respect, is U.E.R.M.W.A. Local 450, embracing 5,000 workers in several plants in Nassau County and Brooklyn, in New York. Party members in that union noted that in plant after plant all the Negro workers hired during the war were being laid off. They acted to prevent such a situation in a shop covered by their local contracts. In that shop, the wartime ratio of Negro to white had been 1 to 33. At the time of action the ratio was 1 to 50. The gap was widening, with the prospect that at the start of 1946, the company would have completely eliminated all Negroes. The comrades took the bull by the horn, discussed seniority revisions, as one of ten demands, with the membership, who unanimously agreed to incorporate a proposal to maintain the wartime ratio of Negro workers in the plants. The union successfully countered the arguments of the employer that this "would mean discrimination against white workers," and successfully made this proposal a part of the new contract agreement. Thus, instead of a complete layoff, many Negro workers will remain in the plant. In this way, a high calibre of leadership made a signal contribution to correct a policy of exclusion of Negroes from industry. This is the first time that a union has taken such action. It is the only known action of its kind to date.

Such actions can be successfully carried out in many industries. This is what we mean by taking a special approach to the Negro question to prevent return to "lily white" shops.

#### THE BARRIER OF WHITE CHAUVINISM

Similar actions are not taken in many unions because a Social-Democratic outlook toward the problems of the Negro people unfortunately exists. A wall of white-chauvinist ideas acts as a barrier to correct working-class policy. There is a lack of faith in our ability to convince the white workers of the correctness of our program, a lack of confidence in their ability to learn. This flows from an insufficient understanding on our part of the Negro question as that of an oppressed nation. There are many concrete expressions of this. For example, many comrades state that seniority revision will weaken the trade unions. In reality, this is an assertion that a contradiction exists between the interests of labor and the needs of the Negro people. Those who yield to such ideas fail to see that seniority revision strengthens the union, that it will place the unity of Negro and white on a firmer foundation and will correspondingly strengthen seniority. If we apply the Leninist definition of opportunism as a policy that favors the short-term interests of a section of the workers at the expense of the long-term interests of the labor movement as a whole, it follows that the

above-given argument against seniority revision is an example of opportunism. There are many other incorrect arguments which merely need to be stated for us to draw the necessary conclusions. They are: (1) "Seniority revision is favoritism, and everyone must be treated equally"; (2) "You can't revise seniority because the white workers won't stand for it"; (3) "We must wait for the whites to be educated"; (4) "The Negro people themselves haven't raised the issue."

But the real "hammer" blow that is delivered against seniority revision is that "the only hope for Negro employment is in a period of expanding prosperity." Those who say this fail to finish the sentence. If they did, it would read, "but in a period of increasing unemployment there is no hope for the Negro worker." True, full employment is the answer, but under that condition seniority modification would not necessarily be an issue. This argument is advanced as a pretext for a do-nothing policy. Its falsity is proved by the actions of Local 450 mentioned above. We fight for full employment but also seniority modification, in order to check the forced mass exodus of Negroes from industry. We are for the full equality of the Negroes; and equality does not mean all white workers employed and all Negroes on relief. The Communists must bring this understanding to the millions of organized workers.

In addition, Communists must be

in the forefront of the fight for such special demands as upgrading, breaking down occupational discrimination, inclusion of Negro workers without discrimination in the in-plant training program, wider inclusion of Negro workers in negotiations for wage contracts, promotion of Negro workers as shop stewards, as well as their promotion to higher posts of operative trade union leadership.

We Communists must also take note of the fact that, after twelve years of existence, the large unions in the steel, auto, packing and electrical industries do not have Negro working-class leaders as national spokesmen. The Communists must fight for and boldly promote the idea of integrating Negro trade unionists on all levels of leadership. The achievement of this objective would, in itself, constitute a strong blow at Negro national reformism, as expressed by Townsend and Weaver in the C.I.O. It would bring new Negro leaders to the fore as spokesmen for the Negro people, consolidate the unions, and contribute to the general strengthening of the alliance of labor and the Negro people.

### CONCRETE TASKS

On these problems the following concrete tasks should be undertaken by the Party:

1. In each plant and industry, unions must act to block employers

from organizing layoffs in such a way as to eliminate Negro workers from skilled and semi-skilled jobs and from placing on Negro workers, generally, a disproportionate burden of the layoffs.

2. In plants where a rigid and formal application of seniority plays into the hands of employers by placing the brunt of the layoffs on Negro workers, security negotiations must be flexibly applied, so as to retain a proportionate number of Negro workers.

3. In plants where a widespread transfer of workers from one job to another is taking place, all efforts by employers to put over a general policy of downgrading Negro workers must be blocked, and the process of upgrading must be accelerated.

4. In industries that are beginning to expand as a result of the resumption of peacetime production, unions must make categorical demands on employers that an equal proportion of Negro workers be hired in each plant.

5. In industries where reconversion necessitates retraining of workers, special attention must be paid to union-controlled training programs in which Negro workers enjoy full equality of opportunity.

6. Jim Crow bars and practices must be eliminated from numerous unions, such as in the machinist and boilermaker unions.

7. Government agencies such as U.S.E.S. must be stopped from serving as tools of employers by arbi-

trarily refusing to list Negro workers in their proper job ratings.

8. Special efforts must be made to promote hiring of Negro veterans, as well as their inclusion in the in-plant training program.

9. Pressure must be exerted throughout the labor movement for a permanent F.E.P.C.

#### NEGRO VETERANS

The returned Negro veteran, after having performed services to the nation without parallel since the Civil War, are among the first victims of the economic and political offensive of the big monopolies and Southern Bourbons. This is not an accident. These reactionary forces, interested in curbing democracy, understand that the role of the Negro veterans in helping to crush Nazi oppression abroad, logically puts them in the forefront of the political struggle for equality at home.

In the army, many of these veterans acquired diversified skills, learned the art of leadership, grew in political understanding, achieved a new realization of their manhood status, and a burning desire not to return to the old order of oppression. This is expressing itself in their desire to fight for full democratic liberties at home.

That is why the Negro veterans are the first victims of the reactionary offensive against labor and the Negro people. Since V-J Day, some eight Negro vets are known to have been murdered. Freeport, L. I., and

the mass terror in Columbia, Tennessee, should alarm every decent American. In many cases in the South, because of terror and intimidation, many Negro veterans are forced to leave their homes to escape terror, intimidation and lynchings, and might properly be called "refugees" from the South.

In addition, employers, North and South, are refusing to hire Negro veterans on skilled jobs; disabled Negro war veterans are being barred from the in-plant training programs; and, regardless of skill, the U.S.E.S. cooperates with management and assigns Negro veterans only to menial jobs.

One of the most significant developments in the country is the mass growth of Negro veteran organizations in practically every community in the country. Each of these organizations, while putting forward the special demands of the veterans as such, also champion the fight of the entire Negro community. Typical is the Georgia Veterans League, which has advanced a splendid fourteen-point program and which seeks the support of labor and all progressive forces for its realization. Among the points are: elimination of Jim Crow in the GI Bill of Rights; job training without discrimination; vocational and technical school training; loans without discrimination; civil rights—the right to vote, equal school facilities, equal and adequate hospital facilities, equal justice under the law, etc. The League also de-

mands equal representation in the Veterans Administration.

Similar groups exist in Mississippi, Louisiana, Virginia, Alabama, South Carolina, New York, Connecticut, and many other states. In Alabama, some 100 Negro veterans marched on the Board of Registrars demanding the right to vote, and since then a state-wide conference was held, and a state-wide organization formed. On a country-wide scale, a National Provisional Organizing Committee has been formed which is striving to unite the Negro veterans everywhere as a means of speeding the fight for full equality for the Negro veterans. The labor movement, especially the Communists, must give aid to the efforts of these veterans to organize not only because of their services to the country, but primarily as a fundamental right of all Americans.

While Communists render support to such developments, we fight for the elimination of Jim Crowism in all veterans' organizations and demand the admittance of Negro veterans in any Post or Chapter of the major veterans' organizations on the basis of complete equality.

