

# 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. 10

## *Contents*

OCTOBER, 1946

- The Twenty-Seventh Party Anniversary *Alexander Bittelman* 867
- The Policy of Anti-Soviet Encirclement *James S. Allen* 879
- Poland Today *Michal Mirski* 893
- The Tactics of the Party in the New York Elections *William Weinstone* 904
- Declaration of the Communist Party of China *Central Committee C.P.C.* 915
- Toward a Program of Agrarian Reforms for the Black Belt *Harry Haywood* 922
- The Origin and Character of the Second World War *A. Leontiev* 940
- BOOK REVIEW:
- The "World Government" Reactionary Utopia *Joseph Clark* 954
- 

Entered as second class matter January 4, 1945, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under 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

ALEXANDER BITTELMAN is a member of the Communist Party's National Committee, and General Secretary of the *Morning Freiheit* Association. \* \* \* JAMES S. ALLEN, whose latest book, *World Monopoly and Peace*, has just been issued by International Publishers, is well known for his writings on American History and the Negro question. He is a regular contributor to *Political Affairs*, as well as to the *Daily Worker*, *New Masses*, and other publications. \* \* \* MICHAL MIRSKI is the Editor of the Lodz weekly Yiddish journal, *Dos Neie Lebn*. He is a prominent Polish Jewish Marxist and a leading member of the Polish Workers Party. \* \* \* A. Leontiev is one of the most distinguished economists of the U.S.S.R. His most recent book, *Marx's "Capital": An Aid to the Study of Political Economy*, has just been issued by International Publishers. \* \* \* HARRY HAYWOOD completes in this issue of *Political Affairs* the study of agrarian problems of the South begun in the September issue. \* \* \* JOSEPH CLARK is a veteran of World War II, and Veterans Affairs Editor of the *Daily Worker*. \* \* \* WILLIAM WEINSTONE, author of *The Case Against David Dubinsky* (New Century Publishers, New York), is the Educational Director of the Communist Party in New York State.

Note: The name of Charles Krumbein, Treasurer of the C.P., U.S.A., was omitted in error from the list of officers of the Party published in the September issue of *Political Affairs*.

THIS  
sary  
muni  
It oc  
can l  
to g  
coalit  
defea  
and  
Ame  
occur  
muni  
its va  
ment  
impe  
mon  
Ame  
head  
ing o  
ing o  
the C  
our  
mobi  
of th  
THE  
Ou  
crisi  
econ  
the  
1914-  
date  
1919.

# THE TWENTY-SEVENTH PARTY ANNIVERSARY

By ALEXANDER BITTELMAN

THIS IS THE TWENTY-SEVENTH anniversary of the founding of the Communist Party of the United States. It occurs at a moment when American labor and its allies are beginning to gather their forces in a mighty coalition—a coalition to combat and defeat the reactionary, imperialist, and warmongering offensive of the American trusts and monopolies. It occurs at a moment when the Communist Party is preparing to fulfill its vanguard role in the labor movement in the organization of the anti-imperialist, anti-fascist, and anti-monopoly *counter-offensive* of the American people—its coalition—headed by labor. For this is the meaning of the decisions of the July meeting of the National Committee of the Communist Party. To celebrate our Party's anniversary today is to mobilize all forces for the realization of these decisions.

## THE ORIGIN OF THE PARTY

Our Party was born in the first crisis of the capitalist system of world economy, the crisis which produced the first world imperialist war of 1914-1918, even though the technical date of our birth is September 1, 1919. Therefore our Party can be

considered a child and product of the present epoch, the new epoch in the world's and in our country's history which was ushered in by the First World War and the subsequent victory of the Great October Socialist Revolution in Russia.

That is why our Party came into existence in the historic struggles of the Left wing of the American labor movement against the imperialist policies of the American monopolies and against the war itself. That is why our Party's birth originates from the struggle of the militant and advanced American workers—in the Socialist Party, in the American Federation of Labor, in the Industrial Workers of the World, etc.—against the opportunism, class-collaborationism and outright betrayals of the reformist leadership of the American Federation of Labor (Gompers & Co.) and of the Socialist Party (Berger, Hillquit & Co.). That is why the principles and ideology of our Party are those of Marxism-Leninism, as formulated by Lenin and Stalin—the principles and ideology of a Marxist working-class party of a new type, capable of fulfilling the vanguard tasks of the present epoch.

Our Party was born in the very midst of the post-World War I offensive of the American monopolies against the working class, the labor movement, and the masses of the people generally. This infamous reactionary offensive was one of sweeping wage cuts, inflation, open-shop drives, union-busting, violent strike-breaking, and other attacks upon the civil liberties and democratic rights of the workers. This infamous capitalist offensive against the people culminated in the fascist-like Palmer raids upon the young Communist movement and all progressive and militant movements of the American working class and its allies—the infamous Palmer raids which did so much to weaken temporarily the American labor movement and which forced the newly born Communist movement to go underground for a short period of time. It was the same economic and political offensive of the monopolies against the American people which had much to do with hastening the outbreak of the first postwar economic crisis in 1921.

To meet the needs of that situation as the vanguard Party of the American working class, the young American Communist movement, had to struggle with and overcome many serious difficulties, internal and external. Internally, the Communist movement had to overcome the many diversities of background and experience of the founders and charter members of our movement, to fuse them all into one homogene-

ous Party, and to consolidate a competent Marxist leadership. Externally, we had to struggle very hard to overcome the wall of isolation which the ruling class and the reformist leaders of the labor movement had erected at the time between the Communists and the masses. To break this wall of isolation, to multiply and strengthen our ties with the masses, and to build the Communist Party in the very struggles of the masses against the capitalist offensive—these were the major tasks of our young Party.

Earnest, persistent, and self-sacrificing efforts to solve these internal and external problems make up the main content of the first years of our Party's history. But it was only at the moment when a successful fusion occurred between the elements of the former Left wing of the Socialist Party, headed by Charles E. Ruthenberg, and the Left-wing elements of the trade union movement (A. F. of L. and others), headed by William Z. Foster—a fusion within one united Communist Party—that the foundations were laid for serious advances of the Communist movement among the masses of the American workers. It was from then on that the Communist Party began to embrace in its ranks and leadership most of the active working-class militants and all creative Marxists in the labor movement. It was from then on, roughly since 1923, along a road of setbacks as well as significant advances, that the Communist Party

of the  
to i  
velo  
worl  
been  
tion  
stru  
conc  
toric  
and  
litical  
worl  
the  
mon  
ican  
the S  
ism  
right  
and  
the s  
by t  
Social  
organ  
the a  
ican  
If,  
ican  
Seco  
stron  
with  
leade  
move  
than  
Worl  
fors t  
the t  
shift  
ship  
to th  
viet l  
fascis

of the United States began seriously to influence all the progressive developments in the life of the American working class and its allies. This has been reflected in the Party's participation in the economic and political struggles for the betterment of the conditions of the masses, in the historic fight for industrial unionism and trade union unity, for the political independence of the American working class and its leading role in the people's democratic and anti-monopoly movements, against American imperialism, for friendship with the Soviet Union, against Jim-Crowism and anti-Semitism, for equal rights, against fascism, for democracy and peace. It was from then on that the struggle for Socialism abandoned by the reformist leadership of the Socialist Party, became once more an organic part of all the activities of the advanced sections of the American working class.