#### THE N.A.A.C.P.

One of the most significant developments of the Negro people's movement during and following the war was the tremendous growth of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. This organization now has 520,000 mem-

bers, in 900 senior branches, youth councils and college chapters. It is the largest and most influential organization among the Negro people, with all the elements present for becoming a real people's organization. It reflects the broad currents of thought among the Negro people. During the war there was a large influx into the N.A.A.C.P. of Negro workers from the auto, steel, aircraft, shipyard, packing and tobacco industries. These workers, now forming a majority of the N.A.A.C.P., take an active part in the membership drives. The N.A.A.C.P., in social composition, can no longer be considered a middle-class organization. It embraces workers, farmers, sharecroppers, students, professionals, veterans, Negro businessmen and women, and white liberals.

As a result of the class ties established between the N.A.A.C.P. and the labor movement, especially the C.I.O., the organization has given support to the recent strike struggles. Joint struggles on civil rights have also been developed. This is due, not only to the general influence of the labor movement, but also to the growing influence of labor in the chapters of the N.A.A.C.P.

As to the top leadership, it must be pointed out that there are forces of unity and integrity in the National Board which must be strengthened in every way. Their support should not only be solicited on issues outside of the Councils of the N.A.A.C.P., but also be mobilized

in the interests of the N.A.A.C.P. to challenge the Red-baiting attacks of A. Philip Randolph. It is under the banner of anti-Communism that these forces, primarily Social-Democrats, operate. Their splitting role is best revealed by the tactics they pursued in the fight for F.E.P.C., and they must be fought and exposed as pursuing policies that are hostile to the interests of the Negro people.

The present program of the N.A.A.C.P. reflects, in the main, the immediate needs of the Negro people. The new labor composition helps, not only to facilitate the progressive trend in the organization, but also the realization of its program; for the membership wants unity and is ready for struggle. This was reflected in the support given by N.A.A.C.P. chapters to the fight for a permanent F.E.P.C. when the January 17-18 delegations to Washington were organized.

#### REASONS FOR PROGRESS

These progressive developments have taken place primarily because of the following reasons:

1. The growth in numerical strength and in consciousness of the labor and progressive movements, the growing influence of labor in Negro life, and the mass entrance of workers into the N.A.A.C.P. In this respect, the activity of the C.I.O. in welding the unity of Negro and white, and the increasing importance of the C.I.O. in the economic and

political life of the country, play a vital role.

2. The organization of more than a half-million Negro workers in the trade unions and their continuing participation in joint struggles with white workers on the key economic and social issues, is developing a sense of understanding of the role of Negro working-class leadership, both with regard to labor as a whole and with regard to the Negro liberation movement.

3. The establishment of the National Negro Congress and its militant activity in the organization of the unorganized and its promotion of the fight for democracy.

4. The general upsurge of the Negro people during the war years, an upsurge which continues to grow under conditions of the sharpened offensive of monopoly reaction against labor in general and the Negro people in particular.

5. The victories achieved by the N.A.A.C.P. in the fight for civil rights, for equal salaries for Negro teachers, and its work on the anti-poll tax and anti-lynch bills.

6. The activity of the N.A.A.C.P. in airing the grievances of the Negro people, especially in connection with the Jim Crowism in the Armed Forces during the war.

A sharp note of warning must be sounded on the activities of the Trotskyites in the N.A.A.C.P. In many localities they are in the leadership of mass branches. They are also attempting to capture the lead-

ership of mass branches in the main production centers—Detroit, Cleveland, Chicago, St. Louis, Pittsburgh, and Baltimore. In some cases they take advantage of the respect of the Negro people for the Communists by posing as Communists in order to gain positions of leadership. Their aim is to paralyze, disrupt, and make the organization impotent in the face of impending struggles and they must be rooted out and exposed.

Clearly, a major task before the Communists is the strengthening and further development of the progressive activities of the N.A.A.C.P. We urge therefore that:

1. Support be given to the N.A.A.C.P. in its efforts to realize its adopted program in the communities.

2. A critical attitude be developed towards reformist and Social-Democratic policies.

3. Unity of action be striven for, to embrace the N.A.A.C.P., N.N.C., trade unions, churches, other community organizations, and the Communist Party, around all vital issues affecting the Negro people.

#### NATIONAL NEGRO CONGRESS

Such activities will undoubtedly result in strengthening all the progressive tendencies in the N.A.A.C.P., weld more firmly the unity of the Negro people, on the basis of advancing its struggle against fascism and imperialism and of promoting its alliance with labor, thus furthering the over-all democratic anti-

fascist unity of the American people.

The National Negro Congress has a proud history. It is well known that the N.N.C. played a vital role in the organization of Negro workers into the C.I.O. from such basic industries as steel, auto, aircraft, meat packing, and munitions. The splendid display of unity of Negro and white workers on the picket lines during all the current major strike struggles is in part due to the effective work of the N.N.C. during the organizing drives. This contribution to Negro and white unity on the part of the N.N.C., expressed through the trade union movement, helps to make it possible for labor as a whole to challenge successfully the offensive of monopoly capital.

It was also this contribution to Negro and white labor solidarity that made it possible to win in many shops new gains for Negro workers, such as upgrading, elimination of wage differential, increased wages, and their employment in industries that previously barred Negro workers. These facts must be taken into account in any discussion or estimation of the N.N.C.

However, it must be pointed out that the N.N.C. failed consistently to follow up its important contributions. Thus, during the war, while correctly giving full support to the struggle for victory, many weaknesses were evident in its work. The Congress, for instance, began a mass campaign for a mixed Army unit, received broad support, but failed to



organize and plan a coordinated and systematic campaign. On the special problems of Negro soldiers in the Army's Jim Crow set-up, the work of the N.N.C. was limited, in the main, to statements of protest. There were no mass campaigns developed on the burning issues of civil rights. As a consequence of such weaknesses, the N.N.C., instead of growing rapidly, began to decline in membership.

#### FOR A FIGHTING N.N.C.

The present situation makes it urgently necessary to have a fighting National Negro Congress that reacts militantly to the problems of the Negro people, spearheading the fight for unity within the Negro community, and strengthening the ties between labor and the Negro people.

The N.N.C. can and must develop the widest activity among the Negro people in the coming Congressional elections. It can play an important role in rallying the Negro people in support of progressive candidates committed to a program of struggle for the immediate needs of the Negro people as part of the fight against reaction's drive toward a new world war. An active N.N.C. can give leadership to the broadest forces in helping to develop a clear-cut program on the crucial issues.

Thus, the tenth anniversary celebration of the N.N.C. in Detroit on May 30, assumes great importance. In this respect, our Party must assist in helping to ensure broadest participation in this celebration, as part of the effort to beat back the offensive directed against the Negro people.

# LESSONS OF THE CONGRESSIONAL BY-ELECTION IN N.Y.

By GEORGE BLAKE CHARNEY

THE SPECIAL ELECTION held on February 19 in the 19th Congressional District of New York offers some interesting and valuable lessons for the labor and progressive movement in the clarification and development of its program and policies for the new political struggles that are looming ahead in the country. This election reflected issues and a shifting relationship of forces of which labor must take full cognizance in order to strengthen its independent position and the alliance with its democratic allies for the Congressional elections of 1946.

## KEY FACTORS IN THE CAMPAIGN

The by-election was called by Governor Dewey as a result of the vacancy created with the appointment of Samuel Dickstein, the Congressional incumbent, to the Supreme Court of New York. Following reapportionment of the district, Dickstein, a Tammany Democrat, had been elected in 1944 on a coalition ticket with the American Labor Party, with a landslide vote. Few

people suspected that the by-election to fill the vacancy would create any great stir in the district. Dickstein had supported the policies of Roosevelt. Arthur G. Klein, most prominently mentioned at the time as his possible successor, had served in Congress from the old district and supported the New Deal program. The district was overwhelmingly Democratic, the pride and strength of Tammany Hall. The A.L.P. and the Democratic Party had concluded an alliance in the municipal campaign in 1945 that resulted in the election of O'Dwyer as Mayor of New York City. It all seemed "in the bag," and thus the Governor's announcement of the special election received but negligible attention in the press. And yet what appeared at first to be a routine by-election in a district with a natural succession, developed into a most bitterly fought battle that came within a narrow margin of upsetting the old apple-cart.