If, as is actually the case, the American working class is today, after the Second World War, incomparably stronger, more politically mature, with infinitely greater capacities for leadership of the people's progressive movements in the American nation than immediately after the First World War, there are two main factors to account for this. First, between the two World Wars a fundamental shift has taken place in the relationship of forces on a world scale due to the victory of Socialism in the Soviet Union and to the defeat of the fascist Axis in the Second World

War. It was a shift favorable to the forces of anti-monopoly and democracy, headed by the working class; and unfavorable to the forces of reaction, imperialism, and pro-fascism, headed by the monopolies. Naturally, this world change in the relationship of forces between people's democracy and monopoly reaction finds its expression in the United States in the following way. It creates more favorable conditions for the growth of a labor-progressive *counter-offensive* against the reactionary *offensive* of the monopolies and imparts great potential strength to the *offensive* capacities of the democratic and anti-monopoly forces of our country which have grown during these years into a first-rate political factor. Second, the adoption by decisive sections of the American working class and of the labor movement of many of the immediate and partial demands for which the American Communists have fought for many years, honestly, capably, self-sacrificingly, in the trade unions, on the political field, in the fields of culture and education, and in all the progressive mass movements of our people.

The contributions of the Communist Party of the United States to the advances of the American working class and its allies—especially the Negro people—during the past quarter of a century, cannot be overestimated. Communists and their sympathizers can take legitimate pride, as well as encouragement for the future, in the

fact that every significant step of progress taken by the American masses between the two World Wars was at least in part attributable to the efforts and leadership of the Communist Party. These steps have been in the field of industrial unionism and militant trade union policies, independent political action, unemployment insurance and social security, and the organization of the unorganized, the opening of the South to trade unionism (for which Communists gave their lives). Others have been in the consistent struggle against American imperialism everywhere, especially in Latin America and China, significant struggles against the monopolies and the high cost of living at various periods, constant struggle against reaction in all its forms and for the democratic rights of the people, pioneering and leading activities in the historic struggle against fascism and anti-Semitism, and for democracy, for victory in the war against the fascist Axis, against imperialist war and for peace. These are the fields of struggle in which the Communist Party of the United States has made lasting and major contributions to the American people, its working class, and their progressive mass organizations, especially the trade unions.

#### MAJOR STRATEGIC CONCEPTS

As a party of Marxist-Leninists, the Communist Party of the United States has introduced into American life what can well be considered the

major strategic concept of the historic liberation mission of the working class. It is the Marxist-Leninist concept that it is the historic mission of the working class, as the most progressive class in society, to lead all the oppressed and exploited toward liberation—to the abolition of capitalism and the establishment of Socialism. And, as an organic part of this concept, the Communist Party of the United States has introduced and fought for the Marxist-Leninist proposition that the working class must strive to become the backbone and leader of the nation, of all progressive movements of the people, of all struggles against reaction, against fascism, against monopoly oppression, against imperialism and imperialist war, for peace and democracy. Lastly, it was the Communist Party of the United States that, in the course of its own history, demonstrated and fought for the Leninist idea of the *vanguard role* of the Party in the labor and people's movements.

It is these major strategic concepts of the leading role of the working class in the people's progressive movements and of the vanguard role of the Communist Party that guide our tactical orientations and policies at various times and periods—tactical orientations and policies which originate in each instance in the prevailing objective situation and relation of forces. Our various coalition policies—the coalition of the working class with other classes and social groups, such as the farmers, profes-

sional  
gro p  
of a  
and  
arise  
these  
by o  
When  
al air  
Axis  
ly ass  
nation  
that  
virtua  
for th  
tion o  
eral p  
vangu  
Party  
strugg  
needs  
unity  
If,  
Amer  
strati  
War,  
matu  
our p  
War,  
the e  
selves  
fluenc  
and  
Party  
ing co  
work  
THE  
OP  
Tu  
Party

sionals, middle class groups, the Negro people, etc.—are determined first of all by the central political aims and tasks of the coalition as they arise from the objective situation, but these policies must always be guided by our major strategic concepts. When, for example, the main political aim was the defeat of the fascist Axis in the war, the coalition naturally assumed the character of a broad national unity, but that did not mean that we had to abandon, as we virtually did, the historic struggle for the independent and leading position of the working class in the general people's movements or for the vanguard role of the Communist Party, although *the forms* of this struggle had to be determined by the needs of strengthening national unity for the winning of the war.

If, as is actually the case, the American working class is demonstrating now, after the Second World War, incomparably greater political maturity and influence in the life of our people than after the First World War, it is in large measure because the experiences of the masses themselves during this period were influenced by the policies, struggles, and leadership of the Communist Party. This is a lasting and far-reaching contribution to our people and its working class.

#### THE STRUGGLE AGAINST OPPORTUNISM

Turning to the *internal* life of our Party during its history, we find that

the laws governing the development of the internal life of every Communist Party also governed the development of the internal life of the Communist Party of the United States, namely, the history of the development of the internal life of our Party is the history of struggle against opportunist and alien groups within the Party—Lovestoneism, Trotskyism, Browderism—as the carriers of bourgeois influences among the workers and within the Party.

All Communist Parties achieve their unity, ideological clarity, and strength only in constant struggle against opportunism—Right opportunism and Leftist sectarianism—in their own midst. Only in this way do they acquire the capacity to function truly as vanguard parties of the working class. In our own history, we have had the same major experiences, only they were complicated by two facts: first, that the Communist movement of America has inherited from the Left currents and movements in the labor movement of the past deep-seated sectarian traits and habits, which are an historic characteristic of the American labor movement, repeatedly criticized by Engels in his own time; and, second, that the existence in our Party for a time of factional groupings and factions resulted in acute factional struggles. These two facts—inherited Leftist sectarian habits and the existence of factionalism—have naturally had the effect of obstructing and distorting the struggle against op-

portunism in our midst, at times endangering the unity of the Party. But—and this is the major conclusion—at every crucial turn in the internal life of our Party, when opportunism in our midst was beginning to threaten the Marxist-Leninist theoretical and political foundations of our Party and its organizational principles, there always came from the very heart of our movement enough strength and determination to throw off the opportunist menace and to free the Party from these internal dangers. Needless to say, the experiences of the internal life of the Communist Parties of other countries have been of inestimable help to the American Communist movement.

Lovestoneism, an opportunist current and grouping in our Party during 1925-1929, was in effect a capitulation to American imperialism, whose economic base is monopoly capitalism. It was leading to the abandonment—or “revision”—of Marxism-Leninism, to the abandonment of our major strategic concepts of the leading role of the working class and of the vanguard role of the Communist Party. After a sharp and bitter struggle, made more painful and protracted by the factional divisions then prevailing in our midst, Lovestoneism was defeated and then eliminated from the Party. In the outcome of this fight, life itself played a decisive part by demonstrating—through the disastrous economic crisis of 1929-32 and the accompanying growth of reaction and fas-

cism—the utter futility and bankruptcy of the Lovestoneite ideas that American capitalism was not being affected by the general crisis of world capitalist economy or that American monopolies have a progressive role to play. Life demonstrated, on the contrary, the acute sharpening of all the contradictions of monopoly capitalism in the United States as affected by the general crisis, resulting in the economic crash of 1929 in America and precipitating the deepest economic crisis in the entire system of world capitalist economy—the very crisis which hastened so much the growth of fascism and the outbreak of the Second World War.

Trotskyism, an alien current and grouping in our Party (the Cannon group), made its appearance at approximately the same time as a tendency of capitulation to American monopoly capitalism—imperialism—in essence similar to Lovestoneism but covered at times with “Left” and “revolutionary” phrases. As is known, the Cannon group was part of an international grouping which started out as an opportunist current in the labor movement and developed later into a network of fascist spies and agents, functioning as veritable wrecking crews in labor and progressive movements. The defeat of the Trotsky (Cannon) group and its elimination from the Communist Party was accomplished in a shorter time and was a less painful process than was the case with Lovestoneism, the reason being that al-

read  
expo  
cia  
of i  
agai  
men  
labo  
the  
ing  
ate  
as t  
labo  
ure  
task  
that  
Part  
even  
by b  
ism  
ism  
our  
nist  
ship  
The  
ities  
fully  
was  
feati  
Bro  
THI  
D  
T  
tuni  
of o  
Part  
in g  
ous  
der  
this  
Part

ready at that time Trotskyism had exposed itself more completely, especially through the gradual unfolding of its attacks upon and struggles against the Soviet Union. Yet the menace of Trotskyism still faces the labor and progressive movements of the United States. Trotskyite wrecking influences and agents still operate within and around our Party, as they do within and around other labor organizations, and their exposure and defeat remains a constant task. It should be added, however, that the relative ease with which our Party rid itself of the Trotsky group even though plagued and weakened by both Lovestoneism and factionalism at the same time that Trotskyism was attempting to get hold of our Party, is a tribute to the Communist integrity of the basic membership and leading cadres of our Party. These are the same Communist qualities that came to expression powerfully years later, when our Party was confronted with the task of defeating, and freeing itself from, Browder revisionism.