What happened? Who were the candidates and what were the issues? What significance has this election for the workers in Detroit, Pittsburgh, Buffalo and San Francisco? What bearing has it on the fall elections and the increasing demand for a new, third party coalition in America? What relation has it to the great wage-and-strike movement that reached its climax in February, and to the present menacing international situation?

The 19th Congressional District is located on the East Side of New York City. It extends, roughly, from

the Battery to 40th Street and from 3rd Avenue to the East River. It includes within it the oldest Jewish community in the country, the heart of the district, as well as a large Italian population in the southern end and an Irish community in the northern section. It contains large sections of Ukrainians, Poles, Greeks, and Spaniards, as well as scatterings of almost every nationality. It is predominantly working class in composition and one of the oldest and poorest communities in the city. It is a community rich in working-class tradition, with many political cross-currents, but preeminently progressive, having contributed many militant champions to the cause of labor and the democratic struggles in our city and country. It is a district well suited to test the burning issues of the day; and to register what new alignments may be in the making in the political arena.

The Democrats, after first designating as their candidate Bert Stand, a district leader on the East Side and one of the Tammany Triumvirs, finally decided on their original prospect, Arthur G. Klein. The Republican Party chose William S. Shea, an officer in the Army, and otherwise a political nonentity. The A.L.P., after considerable discussion, elected to run its own candidate, Johannes Steel, the well-known anti-fascist radio commentator.

This independent course was decided upon by the A.L.P. so as to enable it to square off clearly on the issues confronting the people. It

marked a sudden break with the old policy of election agreements with the Democratic Party that had reduced the A.L.P. to a subordinate and defensive position. This decision came as a bombshell. It represented a bid and a challenge that aroused the greatest enthusiasm within the ranks of the labor and progressive movement; and at the same time provoked the sharpest attack from the Right, which made a hasty mobilization to give aid to the distressed Democratic candidate. The alignments were crystallized in the first week. Klein was promptly endorsed by the Liberal Party, which refrained, however, from collecting petitions to make him their official designee, for fear of showing their weakness in the district. Otherwise they did not stint their support. The *New York World-Telegram* and the *Daily Mirror* immediately opened up a vicious smear campaign against Steel and the A.L.P. They did not accept the cool assurances of Tammany Hall that Klein would win by a landslide. They were frankly worried; and in the closing days of the campaign made frantic appeals to the Republicans to vote for Klein in order to guarantee Steel's defeat. Klein was endorsed by the A. F. of L. Central Trades and Labor Council and by the Wolchak locals in the C.I.O.

Steel's candidacy, on the other hand, was given the endorsement of P.A.C., N.C.P.A., the Independent Citizens Committee, the unanimous vote of the C.I.O. Council in

New York, and the individual endorsements of Henry Wallace and former Mayor LaGuardia. He received the editorial endorsement of the *Daily Worker* and *PM*. The Communist Party withdrew its candidate and announced its support for Steel.

The Republican Party at first speculated on the possibility of a victory in a three-cornered fight based on their strong vote of 25,000 in the 1944 Congressional elections as against 53,000 for the Democrats and 17,000 for the A.L.P., and the hope that now the A.L.P. would split the Democratic vote in their favor. However, it soon became clear that this enthusiasm was only simulated. In fact, the A.L.P. had arrayed against it, not only the Democratic Party, the Liberal Party and the Republicans, but a working coalition of all three. An official communication from the "Shea for Congress" headquarters, addressed to Republican members, stated:

We are confronted with the necessity of defeating the American Labor Party's Johannes Steel, an avowed fellow-traveller whose politics stem straight from the European continent.

On Election Day, Republican captains collaborated openly with Tammany. Shea's only contribution to the campaign was to express satisfaction, when the results were announced, that Steel had been defeated!

#### THE RESULTS

He was defeated but only after the

most exciting and heated campaign witnessed in years. The results were as follows:

Klein (D.)	17,360
Steel (A.L.P.)	13,421
Shea (R.)	4,314
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>35,095</b>

The margin of defeat was 3,939 votes. The A.L.P., despite all difficulties, succeeded in increasing its vote from 18 per cent of the total in 1944 to 38 per cent in this election, an increase of 20 per cent! A shift of about 5 per cent in the vote could have changed the outcome. And on the eve of the election, Tammany had estimated that it would gain a 3-to-1 victory.

The press was almost unanimous in viewing the results as an impressive and challenging show of strength by the A.L.P.

The *New York Times*, in a leading article by Warren Moscow, stated:

The victory was a dubious one for Tammany Hall in the area it once ruled undisputed, Manhattan's lower East side, for instead of the 3-1 victory the wigwam claimed in advance, Mr. Klein squeezed through by the margin of 3,939 votes. . . .

The narrowness of the Klein margin becomes more important when it is considered that Mr. Klein is well known in the area—was a Representative until 1944, when he went out of office because of Congressional reapportionment; is of the Jewish faith in a predominantly Jewish area, while Mr. Steel is not; that Mr. Steel is not even a resident of the district, and that his principal news-

paper support came from the *Daily Worker*, rather than any other metropolitan daily newspaper.

The editorial in the New York *Herald Tribune* viewed it as a "Portent of Left-Wing Zeal," and concluded that this zeal "has produced an overturn of things usual in that erstwhile Democratic stronghold on the Lower East Side."

The *Daily Mirror* entitled its editorial "Victory Without Cheers," and then vented its fury on Tammany for making such a weak showing. Dick Lee, political commentator for that paper, said that "Steel's vote was obviously the big surprise in the election and could have an important bearing on the dealings between the Democratic bosses and the labor leaders on the selection of a joint candidate for Governor in July."

The outcome clearly produced immediate repercussions throughout the city and State. No commentator dared underestimate its significance.

#### MAIN LESSONS

What are the main lessons of the campaign?

Most important is that the vote reflects the deep-going changes taking place within the ranks of the working class. The voters of the 19th Congressional District are predominantly workers, a large number of whom have been directly involved in the great wage-and-strike movement of recent months. This election proved to be a valuable testing ground of present political trends and of the policies enunciated by the Commu-

nist Party at its November Plenum. The election results demonstrate that the Communist Party is not in isolation from the masses in its evaluation of present world developments, in its warnings of the offensive of the great monopolies of America, and of its critical analysis of the capitulatory policies of the Truman Administration. The people saw an opportunity in this by-election to voice a decided opinion on these issues and trends, and to give expression to the need for strengthening labor on all fronts, regardless of old party ties and affiliations.

The A.L.P. succeeded in a period of a two-and-a-half-week campaign in increasing its vote by 20 per cent, even though opposed by the most formidable political machine in New York, a machine that was backed by a scurrilous, reactionary press that unloosed a daily barrage of Red-baiting and calumny against the A.L.P. and its candidate. It must also be remembered that Klein was not unpopular. He had served in Congress under Roosevelt. He had received the endorsement of Senator Wagner and Mayor O'Dwyer. He came before the electorate as a progressive fighter for the Jewish people. Moreover, the elections occurred at a time in the development of the strike movement when it appeared that favorable settlements were in the making and under circumstances that fostered new illusions in Truman and the Democratic Party. Time had passed since Murray's Pittsburgh denunciation of

Truman; and Hillman had recently stepped in to reaffirm his faith in the Administration.

Thus, the A.L.P. vote cannot be ascribed to transient or local causes.

In the first place, those newspaper analysts were in error who referred to the vote as small. The implication thus given was that the voters were indifferent; and that the A.L.P., with a ready mobilization of Left-wing supporters, "sneaked a fast one" over its cocksure opponents. The facts, however, prove that the vote was unprecedentedly large for a by-election.

As Dick Lee of the *Daily Mirror* saw it:

With a total of 35,095 out of a possible 75,000, the results cannot be laid to a lack of interest by the electorate. Such by-elections are ordinarily able to attract only 25 or 30 per cent of the total registered vote.

In this election almost 50 per cent of the voters cast a ballot. In the 4th A.D. and the 6th A.D. South, (the main Jewish areas) the figure was closer to 60 per cent!

Secondly, it is incorrect to conclude, as did the *Herald Tribune* and the *Mirror* editorials, that these results were based on the fact that the A.L.P. secured its maximum and the Democratic Party its minimum vote. As the *Daily Mirror* put it, in its reactionary fashion:

What are the lessons of this election? (1) The Democrats got out an extremely light vote in a district they formerly controlled 3 to 1. Bluntly, their organ-

ization was lousy. They were too confident. They made their man "look bad."

(2) The Reds and fellow travellers, taking advantage of the Democratic sloth, worked with the utmost diligence, got every possible vote to the polls, and are able to claim something of a "moral" victory. They made their candidate "look good."

The *Herald Tribune*, in more dignified fashion, spoke likewise in its editorial analysis:

Attesting both Tammany's failure to marshal its usual voting strength and the A.L.P.'s success in getting out its supporters is the fact that on Tuesday the Democrats polled only 33 per cent of the votes given Dickstein, while the A.L.P. registered 77 per cent of its 1944 votes.

These conclusions are, however, too simple. They view party relationships as fixed. They ignore the important changes and shifts that have occurred since 1944, just as they tend to discount and overlook the workers' growing alertness to the host of new issues thrown up by the war's end.

The character of the campaign, as well as an analysis of the voting, proves conclusively that there was a basic switch in sentiment registered in favor of the A.L.P. The A.L.P. succeeded, not only in holding on to its own stable vote, but in winning away a substantial block of Democratic voters as well. This is the real meaning of the 20 per cent increase. This is the real reason for the general interest and concern shown by the

press and the different groupings in the Democratic Party in the impressive showing of the A.L.P.

The proof is in the following: In the first place, the A.L.P. secured about 16,000 pledges for its candidate prior to election day. The 13,500 votes for Steel indicates that these pledges stood up fairly well.

Moreover, a careful check made of each voter against the pledge cards at the polling places in each election district shows that about 70 per cent of the pledge signers actually voted, and a large majority of these were enrolled members of the Democratic Party. A more detailed analysis of ten representative E.D.'s in the 4th A.D. South disclose that, of the 1,571 votes for Steel, only 645 were enrolled in the A.L.P. Thus, 60 per cent of the total vote, or  $2\frac{1}{2}$  times the A.L.P. vote, came from Democratic and Republican enrollees.

It is also interesting to compare the results in this campaign with the A.L.P.-Communist vote in the Councilmanic elections of 1945. Thus, in the 4th A.D., Connolly (A.L.P.) and Davis (C.P.) received a combined vote of 5,663 out of a total valid vote cast of 24,649.

In this election Steel received 7,194 votes in the 4th A.D. out of a total of 17,010 votes, or a greater vote of 1,531, or 27 per cent, as against an absolute decline in total votes of 7,639 or 30 per cent.

Obviously, the A.L.P. vote represents more than a coalition of the "Left" or simply the expression of "Left-wing zeal." This is all the

more telling in the light of the fact that about 30 per cent of the A.L.P. enrollees did not vote. While this demonstrates a weakness in the mobilization of the A.L.P. that may have provided the margin of defeat, it also indicates the new forces that have come forward to support the labor-progressive coalition.

Furthermore, the switch in voting sentiment was reflected clearly and dramatically in the response of the community during the campaign. The people crowded to every street meeting, indoor mass rally, forum, and symposium. This interest visibly heightened as the A.L.P. sharpened up on the issues, especially as it began to criticize and expose the role and policies of Truman and the Democratic Party. The climax in the campaign was reached at a major last-week rally held at the National Theatre on Houston St. The meeting was called on two days notice. Yet about 1,500 people crowded into the theatre. Congressman Marcantonio, who made the main address, delivered a penetrating and forceful criticism of the Truman Administration, pointing out the need for the progressive forces in the Democratic Party to ally themselves with labor in a new coalition to fight the offensive of the monopolies to whom Truman had capitulated. Marcantonio received a standing ovation from the audience.

This meeting marked a decisive turn in the campaign. It crystallized the issues and gave expression to

the increasing concern of the people, the Jews in particular, with the rising tide of reaction and anti-Semitism, and to their growing doubts that the party they had supported so loyally in the past could or would meet the new issues squarely.

The campaign, in its initial phase, had been conducted on a more personal basis, i.e., Klein was O.K., but Steel was better; Klein fights Rankin, but Steel would fight him more effectively. The result was a slurring over of the basic issues, and an ignoring of the basic reasons for the A.L.P. entering an independent candidate at all. The National Theatre meeting, however, changed the character of the campaign and gave it a new direction and renewed impetus.

It is highly significant that, while the A.L.P. campaigners succeeded in canvassing only 60 per cent of the electorate as a whole, in the 4th A.D. North where they had completed a canvas, the re-canvas, in the last days when the issues had been more clarified, produced more pledges than were obtained in the original coverage. It is also interesting that at no time did Klein ever mention Truman, either in his literature or in his speeches. He held on for dear life to the shades of Roosevelt, and never ventured on to the contemporary scene.

Thus, the main lesson of the campaign is that it points to a new and favorable re-grouping of forces. Given bold, clear, and aggressive leadership, the A.L.P. in New York can strengthen its independent position

and be instrumental in forging a new type of labor-democratic coalition in the 1946 elections.

#### QUESTIONS OF POLICY

While the results of the election were received with enthusiasm in the labor and progressive movement, the policy originally outlined for the campaign, i.e., to run an independent candidate, was not accepted at first without considerable controversy and some trepidation. In our own ranks in the Communist Party, there were those who expressed the opinion that we were in error in withdrawing the candidate of the Communist Party, designated at the New York County Convention, held in January. It is clear that such a policy could have led only to a weakening and disorganization of the labor-progressive coalition and the isolation of the Communist Party.

More serious doubts were expressed from the opposite viewpoint, namely, that the policy of the A.L.P. was premature, and that there was the danger that the A.L.P. would lose contact with the progressive forces in the Democratic Party and with those forces in the trade union movement that were inclined to go along with Truman.

Some asked why the A.L.P. undertook to oppose a Democrat like Klein who had a favorable voting record on New Deal issues. The decision of the A.L.P. did not stem from a sudden or freakish outburst of militancy or from an over-all policy of opposing all Democrats. It was based on a care-



ful analysis of the relationship of forces in the particular district, a relationship which was becoming more favorable to labor. It was based on the conclusion that there was no danger that pitting a candidate against Klein would pave the way for a reactionary Republican. It was based, finally, and most importantly, on the determination to give this constituency a *fighting* Congressman and to challenge the reactionary policies of the Truman Administration that a Klein would be reluctant to oppose or repudiate.

The results clearly demonstrate that the policy adopted was neither hasty nor premature. On the contrary, the A.L.P. was correct in seizing on this by-election, which came in the midst of the great strike wave, to advance the struggle for labor-progressive independent political action. Instead of being isolated, the A.L.P. strengthened its ties with the Wallace-Ickes forces and trends in the Democratic Party and with the independent progressive forces in the LaGuardia-Newbold Morris camp. The results of the campaign have strengthened labor's political initiative and have undoubtedly added impetus to the projected drive of P.A.C. and N.C.P.A.C. for the coming elections.

The press was quick to echo the stir created within the Democratic Party. Thus, the *New York Times*, in a headline news story, stated on February 21:

A possibility that the American Labor

Party will refuse endorsements to Democratic members of the Legislature from New York City who vote for Mayor O'Dwyer's \$142,000,000 tax program developed today and is complicating further the task of Democratic leaders in organizing enough votes to pass the measures.

In view of the exceptionally heavy vote polled Tuesday by Johannes Steel, the American Labor Party candidate, in the special Congressional election for the New York County seat vacated by Supreme Court Justice Samuel Dickstein, the attitude of the American Labor Party is a serious consideration with many Democratic Senators and Assemblymen. Mr. Steel was beaten by fewer than 4,000 votes in a lower Manhattan district that once was overwhelmingly Democratic.

This is an indication of the fact that the A.L.P. is in a strong position for the 1946 elections. However, two dangers must be avoided. On the one hand, it would be an error to conclude that the A.L.P., having shown its muscle, can now "go it alone" in the 1946 elections. On the other hand, it would be equally erroneous for the A.L.P. not to utilize this victory to the fullest extent in developing its own independent tactics, with a view to organizing the broadest democratic coalition on a new basis, with labor as a distinct and determining force.