#### THE FIGHT AGAINST BROWDERISM AND SECTARIANISM

This latest struggle against opportunism within the Party is still part of our present-day experiences. Our Party, as well as the labor movement in general, is still hampered by various remnants and effects of Browder opportunism, thus learning from this latest example that a Communist Party can exercise its vanguard role

in the working class *only* by combatting systematically all opportunist tendencies in its midst, *only* by a constant struggle on two fronts against reformist opportunism and sectarian opportunism.

The effectiveness of Communist leadership of the progressive movements of the American people and its working class will be determined by many factors: deep roots among the masses and their organizations, firm ties with the masses, the ability not only to teach them but also to learn from them, the capacity to formulate and apply a tactical line flexibly and skillfully, etc. Yet there is one factor which is of exceptional importance. It is a firm grasp of and struggle for the fundamental principles of Communism, for a strong Marxist ideology, for *freedom from bourgeois influences*. The struggle against Browderism, just as the struggle against the opportunist currents and groupings in our Party in the past, is essentially a fight for our Marxist principles and ideology and against the ideological and political influences of the bourgeoisie.

Leftist sectarianism has always been, throughout the entire history of our Party, a most serious obstacle to the effective struggle against bourgeois influences within our Party, as well as to the development of the Party's influence among the masses. This is so for the primary reason that Leftist-sectarianism turns the fight against Right opportunism into an attitude and policy of self-isolation

from the masses and their progressive movements. Together with opportunism, the Leftist sectarians also tend to reject policies for Communist mass work, often identifying Communist mass work itself with opportunism. The inevitable result must be a strengthening of bourgeois influences among the masses and, through them, within our Party.

On the other hand, Right opportunism is the carrier of bourgeois influences in our midst and is thus greatly responsible for the rise of "Left" sectarian moods as "a reaction" against Right opportunism, which is in reality reinforced by it. Right opportunism distorts completely the struggle against "Left"-sectarianism and turns this struggle into policies and attitudes which reflect indifference and hostility to Communist principles and ideology. From such attitudes revisionism arises. Together with "Left"-sectarianism, the Right opportunism also tends to reject the theoretical, tactical, and organizational foundations of the Communist Party, very often identifying these foundations themselves with "Left"-sectarianism. The inevitable result is a *direct* strengthening of bourgeois influences in the Party, creating a threat to its very Communist integrity.

#### BROWDER AND PARTY HISTORY

An example of this is Browder's treatment of Party history. It is well

known that the Left wing in the Socialist Party (1912-1918), which organized our Party, was heavily tinged with sectarian attitudes, which it transmitted in good measure to the young Communist movement. Hence, our movement at that time suffered from moods of romanticism, lack of Marxist realism, considerable sectarian exclusiveness—all of which accounts for the considerable success of the ruling classes and the reformists in their attempts to isolate the Communist Party from the masses during the first few years of our existence. Yet it was the same Left wing that proclaimed opposition to the imperialist war and called for a struggle against it in accord with the principles advocated by Lenin. It was this Left wing—hampered though it was by romanticism and sectarianism—that raised the banner of creative Marxism as developed for our epoch by Lenin and Stalin. Moreover, it succeeded in rallying to this banner the bulk of the politically advanced and militant workers in the American labor movement of that time. In short, *it was this very same Left wing that organized the Communist Party*, receiving and withstanding the full impact of the Palmer raids, together with the lynch incitements of bourgeois reaction and reformist opportunism, opening a new chapter in the history of the American labor movement.

But that was not the way Browderism handled our history. In its revisionist hands, all the historic signi-

fican  
Lenin  
peri  
Octob  
an A  
work  
into  
the L  
of ou  
got th  
prehi  
tarian  
do so  
nobod  
other  
sectar  
of ou  
come  
derist  
enti  
the C  
States  
with  
Amer  
tende  
the r  
class  
well  
gle  
States  
SOU  
It  
of th  
from  
rors  
secta  
one-s  
cially  
or e

ificance of the struggle for Marxist-Leninist principles, against the imperialist war, for support to the Great October Socialist Revolution, and for an American vanguard party of the working class—all this evaporated into thin air. All that remained of the Left wing and of the first period of our Party's history, after Browder got through with it, was a kind of prehistoric twilight in which sectarians and romantics were trying to do something, the meaning of which nobody was able to understand. In other words, together with the "Left"-sectarian attitudes of the past years of our movement (far from overcome in our midst today), Browderism undertook to throw out the entire struggle for the formation of the Communist Party in the United States. And this is in full accord with Browder's interpretations of American history in general which tended to relegate to the background the role of the American working class and of the labor movement, as well as of the farmers, in the struggle for democracy in the United States.

#### SOURCES OF ERRORS

It should be said further that one of the sources of theoretical errors, from which originated political errors of both a Right and a "Left"-sectarian character is a tendency to *one-sidedness*. It is obvious, especially to Marxists, that any analysis or estimate which fails to account

properly for all sides and angles of a situation will be false, will be one-sided, will suffer from over-estimates and under-estimates, and will produce a wrong tactical line and policy. It is also obvious that any estimate which accounts only for the central and major aspect of a situation but fails to establish the dialectical relationships of the secondary and tertiary elements of the same situation to its major aspect, will not be complete and will be in danger of slipping down to plain one-sidedness. The history of the radical and Left currents in the American labor movement is replete with examples—costly examples—of such one-sidedness, much of which the Communist movement has inherited, and against which we must be constantly on guard.

Another source of theoretical errors in our history, from which flowed Right opportunist and "Left"-sectarian tactical errors, is a tendency to *over-exaggerate* the special and peculiar features of American monopoly capitalism. Some of these features have been a source of extra strength to American monopoly capitalism, for example, its considerable though diminishing economic and political reserves, giving the monopolies special maneuvering abilities against the American people and their progressive movements at home, as well as enabling American imperialism to exploit and oppress other peoples and nations—Latin America, China, Europe—without possessing

a big colonial empire of the British type. Others of these special features have been a source of extra weakness of American monopoly capitalism, such as the extreme sharpening of all its basic internal and external contradictions due to the high level of development of American capitalism and the extraordinary concentration and centralization of capital. This extreme domination of the monopolies is a source of great instability in the unstable capitalist economy and is mainly responsible for the depth, length, and painfulness of the economic crises in the United States. At the present time, the very fact that the strength of American monopoly capitalism is so disproportionate in relation to the other parts of the world system of capitalist economy is in itself a source of major weakness of American imperialism. This is so, among other things, because the disproportionate strength of American monopoly capitalism is a source of weakness to the world capitalist system by its rivalry with the weaker capitalist countries and by its internal, extraordinary instability. *These special features of American monopoly capitalism are of major importance in the estimation of developing situations and in the formulation of tactics and policies.* But when these special features are over-exaggerated, the resulting picture is naturally false and the tactics are wrong. Moreover, a point is reached where American monopoly capitalism begins to be viewed

as something qualitatively different from monopoly capitalism in other capitalist countries, and the basis is thus laid for a revision of the fundamentals of Marxism-Leninism. It is in the same connection that American monopoly capitalism begins to be viewed as isolated from the capitalist system of world economy, or as some external power standing above it, instead of as the major and dominant part of that system.

It is well known in our Party, that, for example, in the struggle against Lovestoneism, the common theoretical error of all groups in the Party was an over-exaggeration of some of the special features of American imperialism—one group exaggerating its *strength* while the other exaggerated its *weaknesses*. It is also known that the main source of this error was an insufficient appreciation of the role and position of American imperialism in the capitalist system of world economy, from which Lovestoneism developed a completely opportunist—essentially bourgeois—theory that American imperialism is not subject to the general crisis of the capitalist system of world economy, and that American capitalism is “exceptional.” It was from the same failure to appreciate sufficiently the position of American imperialism in the system of world capitalist economy that the groups in the Party which opposed and combatted Lovestoneism tended to slide down into certain Leftist-sectarian attitudes.

This does not, of course, alter the

fact t  
ism i  
Foste  
our  
demo  
the f  
oppo  
Com  
the p  
They  
abilit  
ing r  
Love  
their  
and  
catio  
a un  
a un  
Fr  
clear  
cal e  
Party  
cons  
and  
the  
ism  
curro  
Brow  
stand  
can  
Mar  
ing  
prog  
and  
mur  
that  
to t  
tend  
from  
the  
nist

fact that the opponents of Lovestoneism in the Party, led by Comrade Foster, from whom have developed our Party's basic leadership, have demonstrated throughout the years the fundamental soundness of their opposition to Lovestoneism, their Communist integrity, and loyalty to the principles of Marxism-Leninism. They have also demonstrated their ability to merge with the overwhelming majority of the members of the Lovestone group, who have proven their loyalty to Communist principles and to the Party, to attain the eradication of all factionalism and to build a united Marxist-Leninist Party and a united Party leadership.

From the foregoing it should be clear that any fundamental theoretical error will inevitably affect the Party's main strategic concepts and, consequently, its tactical orientation and policies. We have seen this in the case of Lovestoneism, Trotskyism (while it was still an opportunist current in the labor movement) and Browderism. In each of these instances, the opportunist attack finally came down to the denial of the Marxist-Leninist concept of the leading role of the working class in the progressive movements of the people and of the vanguard-role of the Communist Party. We have also seen that the Leftist-sectarian "reactions" to these Right opportunist attacks tended to *isolate* the working class from the progressive movements of the people and to *isolate* the Communist Party from the working masses.

## CONCLUSION

These two dangers are still with us, as was clearly pointed out in the reports of Comrades Foster and Dennis to the July meeting of the National Committee of the Party. The point at which these dangers come to sharpest expression is naturally the application of the Party's main strategic concepts to the present period, namely, the tactical line of the Party for the building of an anti-imperialist, anti-monopoly and anti-fascist coalition of the American people, headed by the working class, with the Communist Party striving to function as the vanguard of the working class. And, again, as is natural, Right opportunism would "leave out" of our tactical line the struggle for both the leading role of labor in the coalition and the vanguard role of our Party in the labor movement; while Leftist-sectarianism would so conduct the fight for these objectives as to tend to isolate labor from its progressive allies and to isolate the Communists from the non-Communist progressive and middle-ground forces in the labor movement. The end result of both opportunist tendencies—Right and Leftist—would inevitably be the same: the fight for the coalition and the vanguard role of our Party would be seriously jeopardized.

That is why the reports of Comrades Foster and Dennis, and the deliberations of the entire July meeting of our National Committee, devoted

central attention to the correct ways of struggle for the labor-progressive coalition and to the building of the Communist Party (its organizations, membership, press, etc.). More specifically, the Plenum established the political conditions for such a struggle as would contribute to the development of correct and proper relations between labor and its progressive allies in the coalition and as would help cement the further collaboration on the basis of the principles of labor unity, between the Communists and non-Communists in the labor movement, especially in the trade unions.

Speaking of the application of our tactical line to the forthcoming elections, Comrade Foster said:

To stop the election drive of the reactionaries is, therefore, of most serious urgency. It will require the consolidation of a great democratic coalition to elect the progressive candidates on the old party lists, and to put in the field progressive independent candidates. Organized labor must be the backbone of this great movement for independent political action.

Dealing with the role of the Party, Foster said:

It realizes the great tasks standing before it and it knows that it can fulfill these tasks only if it vastly extends its

membership and mass contacts, as well as by raising its ideological level. Hence, the National Committee considered and handled the matter of Party building in the sense of a major political question. (Our emphasis—A. B.)\*

And here is what Comrade Dennis said in regard to our tactical line:

As we enter the final phase of the Congressional election campaign—a crucial battle in the struggle against reaction and war—we Communists are faced with enormous responsibility. . . . One of the most indispensable contributions we can make is to strengthen the independent organizations and activity of labor and its allies, and to bend heaven and earth to crystallize the widest democratic coalition. (Our emphasis—A. B.)\*\*

Thus spoke the Party leadership, applying our principles and main strategic concepts to the present situation and our immediate tasks. Thus we are carrying forward the historic battle for the liberating mission of the working class and the leadership of its vanguard party. Thus we shall celebrate the 27th Anniversary of the Communist Party of the United States by fighting to realize the decisions of the July meeting of our National Committee.

\* *The Worker*, July 28, 1946, Sec. 3.

\*\* *Political Affairs*, Sept., 1946, p. 807.

# THE POLICY OF ANTI-SOVIET ENCIRCLEMENT

By JAMES S. ALLEN

AS THE SOVIET UNION begins her thirtieth year, the United States assumes the forward position in the anti-Soviet bloc. Despite the experiences of the past three decades, during which the policy of hostile encirclement of the Soviet Union in various stages and forms brought great harm to all countries, this policy has now become the foundation of the bipartisan foreign policy of the Administration. This conclusion is inescapable from the evidence accumulated since the San Francisco Conference one year and a half ago.

During this period Administration foreign policy has developed in two phases, of which the dividing line roughly is the New York meetings of the Security Council in March-April, 1946. Until then there had been much talk by Administration leaders of the need to "get tough" with the Soviet Union, but they were still hesitant about accepting full responsibility as active leaders and organizers of a world-wide anti-Soviet crusade. The initiative was taken largely by the British, with the sup-

port of the United States, while Vandenberg and other forces were needling the Administration to assume active leadership in organizing a new hostile encirclement of the U.S.S.R.

The discussion on Iran at the Security Council last March was the first public demonstration that the Administration had decided to take the initiative in the anti-Soviet crusade. Byrnes led the fight to preserve Iran as an anti-Soviet buffer state located strategically near the Caspian oil regions of the Soviet Union. As subsequent events with respect to Turkey and Palestine were to show, the move on Iran was part of the larger campaign now actively pursued by the United States to keep the Soviet Union hemmed in at the Black Sea region and in the Middle East. This in turn was linked with the grand strategy, now adopted as the kernel of its foreign policy by the Administration, to isolate the Soviet Union.

Since March this strategy has unfolded in every United Nations gathering and in every move of the Administration outside the United Nations. Bipartisan policy-makers prefer to retain the United Nations, but to transform it into an instrument of American imperialist policy by shoving aside the principle of Big Power unanimity and establishing *de facto* control of the organization by the United States. While pretending to adhere to wartime agreements, such as the Potsdam accord on Ger-

many and the Moscow agreement on China and Japan, in practice they constantly violate them and seek to place the burden of a rupture upon the Soviet Union.

Refusing to be bullied, and by its own energetic efforts to preserve a basis for peace, the Soviet Union was able to obtain some positive results at the June-July meeting of Foreign Ministers in Paris, in the form of a number of compromises on the peace treaties with the former German satellites. To that degree this meeting was a setback for those extremist forces working for an immediate rupture with the Soviet Union.