#### THE COMMUNISTS IN THE CAMPAIGN

The Communist Party played an active and constructive part in the campaign. It did not hesitate to

withdraw its own candidate, convinced that the policy of the A.L.P. in nominating Steel was advancing the strategic needs of labor in developing the struggle to break the working masses away from dependence on the Democratic Party. The Communist Party sections on the East Side worked diligently to reach the voters and clarify the issues. The Party spoke independently for the candidate of the coalition, and helped materially, as did the *Daily Worker*, in rallying the people of the district against the vicious Red-baiting campaign of the *World Telegram*, *Daily Mirror*, and the Social-Democratic press. How ineffectual the Red-baiting was, can be illustrated by the fact that a smear-editorial in the *Daily Mirror* which identified Steel with Hitler in one paragraph and with Stalin in another, was reprinted by Tammany in 100,000 copies—however, with the passage linking Steel with Stalin omitted!

This election also demonstrates how false and bankrupt are the policies of Earl Browder who accused the Communist Party of breaking up the "progressive" coalition with Truman and who no doubt predetermined the A.L.P. to suffer a debacle in the election.

### CONCLUSION

Could Steel have won? It is generally believed that one more week might have changed the outcome. Many election districts were lost by small margins, and a better concentration of forces in 20 E.D.'s could

have been decisive. The trade unions responded, but far from sufficiently.

What is most important, especially for the future, is the need to integrate the trade unions more fully into the active, day-to-day work of the A.L.P. This not only requires more participation by these forces in the district clubs of the A.L.P., but the development of a concentrated campaign of activities in the unions themselves on political action; to link up the activities of labor's representatives in the City Council, State Legislature and Congress with the daily life of the unions; and to mobilize the membership in the shops and locals on the issues that so vitally affect them.

The fight for peace will be the decisive issue in the 1946 congressional elections. The recent developments in the U.N.O., the speeches of Byrnes, Vandenberg, Dulles, Connally, etc., and the flagrant, war-inciting harangue of Churchill point to the urgent need to mobilize the broadest masses of the people in active struggle against the offensive of American and British imperialism. These developments verify most dramatically how correct was the tactic employed in the 19th Congressional election. They reveal how imperative it is for the labor and progressive forces to fight for the defeat of the imperialists in both the Republican and Democratic camps and to lay the basis for achieving a new political alignment in this country, independent of the parties of the bourgeoisie.

# THE STRATEGY OF THE PACKINGHOUSE WORKERS' STRIKE

By JAMES KELLER

THE PACKINGHOUSE WORKERS' STRIKE was a complex class battle fought out on a high plane of economic struggle, with important political aspects. Because of the complexity and scope of the strike, the question of correct policy played a specially decisive role. Fortunately, and despite all obstacles, such a correct policy prevailed in the conduct of the strike. Moreover, the policy itself contains rich lessons which can now be tested in the light of results, by the practical activity and struggle of the masses.

The crux of the entire strike centered about the problems created by Government seizure of the meat plants. Seizure subjected the strikers and their union (the United Packinghouse Workers of America-C.I.O.) to the most severe test of the entire struggle. This was indeed a test of the unity and fighting spirit of the packinghouse workers. But, more than that, it was a test of the ideological capacities of the membership and leadership of the union, for it required a correct estimate of the

role played by the Truman Administration, as well as other complex factors. The packinghouse workers passed this test with flying colors, and in doing so have made an important contribution to the C.I.O. and the entire labor movement.

The direct issue involved in the strike was that of wages. The union demanded a minimum of 17½ cents an hour, an additional 7½ cents to be negotiated later. The meat companies made varied offers of 4 to 10 cents an hour. The A. F. of L. union (Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen of America) declared from the very outset its readiness to settle for 15 cents an hour. *The final recommendation of a 16 cent an hour increase made by the fact finding panel represents a 20 per cent wage increase and is unquestionably a decisive victory for the packinghouse workers.* This victory is all the more impressive because it was achieved in spite of the treacherous and divisive tactics of the A. F. of L. leadership and other adverse factors.

To grasp the important lessons of the strike, several distinct stages through which it went must first be described.

## THE FIRST STAGE OF THE STRIKE

The *first stage* began on January 16, the date set for the strike. This stage represented a heavy offensive blow against the meat trusts by the union. Unlike the "one-at-a-time" strategy employed by Reuther in the

auto industry, the packinghouse workers struck all of the major companies at the same time. The union purposely permitted a number of the small companies to continue production in order to serve the needs of the U.S. Army and hospitals, as well as other essential public institutions. In its timing, the strike corresponded to the general strategy of the C.I.O. and became effective five days before the walkout of the steel workers. Nor were the seasonal characteristics of the industry overlooked, the time selected being most favorable in this respect.

From its beginning to the very end, the strike was marked by unsurpassed public support. This support was expressive of the deep sympathy of labor and the people for the packinghouse workers. Both of the communities adjoining the Stock Yards in Chicago, the "Back of the Yards" whose population is predominantly white, and the "South Side," predominantly Negro, gave solid, *organized* support to the strike.

Thus, the meat companies in Chicago were surrounded, not only by a solid ring of pickets, Negro and white, but also by the wider ring of both communities. Support for the strike, however, was not limited to any one section of the country. It was nationwide, embracing large sections of the press as well. The union, moreover, energetically reached out to the consumers, farmers, and office workers, distributing hundreds of thousands of leaflets among them,

sending representatives to conferences, etc., with considerable effect. One leaflet evoked considerable good-natured reaction because of its title: "Office Workers—You Have A 'Steak' in This Strike."

The first stage was marked above everything else by the union's ability to effect a nationwide stoppage. For the first time, a nationwide strike in the meat industry was successfully realized.

#### THE ISSUE OF GOVERNMENT SEIZURE

The *second stage* of the strike began on Monday, January 22, with the first unofficial rumors of Government seizure. The prospect of seizure ran like a chilling blizzard through the ranks of the strikers and momentarily shook their confidence in victory. Without waiting for official word, the leadership of the A. F. of L. union immediately announced its intention of calling off the strike in the event of Government seizure. As for the International leadership of the U.P.W.A.-C.I.O., no official position was taken until the National Strategy Conference of the union on January 25.

The situation then developed as follows: On Tuesday, January 22, International representatives of the U.P.W.A. went to Washington to confer on the matter of seizure. The newspapers carried stories to the effect that President Truman was reluctant to seize the meat plants because of uncertainty as to what the

U.P.W.  
Janu  
the  
made  
Frida  
dent  
tain  
simp  
omit  
prom  
prev  
repro  
prom  
reco  
ing  
ated  
was  
as a  
T  
ure  
of t  
was  
the  
does  
from  
posi  
trict  
as f  
I.  
the  
clar  
incr  
con  
ma  
pro  
wit  
tha  
fill  
2  
me  
lish

U.P.W.A. would do. On Wednesday, January 23, formal announcement of the Government seizure order was made and the seizure date set for Friday midnight. By that time President Truman apparently felt so certain of ending the strike through the simple expedient of seizure that he omitted from the seizure order a promise made in Washington the previous day to the International representatives of the union. The promise was to enforce the wage recommendations of the Fact Finding Panel in the Government-operated plants. Omission of this point was later branded by the U.P.W.A. as a "double-cross."

The first reaction against the seizure order came from District One of the U.P.W.A. in Chicago, and was made public by Herbert March, the District Director. Since space does not permit extended quotations from statements and speeches, the position taken by the Chicago District of the union can be summed up as follows:

1. While, in the steel situation, the Truman Administration had declared itself in favor of an 18 cent increase, in the packing industry no commitment on wages had been made. Hence, the workers faced the prospect of Government seizure without any guarantees whatever that their demands would be fulfilled.

2. Under these conditions Government seizure threatened to establish the pattern of compulsory arbi-

tration of strikes by the Government under conditions favorable to the employers and dangerous to the entire labor movement.

3. Therefore, production would not be resumed without specific guarantees by the Government on the matter of the workers' demands.