At the same time, Byrnes developed further the forward position of the United States in its new role as leader of the anti-Soviet encirclement. He increased pressure upon the Danubian countries, sought new bridgeheads for the United States in the Balkans at Trieste and along the Danube, attempted to force a showdown on Austria as a preliminary to a showdown on Germany, and tried to deny the Soviet Union even a minimum of economic relations with Italy. These policies were continued into the Paris Peace Conference, where Byrnes from the start retreated from the Big Four agreement on procedure and indicated he was prepared to abandon, if necessary, even the compromises on the treaties already reached by the Foreign Ministers.

\* \* \*

It was also in connection with the Paris Foreign Ministers meeting, that the United States indicated that it was seriously embarked upon the partition of Germany, with the aim of fully restoring monopoly capitalism in the Western zones and developing a rump German imperialism under the Anglo-American wing. While advancing proposals for a 25-year "disarmament" treaty for Germany among the Big Four, urging the drafting of a peace treaty for Germany and demanding immediate "economic unity" for that country, reparation payments from the British and American zones to the Soviet Union were suspended as the Anglo-American wing announced the project for the "economic" merger of their zones.

In the midst of the Paris Peace Conference, the partition plan for Germany was carried further by Byrnes in his speech at Stuttgart. Here the full-blown American policy was presented in much greater detail and more precisely than hitherto.

Politically, it is an attempt to freeze the present situation in Germany by imposing immediately a provisional central government before democratic changes, already far developed in the Soviet zone, begin to affect the situation in the Western zones. The American plan for a National German Council which would prepare a draft constitution evades completely the basic provisions of the Potsdam

accord shall  
is den  
files o  
news  
the r  
Weste  
tions  
that c  
retard  
demo  
To  
woul  
posed  
States  
prepar  
ernme  
of Ge  
woul  
vide f  
fore t  
make  
struct  
a poli  
the U  
be fre  
perial  
propo  
such  
signed  
The a  
can e  
the e  
and t  
Fren  
zone  
tion.  
The  
the S  
unific

accord that a central government shall not be set up until Germany is denazified and demilitarized. The files of leading British and American newspapers are full of evidence that the military governments in the Western zones have placed in positions of leadership reactionary forces that cooperated with the Nazis, while retarding and repressing the most democratic forces.

To neo-fascist Germans, who would enjoy a majority on the proposed National Council, the United States would entrust the tasks of preparing a central provisional government and of framing the structure of Germany. Furthermore, Byrnes would instruct this Council to provide for a *federalized* Germany before the German people are ready to make a democratic choice on the structure of their state, thus setting a political framework within which the United States and Britain would be free to develop their German imperialist bulwark in the West. The proposal to sign a peace treaty with such a federated Germany is designed to perpetuate this situation. The agreement on the Anglo-American economic merger, announced on the eve of Byrnes' Stuttgart speech, and the steps already taken by the French to form a new state in their zone are the beginning of the partition.

The effort to make it appear that the Soviet Union is opposed to the unification of Germany loses all

weight, not only in view of the American and British policy, but also because the Soviet Union for the past year has urged the establishment of a central German administration. As Molotov made clear in Paris in July, the Soviet Union stands opposed to federalization, sees the function of a central German administration at this stage as coordinating the economic and political efforts of the various zones in accordance with the Potsdam accord, including the agreement on reparations, and envisions the establishment of a provisional government only when such a regime will have a democratic foundation and is able to guarantee further democratic development.

With respect to the economic aspects of Byrnes' speech, these are designed to assure the development of the Western zones at the expense of the Soviet zone, where economic recovery is far ahead due to the land reform, the confiscation of the Nazi monopolists and the steps toward the nationalization of the trusts. In the Western zones, and especially in the heavy industrial area of the Ruhr, production remains much below the levels permitted by the Allied schedule; therefore Byrnes' insistence upon raising the permitted level of industrial production is a transparent attempt to blame the Soviet Union for the failure of Anglo-American policy in the West.

As concerns the much-emphasized need for "economic unity," Byrnes

failed to provide in his plan the essential guarantee which must be given—four-power control of the Ruhr industrial machine, now in the hands of the British. While rejecting the French proposal for the political separation of the Ruhr and the Rhineland, Byrnes also rejected the Soviet proposal for special four-power control of the Ruhr, the center of German war industry. Actually, the Anglo-American economic merger lets the United States into control of the Ruhr, while keeping the Soviet Union and France out. Nor did Byrnes even think it necessary to pledge, as the Potsdam accord provides, the complete destruction of the German trusts and cartels which are centered in the Ruhr. Thus, the essential economic component of building up a truncated German imperialism in the West is fully developed in the American policy.

Furthermore, in his Stuttgart speech Byrnes laid the basis for retreating from the Potsdam provisions on the eastern boundaries of Germany. While agreeing to cede the Saar to France, and accepting the cession of the Koenigsberg area to the Soviet Union, he held forth only vague promises that the United States would support a revision of Germany's eastern frontier in favor of Poland. While the Potsdam accord provides that these boundaries shall be confirmed at a peace conference, Byrnes' statement is a retreat from the commitments already made, and

indicates that the United States will fight against them.

\* \* \*

Other developments also make it plain that the Administration's bipartisan policy has taken definite shape as one of weakening and isolating the Soviet Union, while expanding American imperialist interests throughout the world. Arrogance and bullying reached a new high in the bellicose "ultimatum" to Yugoslavia over the shooting down of an American plane, one of hundreds which were systematically violating Yugoslav sovereignty. A formidable American fleet was sent to participate with the British fleet in a joint demonstration in the Aegean Sea, with the double aim of supporting the fascist-royalist regime in Greece, as an outpost against the Balkan democracies, and of supporting the Turkish police state in its control of the Dardanelles.

This action is of particular importance because it shows to what extent the Administration has already gone in applying the policy of encirclement. This demonstration of force, on a much bigger scale than the earlier visit of the battleship Missouri to Istanbul, is intended to back up the American note rejecting Soviet proposals on control of the straits that connect the Black Sea with the Mediterranean. It reveals clearly the intention of the United States to keep

the  
Bl  
part  
wat  
imp  
back  
ticip  
ing  
Mid  
side  
mar  
L  
Far  
purp  
Sovi  
Sout  
oush  
that  
mon  
the  
shel  
Gen  
beco  
out t  
cratic  
ture  
Chin  
porte  
the  
persi  
tions  
Nort  
As  
polic  
turity  
view  
Dem  
the i  
tang  
creas

the Soviet Union bottled up in the Black Sea and to deny her effective participation in the control of a waterway which is of most immediate importance to her security. This is backed by increasing American participation alongside Britain, in building up strategic posts in the whole Middle East hinterland, which is considered one of the leading areas of maneuver against the Soviet Union.

Likewise, American policy in the Far East makes sense only if its purpose is to build up strategic anti-Soviet positions in China, Japan and Southern Korea, while simultaneously repressing the democratic forces that stand in the way of American monopoly-capitalist domination. As the flow of materiel to Chiang Kai-shek grows constantly in volume, General Marshall's "mediation" has become a hollow pretense at carrying out the Moscow agreement for democratic unity in China. The very nature of Chiang's demands upon the Chinese Communists, which are supported by the "mediation" game of the American mission, reflects the persistent aim of regaining the positions previously held by Japan in North China and Manchuria.

As concerns Japan, the MacArthur policy has been taken over in its entirety by the Administration. In view of the powerful Communist-Democratic resistance in China and the inner weaknesses of the Kuomintang dictatorship, Japan is now increasingly considered as the main

Far Eastern base of the anti-Soviet encirclement. The Allied Council in Tokyo and the Far Eastern Commission in Washington, established at the Moscow Conference, have been turned into a facade for American imperialist control of Japan, which is shared with the very forces that prepared and led Japan's war of conquest.