The clear-cut, courageous position taken by the union in Chicago fully reflected the mood and fighting spirit of the workers. It served as the rallying point for all other districts of the U.P.W.A. and halted the danger of demoralization in the ranks of the strikers. By Friday, January 25, the position of the union had crystallized around the stand taken by District One, resulting in a unanimous vote by the National Strategy Conference. The conference adopted a fighting statement which rejected unconditional seizure, termed the order for seizure "a complete double-cross," accused President Truman of engaging "in a strike-breaking action," and declared among other things:

It is significant that although the Government is unable to bring our soldiers home from China and other foreign countries they have ample forces available, apparently, to attempt to break a strike and to maintain the packers' profits. (U.P.W.A. Conference statement—January 25, 1946.)

It was only a matter of hours after the action of the Conference that assurance came from Secretary of Agriculture Anderson that "he would favor putting into effect im-

mediately any wage increase recommended by the Government Fact Finding Board." (*Chicago Sun*, January 26, 1946.) On the basis of this assurance, the Conference voted the following day to have the strikers return to work, but not to call off the strike pending the outcome of the Board's recommendations.

In the light of the recommendation for a 16 cent increase and the entire experience of the strike, the position taken by District One, and accepted by the National Conference, has been brilliantly vindicated. This position has been subjected to criticism from two directions. Some have maintained that the union erred in refusing to comply with the seizure order and in not voting to return to work immediately. Others have taken the position that the workers should have stayed out until they won the 17½ cent increase.

The first criticism fails to take into account that the union's position was a flexible one, avoiding a head-on collision with the Truman Administration and leaving the door open for proposals that would lead to a satisfactory settlement. This policy took into account the specific position of the Truman Administration which is hesitant about breaking openly with its support in the labor movement. It is clear now that the union was not orientated toward a clash between strikers and troops on the picket line. Neither was the occupation of the meat plants by troops considered inevitable. The Admin-

istration refused to lift a finger against the arrogant defiance of the steel trusts and the big employers generally; but at the same time, it was hardly in a position to engage in reckless suppression of labor. The critics of the union's position in this case did not fully evaluate the union's policy, misconstrued it, and failed to evaluate correctly the position and role of the Truman Administration. Moreover, these critics completely lost sight of the masses. For, unconditional return to work would have been considered a defeat and would have created demoralization, to the detriment of the union.

On the other hand, those who favored an uncompromising stand for 17½ cents also erred. For this position tended to create a head-on clash between the workers and the Administration. It would have opened the union to serious attack by its enemies, and would have narrowed its support among non-labor allies.

In a struggle as complicated as the packinghouse strike, two elements are essential to victory. One is, courageous and clear-headed leadership, capable of correctly appraising the situation and adopting the appropriate policy. The other is the intelligent and militant support of the membership. Good leadership can hardly be effective without the conscious and militant support of the membership. On the other hand, even the most magnificent militancy of the masses can be rendered inef-

fectiv  
and I  
For  
neces  
packi  
leng  
have  
same  
pract  
emer  
lead  
they  
ure  
of a  
T  
men  
the  
on  
said  
dir  
be  
thes  
stri  
dan  
by  
hav  
ing  
a b  
sult  
ing  
onc  
Tr  
tra  
ma  
anc  
acy  
I  
Ne  
ou  
the  
wa

fective if unaccompanied by correct and bold leadership.

Fortunately, both of these elements necessary to victory emerged in the packinghouse strike. The union challenged the precedent which would have subjected the workers to the same treatment after the war as was practiced in the period of wartime emergency. As for the opportunist leadership of the A. F. of L. union, they changed their position on seizure exactly five times in the course of as many days.

The Ford and Chrysler settlements followed within two days of the packinghouse workers' victory on the seizure issue. It cannot be said that these settlements were the direct result of this fight. But it can be said that without such a fight these settlements and the rest of the strike struggles would have been endangered. Unconditional surrender by the packinghouse workers would have given heart to the union-busting front and might well have started a backward trend. As it was, the result was just the opposite. The packinghouse workers firmly rebuffed the one-sided "neutrality" of President Truman toward their strike, but trained the heaviest guns against the main enemy, the trusts, challenging and exposing their arrogant conspiracy against the American people.

In its issue of February 4, the *New Republic* correctly relates the outcome of the seizure question in the packing industry to the general wage struggle, and to the beginnings

of a break in the solid front of the employers. In the following statement, the *New Republic* also comes close to a correct estimate of the stand taken by the packinghouse workers:

On the day that the federal government took over the meat-packing industry, the CIO packinghouse workers reversed their decision of the previous day and voted to send their members into the meat plants. The way for this wise decision was paved when Secretary of Agriculture Anderson promised the union that the government would institute any wage increase recommended by the presidential fact-finding panel in the meat case. Secretary Anderson himself was reversing an earlier opinion, and his turnabout permitted the packinghouse workers to change their ominous decision to defy the government and continue the strike.

This statement, however, does not reveal a full understanding of the union's stand. The *New Republic* accurately states the main facts, but not their exact relationship and meaning. The fact is that rejection of unconditional seizure was the only position the union could take if it wanted to fulfill its responsibilities to its membership and the labor movement. This action was no empty gesture; it was backed by the determination of the workers. Far from being "ominous," the union's position was so firmly grounded and so well executed that President Truman and Mr. Anderson would have found it extremely difficult to take

any other course than the one they finally adopted.

The packing strike was a blow to the hopes of the top bureaucrats of the A. F. of L., whose pet theory has been that C.I.O. unions in mass production industry would crumble under the stress of postwar struggle.

In their minds, the union's large Negro membership, its history of heavy defeats in numerous struggles, and other factors, made this section of the C.I.O. appear to be a good place to search for a weak point that would break under the impact of Government seizure.

Instead, however, the supposed weak spot proved to be a powerful fortress in the wage front. The supposed weaknesses proved to be the opposite. Racial strife did not materialize; instead, the unity of Negro and white reached a new high level. The Negro workers proved to be a tower of strength and an inspiration in the strike. The industrial form of organization provided the scope and unity essential to victory, drawing allies to the support of the workers. Finally, the practically complete absence of Red-baiting and the important positive contributions of the Communist Party combined to nullify the hopes of the A. F. of L. bureaucracy.

Nor have the hopes of the A. F. of L. hierarchy materialized with regard to the C.I.O. as a whole. Far from disintegrating under the stress of postwar battles, the C.I.O. is bearing the brunt of the entire wage

struggle and is emerging as the standard bearer of American trade unionism and national progress.

Much has been said about the use of Negro workers by employers to break strikes in the past. Such statements appear historically accurate on the surface, but are inaccurate in essence. When first brought into industry, the Negro workers faced a hostile world, a world which included the white workers, because the labor movement, by the policy of the old-line leaders, had on the whole, excluded the Negro workers.

The pioneering efforts of the Communist Party in the struggle for Negro rights at once revealed the vast progressive potentialities of the Negro masses. This is borne out by the fact that every measure of friendship and solidarity extended to the Negro people by the C.I.O. has been returned with interest compounded many times. The truth about past struggles is that it was not basically a case of Negro workers scabbing on the white; it was rather the white workers scabbing on themselves through their failure to fight for the rights of the Negro people and to include Negro workers in the trade unions on the basis of full equality. The vast strength and unity of the present struggles are largely due to the progressive position held by the C.I.O. on the question of Negro rights and membership. The full acceptance of this position by the entire labor movement will go far toward making it impregnable.

THE

In  
pack  
its v  
stitu  
read  
ress  
Brow

Th  
port  
bran

our  
dust  
al C

nois  
lem  
tabl

bran  
larg  
tim

ing  
this  
ers

100  
the  
tion

Fel  
and  
dur

Ca  
N

wo  
vis  
we

tim  
no  
eff

me  
un  
inf



## THE ROLE OF THE PARTY

In the work of the Party in the packinghouse strike, as in the rest of its work, the strike movement constituted a major test of the fighting readiness of the Party and the progress it has made in overcoming Browder's revisionism.

The strike fully confirmed the importance of reconstituting the shop branches and of bringing together our forces in the concentration industries. Following the last National Convention of our Party, the Illinois District boldly tackled the problems of concentration and the re-establishment of shop and industrial branches. This fact contributed largely to the important and, at times, decisive role of the Party during the struggle. The recognition of this role by the packinghouse workers is borne out by the fact that some 100 packinghouse workers joined the Party during the strike, an additional 100 were recruited during February in the Chicago District, and many more are expected to join during the present Party Building Campaign.