Military-strategic backing for this policy of encirclement, which proceeds hand in hand with American expansionism everywhere, is also developing rapidly. A world-wide network of American bases is being built up permanently out of the many wartime acquisitions, while the joint military staff organizations, established during the war with Britain and her Dominions, still function to allow the joint use of bases outside the American-controlled network. Administration military policy provides for the largest postwar airfleet in the world, a navy larger than all others combined, and the biggest peacetime army in American history. Stock-piling of atom bombs continues, while American spokesmen declare bluntly that unless the U.N. accepts the Baruch plan the United States has no other alternative than to train for atomic warfare.

\* \* \*

One year after the end of the war, United States policy is dominated by the following aims: (a) to weaken

the Soviet Union and to isolate her; (b) to restore monopoly capitalism in Germany, maintain it in Japan, and restore these countries as anti-Soviet outposts under the auspices of American imperialism; (c) to support reactionary and fascist forces everywhere, for the double purpose of maintaining American imperialist positions against the democratic forces and providing a new network of anti-Soviet buffer states.

Underlying the present Administration policy are fallacies similar to those which characterized the pre-war anti-Soviet crusade led by the Axis and the Munichmen, and which ended in catastrophe for them. These fallacies can be summarized as follows:

1. The capitalist world can be united against the Soviet Union.

2. The United States is strong enough to undertake with success the immense task of mobilizing a world-wide anti-Soviet front within a comparatively short time, say five to ten years.

3. The Soviet Union is so exhausted by the war that she cannot overcome inner weaknesses within the current Five-Year Plan, and can therefore be isolated politically and strategically by continuing the present campaign of diplomatic pressure, backed by an economic boycott and by military demonstrations.

An extreme wing is of the opinion that the immediate use of the atom bomb, before the American monop-

oly is lost, will result in a decisive victory over the Soviet Union in short order.

\* \* \*

A united capitalist world has been the utopia of reactionary planners since the Russian Revolution of 1917, and it was also the aim of the Axis and the Munichmen with results now sufficiently known. The great cleavages and conflicts which characterize the non-Soviet portion of the world, and which caused the best-laid plans of the Axis to come to naught when faced with the determined resistance of the Soviet Union, make capitalist unity on a world scale a hopeless, reactionary dream.

More specifically, the outcome of the war, despite the stronger position now enjoyed by American imperialism, renders it more difficult to carry through a world-wide encirclement of the Soviet Union. The area of operation and maneuver available to reaction has been considerably reduced.

Only half of Germany is immediately available for the restoration of a rump imperialist power. In Western Europe as a whole, and more particularly in France, which is indispensable to the maintenance of an anti-Soviet consortium in Europe, monopoly capital is hard pressed to maintain itself against the powerful working-class and democratic movements. This is also true in Italy. In

Eastern and Central Europe the post-war democratic transformation has already proceeded so far that nothing short of armed intervention by the imperialist powers can restore the rule of landowners and foreign monopolies, and revert these countries to their previous role as anti-Soviet buffer states.

In Asia, the new upsurge of the independence and democratic movements that followed upon the defeat of the Axis makes it extremely more difficult to restore the position formerly held by imperialism. This is seen particularly in China, but also in India and Southeast Asia (Indonesia and Indochina), and in Iranian Azerbaijan. The colonial upsurge is also spreading throughout the Arab world of the Middle East and North Africa, and has aroused the Negro peoples of Africa, and has opened a new phase of the struggle for full sovereignty by the Latin-American Republics.

These movements further unsettle the position of the old and long-established empires, particularly the British Empire and the associated imperial powers such as the Dutch. Today there is no immediate perspective of stabilizing the colonial world, particularly if it is to serve as the instrument and the "hinterland" of an anti-Soviet encirclement.

Concerning the most important move toward "unity" of the postwar capitalist world, the Anglo-American bloc, this is less stable than may ap-

pear at first sight. American and British imperialism have found common ground in the defense of imperialist positions throughout the world in a common diplomatic and military policy and in their anti-Soviet combination. But we should not lose sight of the inter-imperialist rivalry that operates simultaneously and that tends to drive these powers apart.

A solid Anglo-American bloc lasting for any long period must lead to the final subordination of Britain to American imperialism, because of the great superiority of American resources and power. Churchill carefully avoided mentioning this in his Fulton speech; nonetheless, it is a fact that all Englishmen cannot help considering. With every new American expansion and every State Department ultimatum, and particularly as the United States begins to press for the benefits arising from the loan to Britain, the connection with the United States will become more and more a burning issue of British politics.

\* \* \*

Perhaps the biggest factor deepening the disunity of the capitalist world is the emergence of the United States in its new active role as the leading imperialist power. Its expansionist drive engenders new forces of opposition throughout the world in defense of the security and independence of nations. While American im-

perialism establishes shady and shaky coalitions with the most reactionary and oppressive forces abroad, it at the same time arouses against these allies and against itself the popular democratic forces on a world scale, and thereby deepens cleavages within empires, within nations and among the powers.

In fact, some important American publicists have recently questioned whether a coalition with Britain, coupled with support to reactionary forces throughout the world, can result in an effective world-wide hostile encirclement of the Soviet Union. Walter Lippmann has presented this problem most concisely in a series of articles in the *New York Herald Tribune*, where he proposes an "alternate" course.

According to him, the "indirect" method of operating through anti-Soviet coalitions is ineffective and should be dropped in favor of the "direct" method of provoking a real show of strength at a point where the Soviet Union is judged weakest. In his opinion this spot is the Black Sea region, and the particular point where American force should be applied is the Dardanelles. Lippmann admits that this method, which he terms a policy of "calculated risks," carries the risk of an immediate war of annihilation, but he holds that it should be adopted anyhow to force the Soviet Union to "arbitrate."

Compulsory arbitration on American terms is to be imposed upon

the Soviet Union in order to gain the necessary time, according to Lippmann, to "restore" Europe, "unify" China, and "reorganize" the British Empire.

In this program there is no real contradiction between the "indirect" and the "direct" method. There is only a difference in timing and in estimation of the forces at the disposal of the American encirclement policy. Lippmann doubts that the United States has sufficient strength to operate simultaneously in many parts of the world, and believes that it will take too long to complete the anti-Soviet siege; he therefore advises concentration upon one key area for a "test of power," even at the risk of provoking war. Above all, he wants things settled before the Soviet Union becomes even stronger and the democratic forces advance further.

Actually, the Administration uses both methods—working through whatever anti-Soviet coalitions it can establish while bringing power to bear at specified points, including the Dardanelles-Black Sea area. Lippmann is afraid that the Administration is dispersing American forces too much, and delaying too long. His policy of "calculated risks" aims at speeding up the process of hostile encirclement by having the United States take upon itself the task of confronting the Soviet Union with a decisive test of strength.

Lippmann's articles are a reflection

of the keen debate in top imperialist circles. The question is no longer to decide a policy; this has been established in the main outlines, as summarized earlier in this article. The debate is between "extremists" and "moderates," between those who counsel caution and those who argue for speed, even at the risk of precipitating another world war.

These debaters are playing with fire, since they are already testing their ideas in action. Concentration of force at the Dardanelles is not only Lippmann's idea; it is shared by the American and British governments who have dispatched fleets to the Aegean and have taken other military steps in this area, although they do not exclude trying other methods at the same time. And the policy of "calculated risks" is not unlike the idea harbored in some important circles of using the atom bomb which, far from preventing a war, as they publicly claim, would set off a long and terrible war.