Nevertheless, the Party and the workers paid dearly for our past revisionist errors. The shop branches were not in full fighting trim by the time of the strike and therefore did not achieve full effectiveness. The effects of the past period were felt most sharply in Swift's, where the union local came under opportunist influences.

The neighborhood clubs and organizations found it much more difficult to develop effective activities around the strike movement than was the case with shop branches. But, despite the slow reaction, the Party clubs, the sections and the District played a very important role.

As regards the independent role of the Party, especially effective was the aid given to the picket line by means of a canteen on wheels which made from two to five trips each day around the picket line. The canteen was launched by the South West Section of the Party in Chicago, but was soon the joint enterprise of two additional Sections, the South Side and 10th Congressional.

In all, over \$1000 in cash, plus considerable quantities of food, were collected for the canteen. Altogether, some 8500 servings of coffee and food were brought to the picket line in the course of ten days. Over 8000 copies of *The Worker* and *Daily Worker* were distributed among the pickets by the canteen. Leaflets made it clear to the pickets that the Communists were supporting the strike as a matter of working-class duty and not philanthropy. The leaflets also explained how the money and food were collected through the voluntary efforts of Party members and friends.

Space does not permit a complete account of the excellent reception of the canteen and the papers by the pickets. Suffice it to point out that the idea spread to other strike fronts

where it has been carried out on a larger scale and even more effectively.

While it is not the purpose of this article to make a thorough examination of the weaknesses that emerged in the course of the strike, some of the major ones must be mentioned. These are:

1. An underestimation of the need for a serious unity approach to the A. F. of L. and especially to the membership of the A. F. of L. Despite its miserable and divisive record during the strike, the A. F. of L. leadership was under great pressure from its members and might well have been forced to adopt a larger measure of united action. The opportunities for this were largely neglected by the U.P.W.A.

2. The insufficient participation of white workers on the picket line, in proportion to the Negro workers in the Chicago meat plants. A similar weakness is reflected in the composition of the Party in the meat packing industry.

3. Serious organizational shortcomings in the preparation of the picket line in Chicago.

#### THE FINAL STAGES OF THE STRIKE

Following the return to work, the strike entered its final stage. This stage was characterized by the vigilance of the workers and the unrelenting pressure upon the Fact Find-

ing Board for an equitable settlement. With the strike still formally in effect, the workers went back under the slogan, "Take the picket lines into the plants." This slogan, together with demonstrative actions in the plants, went a long way to show the fighting readiness of the union, and to safeguard the interests of the membership.

The main tasks remaining before the packinghouse workers are to insure that the awards made by the government are enforced and the wage increase put into effect everywhere; to join the general movement against rising living costs; and to fight the demands of the trusts for increased prices, which, if granted, would eventually wipe out the benefits of increased wages. The workers have the further tasks of completing the organization of the packing industry, cementing relations with the A. F. of L., especially with the membership, and raising to a higher level, on the basis of ideological clarity, the unity of Negro and white workers.

As a result of the strike, the packinghouse workers have been greatly strengthened organizationally and ideologically. They are now in a favorable position to make extensive new gains in wiping out wage inequalities, improving working conditions, and solving the numerous problems already mentioned.

Extremely significant was the raising of the demand for establishing the packing industry as a public

utility. The raising of this demand, together with other actions during the strike, indicates serious beginnings by the union to rise above the level of purely economic struggle. The issue that aroused some of the most enthusiastic response at strike meetings was the calling for a third party under labor's leadership. This flowed from the political lessons the workers learned from their strike experiences.

The anti-labor tendency in the Truman Administration was unmasked before the masses generally in a sharp manner in the course of the struggle against unconditional seizure.

The nature of Government "seizure," under which the old union-busting management runs the plants as the "agents" of the government—under old policies, with profits still accruing to the management—serves to bring to the work-

ers an insight into the true class nature of the State.

The Administration's continued policy of ignoring demands of the union for the replacement of company administrators by government administrators and for the operation of the industry as a public utility, the general concern of the workers about the new wage-price policy and its inflationary consequences—all go to move the workers in the direction of more fundamental thinking on class relations.

The packinghouse workers are now in a position to draw serious political conclusions as a result of their magnificent struggle. They will certainly be found in the front ranks of labor's march forward in the struggle for greater economic security, democracy and peace, a struggle whose absolute success can be guaranteed only by the socialist reorganization of society.

## BOOK REVIEW

### A POWERFUL SEARCHLIGHT ON THE IMPERIALIST WARMAKERS

By FRED BLAIR

THE GREAT CONSPIRACY—THE SECRET WAR AGAINST SOVIET RUSSIA, by Michael Sayers and Albert E. Kahn. Little, Brown & Co., Boston. Price \$3.50.

Such a book as this has been needed for a long time in the United States. It is a factual "Katusha" against the barrage of lies proceeding from the big anti-Soviet guns of the monopoly-controlled press and radio.

This book is especially timely now, when Churchill, in unison with Vandenberg, Byrnes and Bevin, has issued the call for a new anti-Soviet war alignment.

Today, despite the fact that our Soviet ally was the strongest factor in the United Nations victory over fascism, and despite the body of correct information on the Soviet Union that reached Americans for the first time during the four years of war, a renewed campaign of anti-Soviet lies and slander is having its effect. Imperialist reaction is arousing prejudice against the land of Socialism, inculcating fear and distrust of her, and a belief that friction and even war, between the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R. are inevitable.

Coming as it does, at this crucial moment, *The Great Conspiracy* demands the attention and study of all who want to achieve the consolidation

of the hard-won victory over Fascism.

*The Great Conspiracy*, as packed with facts as it is, is more interesting than any detective tale. It reminds the reader of *Under Cover* by its wealth of detail and documentation. But its scope of vision is not so limited as *Under Cover*. Sayers and Kahn are not so coy about naming the Big Boys behind the conspiracy as Carlson was about naming the higher-ups behind the fascists he pilloried.

*The Great Conspiracy* is a valuable book for a number of reasons.

1. Sayers and Kahn, in this book, give a connected picture of worldwide anti-Soviet activities from 1917 up to mid-1945, from the October Revolution up to the Red Army's victorious march into Berlin. To most people, and even to many Communists, these facts have in the main been simply unknown. These facts could be secured only by going through many books, to which most people do not have access, and of whose existence they were not even aware. Now these facts are assembled in chronological order, the facts suppressed all these years by the press and publishing firms; the facts that by their simple statement heartily damn a whole series of public figures, statesmen, Congressmen, Senators, writers, businessmen, reactionary trade union leaders, and

politicians, as well as the whole political underworld of Trotskyism, and Social-Democracy in America.

It is no wonder that the "gangsters of the pen," who flourish in such sheets as the *Socialist Call*, *New Leader*, *La Follette Progressive*, *Militant*, as well as in "more respectable" organs, such as *Reader's Digest*, the Luce publications, various literary review magazines, and the capitalist press, are frothing at the mouth over this book. The connections of the anti-Soviet conspirators, the development and defeat of their various plots through the years, are exposed in this book in a way that lifts many masks and reveals many fascist visages hiding behind "liberalism" and bourgeois respectability. Wide circulation of this book will deliver telling blows to the dirty work of the anti-Sovieteers.

Not the least important in this historical picture is the description of the role played by Herbert Hoover and Winston Churchill. This book does a valuable and necessary job in exposing Hoover's personally-motivated class hatred of the Soviet Union, and its roots in his financial losses through the socialization of the means of production by the Soviet government. The book shows how this hatred motivated Hoover's manipulation of relief against European democracy and the Soviet Union, and played a large part in all his subsequent history up till now. The book gives historical background to many policies and movements promoted by this sinister imperialist figure. Similarly, Sayers and Kahn, in portraying Winston Churchill's machiavellian anti-Soviet intrigues, strip from this imperialist much of the halo of "anti-fascism" he was able to wear

during the war, and enable one to look at his war record without illusions, and at his present activities with objectivity. They reveal, for example, his leading role in the war of intervention against the new Socialist country, the war he would resume on a larger scale today.

2. In their description of the activities of the Trotskyites and Bukharinites, as well as of the Mensheviks, Sayers and Kahn give a vivid picture of the degeneration of these groups from political trends in the working class to counter-revolutionary servants of fascism, spies for foreign imperialist governments, assassins, and wreckers.