The strength of the United States figures prominently in all these calculations. As we have seen, there is some disagreement in imperialist circles on how to measure it. The most important outer factors that restrict the expansionist drive of American imperialism have already been mentioned. With respect to inner factors, it is obvious that the industrial, economic and military strength of the United States has increased greatly during World War

II. With the exception of the demobilization of a large part of the armed forces, this strength has been maintained during the first postwar year. However, existing military strength is not considered sufficient to back up the global anti-Soviet policy, especially in view of the extreme demoralization of our armed forces abroad. New demands are constantly being made for the revision upward of present Administration plans for the permanent armed forces, for the creation of new specially trained mobile forces ready to strike at a moment's notice, and for the expansion of the permanent munitions industries.

From the viewpoint of estimating the inner strength of the United States, political as well as economic, the main consideration is the economic perspective. Already there are signs that the postwar boom will not last the three to five years generally predicted. This certainly was the main cause for the flurry downward of the New York Stock Exchange last month, which contributed to the state of general international nervousness. It was not the international tension and rumors of war that caused the drop of du Pont and other heavy war industry shares; it was rather the other way around. The Stock Exchange supplied advance indications of an approaching economic crisis, and it was this that heightened the talk of war. For the prospect of war or peace is closely

linked with the economic perspective in the United States.

Estimates of the length of the post-war boom must figure prominently in the war calculations of all imperialist circles. That they are seriously considering major preparations for war, or war itself, as a means of holding off the economic crisis cannot be easily dismissed. For it cannot be denied that a severe crisis in the United States, dragging the entire capitalist world along, will seriously impair the world position of the United States and therefore its effectiveness as the leader of the anti-Soviet encirclement. Nor is it possible to predict the internal political movements and struggles that would arise as the trade unions and other popular forces defend themselves against mass unemployment, wage-cuts and the drive of the trusts to place the burden of the crisis upon the people.

A decided shift away from social legislation is already noticeable in Administration policy, as it places more emphasis upon military preparations. Stock-piling of raw materials, expansion of the munitions plants in active or stand-by condition, construction of new military installations at home and abroad, and the large Budget appropriations for the armed services are signs of this trend, that can be expected to grow as evidence accumulates of an approaching economic crisis.

Aside from the economic perspec-

tive, the domestic political situation is not in all respects conducive to the maintenance of the bipartisan foreign policy in its present form. The alliance symbolized in the Byrnes-Vandenberg team is already strained in the current election campaign. The effort of the Democrats to hold labor and progressive support by attempting to confine election campaign discussion to domestic issues, while simultaneously pursuing a foreign policy indistinguishable in any basic respect from that of the Republicans, is the greatest contradiction of domestic politics.

This electoral tactic cannot stand for long without being seriously challenged by progressive forces within the Democratic Party itself, not to speak of the independent labor and progressive organizations that have joined with the Democrats to defeat the Republicans.

Despite the bipartisan agreement to keep foreign policy out of the elections, the fight for peace is the basic issue in the present campaign, and will remain the central issue of national politics right up to the presidential elections of 1948. As the people are aroused to the dangerous course of the Byrnes-Vandenberg combination, the cleavage within Democratic ranks and to a lesser extent among the Republicans will become greater, threatening to disrupt the bipartisan agreement.

The sharpest national debate on foreign policy since the United States

assumed leadership of the anti-Soviet drive was set off by Henry Wallace when he finally spoke out, after a long silence, against the Anglo-American bloc and the "get-tough-with-Russia" policy. His Madison Square Garden speech came as a challenge to the bipartisan "get-tough-with-Russia" policy followed by Byrnes. It voiced the deep-felt sentiments of the American masses for peace and for friendship and cooperation with the Soviet Union as the basis for guaranteeing the peace.

Even more convincingly than his Garden speech, Wallace's lately revealed letter of July 23 to the President outlined a policy for American-Soviet cooperation, in support of which the masses can be rallied for restoring F.D.R.'s policy of Big Three Unity. This letter was especially of service to the cause of peace in that, unlike the Garden speech, it showed the direct responsibility of American imperialism and its atomic diplomacy for the present danger of war. This document, too, was devoid of the Red-baiting that diminished the positive values of his speech. Wallace's intervention in the elections remains highly significant precisely because he centered attention upon the one issue that Democratic and Republican leaders alike hoped to keep out of the campaign. It is already clear that Wallace represents a sizeable sentiment within the Democratic Party, especially in its lower organizations.

By first encouraging Wallace and then repudiating his speech, Truman revealed that the Administration hoped to garner the benefits of Wallace's progressive appeal in the elections while continuing the anti-Soviet policy. That the President was compelled to adopt this maneuver shows how progressive opposition to the present reactionary foreign policy is forcing the Administration to tuck and squirm. This was immediately understood abroad as a sign that the home front support to Byrnes in Paris is not as solid as the bipartisan team at the Peace Conference made it appear.

In fact, Wallace's opposition to the bipartisan policy indicates that popular pressures are beginning to have an effect. His speech, of course, does not mean a "redirection" of foreign policy, as Truman was quick to assure all wings of the bipartisan anti-Soviet crusade. But it does indicate a possible redirection of the progressive forces within the Democratic Party along the lines of independent action, together with labor, against reactionaries in both old parties.

These economic and political difficulties, as well as the anti-war sentiments among the American people which persist despite the intensity of the anti-Soviet agitation, lead many to question whether the country is strong enough to organize and sustain an anti-Soviet coalition over a decade or two. These considerations undoubtedly enter into the

calculations of the extremists who want the United States to strike soon, before the situation deteriorates further. But for the same reasons enumerated above, it may also be asked whether American imperialism is strong enough to emerge victorious from a war which might be provoked by "tests of strength," a war in which it will have to face a powerful military and political coalition arrayed against the American imperialist drive for world conquest.

\* \* \*

As concerns the third main fallacy underlying Administration policy, it would seem that memories are rather short. Similar speculations on Soviet weaknesses and disunity were quite the vogue during the inter-war period and even during World War II. It is now a fully documented fact, substantiated by German archives uncovered after the war, that while Hitler was feeding this notion to the West he was planning to attack Britain and all Europe, for he was convinced of the weaknesses of the Western powers but felt that he needed more time and greater strength before attacking the Soviet Union.

Nor can it be denied that the Nazi armies were already defeated on Soviet soil before the invasion of Germany by the Allies. Hitler had all the resources of Europe at his command. Besides, as is now substantiated by many who could not speak before,

the Churchill-Bevin-Attlee coalition government, during the most decisive moments of the battle of Russia, was withholding the Second Front and fighting to divert lend-lease from the Soviet Union in the hope that Germany and the U.S.S.R. would cancel each other out.

It is no idle Soviet boast that the Red Army and the Soviet peoples struck the decisive blows that brought Hitler-Germany to its knees. No one should be deceived by the comparative ease with which our armies entered Germany into believing that our armed forces and our home front withstood anything like a decisive test in the recent war.

That the Soviet Union suffered greatly from the war is obvious. But it is equally plain that despite the loss, during one period, of half her pre-war industry and of great food and raw material sources, and despite the severe drain of manpower, the Soviet Union mustered the strength to hold the aggressor and then to annihilate him. Under the most adverse conditions she was able to overcome the enemy's advantages of surprise, initial superiority in weapons and war experience, while developing a superior war strategy and eventually gaining the initiative. In view of this experience, as well as technological and scientific progress in the Soviet Union, whatever advantages the United States may now possess in the way of new weapons cannot be considered decisive.

It should also be remembered that the material gains of the United States during the war are now more than offset by the loss of political prestige arising from our postwar policies. On the other hand, most of the peoples of Europe view the Soviet Union as their liberator from fascism, while her political prestige has grown immeasurably throughout the world, due not only to her great victory, but also to her stubborn and consistent struggle against the revival of fascism and for world peace. In the midst of the atmosphere of mistrust and hate generated in the United States by anti-Sovieters, it is sometimes difficult to appreciate this fact fully.