The recital of this history will be of great value to those people who do not know these facts, and who are confused by the press into believing that the fight against counter-revolutionary Trotskyism, for example, is "only a fight between different factions of Communism." For our own Party, this example will serve to stiffen the determination of the membership to combat Browderism, and to eliminate it from the labor movement. The rapid degeneration of Browder from a revisionist operating within the Communist ranks, to an anti-Communist servant of imperialism is but one example of a recurrent political phenomenon. This can be understood from a reading of those scores of pages in *The Great Conspiracy* which deal with the Trotskyites and their kind.

3. *The Great Conspiracy* portrays the Soviet Union objectively, and therefore truthfully. This in itself makes it one of the few exceptions in books dealing with the Soviet Union and published by bourgeois houses. The

branch of Big Business which is the American publishing industry, has poured such a flood of garbage into the libraries and book stores of the nation, that to find a bourgeois-published book of this nature is in itself an event. A publishing industry which can at this time contemplate publication of a book on Joseph Stalin by the fascist spy Trotsky, is about as corrupt and venal as the Parisian press under Otto Abetz's patronage. The publication of *The Great Conspiracy*, and its circulation through the channels of the bourgeois publishing business, may help to reach many people and clear their minds of some of the filth that was put there by a number of books in the last few years of the type of *Out of the Night*.

4. *The Great Conspiracy* reveals that anti-Communism and anti-Sovietism are the hallmarks of the fascist Fifth Column, and the cloak for treason in all countries. It is impossible to read the history of Vidkun Quisling, for example, without drawing conclusions about such characters as Wm. H. Chamberlain, Eugene Lyons, Eastman, Dubinsky, La Follette, Norman Thomas, and other anti-Soviet, anti-Communist elements in America who pose as "radicals" and "liberals" in American politics, as Quisling once did in Norway.

\* \* \*

These and other strong points about this book make it indispensable to all who wish to be informed on American-Soviet relations. Yet, with all its strong points, *The Great Conspiracy* does suffer from certain weaknesses. True, it does not claim to be a theo-

retical work. It is a valuable marshalling of a mass of factual material and, as such, it is of inestimable worth. But there are some theoretical conclusions which should be drawn from all these facts that this book does not state, and whose omission might lead to erroneous conclusions.

1. The book ends its story in the period between V-E Day and V-J Day. The ending of the book sounds far too optimistic a note as far as relations between the Soviet Union and the capitalist world today and tomorrow are concerned. It might be possible to draw the conclusion from this ending that "the Great Conspiracy" against the Soviet Union is finished once and for all. It might be possible for some to conclude, as Earl Browder did, that "Capitalism and socialism have begun to find the way to peaceful co-existence and collaboration in the same world." But all the developments since the date on which this book ends, and many developments during World War II, clearly show the crass bourgeois-liberal, anti-Marxist nature of this Browder formula, which is, in essence, social-imperialist since it glosses over and hides the imperialist anti-Soviet drive.

Anyone who notes the arming of fascist mercenaries in Europe by U.S. and British imperialists (as they did with anti-Soviet bands after World War I), the Truman Administration's adventures in China, the Canada "spy scare," the anti-Soviet maneuverings of Bevin and Byrnes in UNO, the "atomic diplomacy" of the U.S. Government, the anti-Soviet incitements flooding the press and radio, and U.S. and British aid to Vatican clerico-fascist politics, among many things, can

only  
spira  
back  
worl  
State  
TI  
mou  
trigu  
mou  
man  
the c  
war,  
Hoo  
the  
the S  
Tro  
the p  
2.  
fici  
plan  
tion  
ciali  
men  
temp  
capit  
pose  
socie  
man  
impe  
the  
show  
the  
gene  
obje  
spira  
tion  
from  
rage  
at  
mea  
area  
subje  
dous  
and  
ary

only conclude that "The Great Conspiracy" is as much alive as ever, backed by the full power of reactionary world imperialism, particularly United States imperialism.

Thus, the reader must add to the mountain of facts about anti-Soviet intrigue in the past the equally high mountain of facts about anti-Soviet maneuvers in the present, indicating the drive towards an anti-Soviet world war, which is the dream today of the Hoovers, Vandenberg and Churchills, the Francos and Perons, as it was of the Sidney Reillys, Rosenbergs, Hitlers, Trotskys, Bukharins, and Tanakas in the past.

2. The book does not explain sufficiently *why the plots arose*. That explanation is found in the contradictions between the capitalist and socialist worlds, in the capitalist encirclement of the Soviet Union, in the attempts of the imperialists to weld the capitalist world together for the purposes of destroying the rising socialist society. The book does show how many of the plots collapsed because of imperialist contradictions and crises of the capitalist world. But it does not show how the root of all the plots is the creaking capitalist system in its general crisis. It does not give sufficient objective basis for "The Great Conspiracy." Rather, there is an implication that these plots arose, and arise, from subjective factors, such as the rage of the former exploiting classes at losing their property and their means of exploiting the masses in the area of former Russia. No doubt these subjective factors played a tremendously important role in cementing and organizing the counter-revolutionary forces. But without the objective

basis, the capitalist encirclement of the Soviet Union—which still exists—these plots would not represent the danger they did then and do today.

3. The book does not explain sufficiently *why the plots collapsed*, which would also explain why present and future plots will also collapse. The continual disruption of these ambitious schemes inside and outside the Soviet Union is due basically to the superiority of the socialist system over the capitalist system. This superiority showed itself in the superior ability of the Soviet system to ensure for the Soviet people full employment, a continuously rising standard of living and culture, peaceful dwelling together of all nationalities and religions, greater and higher democracy for the people, and greater ability to defend the nation against aggressors.

The Socialist world was a rock upon which German, Japanese and all other fascists broke their heads, just as White Guards, Mensheviks, Social-Revolutionaries, Trotskyites, Bukharinites, bourgeois nationalists, and all other internal and external enemies did in the past. And this was so because it was supported by the millions of the common people.

The nature of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, as a Marxist-Leninist Party, a revolutionary Party, a Party armed with advanced theory, and organized on Lenin's principles of organization, combining democracy with centralism, enabled this Party to steel the people to withstand all assaults from within and without.

And the policy of the Communists, guided by Lenin and Stalin, was a policy comprehended completely by the millions, who fought for its realiza-

tion with all their strength and skill.

That is why a clever Sidney Reilly, a demoniac Yagoda, a slimy Trotsky, a "brainy" Bukharin, could not succeed in their ambitious schemes. The vigilance of the people as a whole, and particularly the vigilance of the Communists, ferreted out all these intrigues, and the "wrath of the people thundered" and smashed them all. Simultaneously, the masses of the capitalist countries, with their increasing love and respect for the socialist land in which they see the champion of democracy and peace, has proved a powerful factor in disintegrating "The Great Conspiracy" in the past, as it will at this moment when a new anti-Soviet crusade is under way.

Notwithstanding these criticisms, one must estimate this book as a powerful weapon against the campaign of the anti-Sovieteers.

*The Great Conspiracy* is a text-book on counter-revolutionaries and Fifth Columnists. Its study is valuable for Communists, old and new members

alike, as well as for leaders and rank-and-file members of trade unions and other people's organizations who are sincerely anxious to work for the preservation of peace.

*The Great Conspiracy* is a source-book of material for combatting Trotskyism. The record of these fascist gangsters given in this book, drawn from their activities in all countries, is one which, if adequately presented in connection with their present activities to the workers, Negro people, and middle classes of America, will help teach the people that they must rise up and expose these poison-spewers wherever they are to be found.

This book is a real weapon against the anti-Soviet prejudices that have been inculcated in the minds of the masses by press, radio, pulpit, and cinema. It has mass appeal.

*It is, above all, useful at this crucial moment, as an instrument for exposing the plot of American and British imperialism to drag the peoples into a new anti-Soviet war.*



d rank-  
ons and  
who are  
the pre-

source-  
abating  
e fascist  
drawn  
tries, is  
nted in  
activities  
le, and  
ill help  
ust rise  
spewen  
.

against  
at have  
of the  
bit, and

s crucial  
r expo-  
British  
s into a