From the viewpoint of preventing the crystallization of a new hostile encirclement, the Soviet Union is in a much stronger position than before the war. The problem of encirclement is not only regional or geographic, although in this respect also the Soviet Union has improved her security positions. The problem is also vertical, affecting all nations no matter how remote they may be from the Soviet borders, for involved are the basic issues of society and progressive development.

The crop of rumors and speculations about splits within the Soviet Communist Party, government or Army are as unfounded and pernicious as previous campaigns of this kind. The energy with which the U.S.S.R. is now eradicating the ideo-

logical influences of the Nazi occupation and the corruption which crept into some State institutions is a sign of real Soviet strength and not of weakness. This is a vital aspect of the all-Union mobilization for the successful fulfillment of the Fourth Five-Year Plan which by 1950 is scheduled to complete reconstruction of war-torn areas and in addition raise Soviet industrial production 48 per cent above the level of 1946. Simultaneously with this stupendous effort of reconstruction, prices are receding rapidly, the rationing system is being gradually withdrawn, and millions of new workers are being trained in industry.

The Soviet peoples have returned to the peaceful labor of effecting the transition from socialism to communism with a confidence born of previous successes and their great victory in the partiotic war. They have gained, not only a new moral strength from victory, but also a deepened confidence in their socialist state—in its capacity to overcome great difficulties and to preserve the sovereignty of the sixteen Soviet Republics.

As to the perspective, raised before Hitler's attack, of completing the transition from socialism to communism within 15 years after the fulfillment of the Third Five-Year Plan, this was revived by Stalin in his speech last February. Sights are set on goals that would bring Soviet output per person to the level of the United

States during its best years by 1965 or 1970.

The policy of hostile encirclement of the Soviet Union has been revived as a dominant policy. This time the imperialists of our own country play the leading role. Such a policy can hardly develop without jeopardizing the security of the whole world.

It is an anti-American policy. Instead of banishing fear and want from the world, as Roosevelt urged

us to do, the Administration bipartisan policy is spreading fear and want, and is making the United States the most feared and most hated nation in the world. We are being dragged back to the very policy that led to World War II. Our task is to make the American people understand the anti-American nature of this policy, and to organize the forces that will prevent imperialism from launching World War III.

# POLAND TODAY

By MICHAL MIRSKI

IN THE NATIONAL REFERENDUM held on June 30, the Polish people for the first time had an opportunity to vote freely, and to consider and determine freely, their own destiny.

Three questions were posed: one, a unicameral legislature; two, the government policies on agrarian reform and nationalization of industry; three, the western boundaries on the Oder and Nissa rivers and friendly relations with the Soviet Union. On all three questions, the Polish people expressed themselves affirmatively in their overwhelming majority. The Polish people thereby gave their approval to the political and social reforms that had been carried out and *expressed the fullest confidence in the democratic camp*, its initiators and leaders.

The official results of the voting, as published by the Election Commissioner of Poland, are as follows:

|   |            |
|---|------------|
| Number of citizens eligible to vote .....                                   | 13,160,450 |
| Number of citizens who voted .....  | 11,857,000 |
| On the first question—to eliminate the Senate.....                          | 7,644,522  |
| Those in favor of retaining the Senate.....                                 | 3,686,029  |
| On the second question—endorsing the agricultural reforms, and nationaliza- |            |

|   |            |
|---|------------|
| tion of industry .....  | 8,899,105  |
| Those opposed .....   | 2,634,446  |
| On the third question—endorsing the new boundaries to include the Oder and Nissa rivers ..... | 10,534,679 |
| Those opposed .....   | 995,854    |

Stanislaw Mikolajczyk, head of the legal opposition, who had insisted at home and abroad that the majority of the people supported him, suffered a serious defeat. The people gave Mikolajczyk a proper trouncing for his acts of political sabotage, for his political insincerity, for his agitation for a bicameral legislature (including a senate) which he himself had opposed for years. The people, including the peasantry, thereby showed that they understood his tactics to be aimed at breaking the national unity of the Polish people, at breaking the unity of the democratic camp and thus to serve reaction in Poland and all foreign elements who are speculating on a third world war, for which Poland would again be made to serve as the place d'armes.

The Polish people, therefore, went along with their true friends, with the leadership which they know represents them, with the democratic camp.

## THE DEMOCRATIC FORCES OF POLAND

Who constitutes this democratic camp?

The democratic camp, which includes the broadest and basic sections of the Polish people—the working

class, the peasantry, the city middle class and intellectuals—is represented by the following major parties: the Polish Workers Party, the Polish Socialist Party, the Peasant Party, and the Democratic Party. They created the first government in Lublin in July, 1944. In 1945 the Labor Party joined.

The Polish Workers Party (P.P.R.) came into existence in 1942. It bases itself ideologically on the best traditions and experiences of working-class struggle. From the first socialist organization of the Polish proletariat in the 1880's, it inherited the principle of unity with the Russian working masses in common struggle against reaction. It adopted the uncompromising character of the Social-Democrats of Crown Poland and Lithuania in their struggle against the reactionary ruling classes. It has made its own, the experiences in political struggles of the Communist Party of Poland.

Its main strength, however, arises chiefly out of its own experience in the bloody life-and-death struggle against the German-Hitlerite occupationists. In the fire of this struggle, its ideological and organizational backbone was welded, and the party developed into a mighty leading force.

The P. P. R. won support, not only as *the* party of the Polish working class, but as the leader of the nation in the national liberation struggle against the German occupation forces.

At the present time, the P.P.R. has 350,000 members. Its main bases are, obviously, in the industrial centers of Poland, the chief ones being Warsaw, Lodz, Cracow, and Silesia. The party is also deeply rooted in the Polish villages. It has influence, too, among the city middle class and the intellectuals. The P.P.R. is one of the main pillars of the democratic camp in Poland. It is represented in the Government of National Unity by five ministers. The general secretary of the party is Wladyslaw Gomulka.

The P.P.R. has been singled out for the most savage attack by reaction. The sharpest weapons—in the literal sense of the word, too—are directed at it.

The second party that is active among the workers in Poland is the Polish Socialist Party (P.P.S.). In 1939, with the occupation of Poland, its predecessor fell apart, and a number of groups came into existence. Chief among these were the Workers Party of Polish Socialists (R.P.P.S.), a united front group; and the "Freedom, Equality and Independence" group (W.R.N.), the London group. The P.P.S. emerged as a new party in 1944 with the merging of the R.P.P.S. and other socialist groups that were active during the occupation, as well as the democratic elements that split away from the reactionary group of London "socialists" of the W.R.N.

The P.P.S. links up its current activity with the best of its pre-war traditions. Reaction cannot forgive

the P.P.S. for having abandoned the reactionary-Pilsudski elements and for having entered the path of united front struggle of the Polish working class. The present line of the party, as carried out by Osobka-Morawski, the present premier, Cyrankiewicz and Szwalbe, is the unity policy for which a struggle was conducted in the party prior to the war by such responsible leaders as Barlicki, Prochnik, and Dubois. The party is permeated with the spirit of Lieberman, the consistent anti-Pilsudskite, who, as early as 1930, was jailed together with the young Dubois in the Brest Litovsk prison in the Pilsudski Sanacja regime. The P.P.S. cooperates with the P.P.R. in struggle against reaction, for the reconstruction of the people's economy, and for the rebuilding of a people's Poland on a really democratic basis. Together with the P.P.R., it works to weld the united front of the working class and the bloc of the working class and the peasantry.

However, there are some elements in the P.P.S. who do not fully follow the policy of its leadership. These elements drift in the direction of the reactionary W.R.N. (London) group, and make efforts to prevent complete cooperation between the P.P.S. and the P.P.R.

The P.P.S. has about 300,000 members. It is represented in the government by five ministers.

The democratic party of the Polish peasantry is the Peasant Party. It traces its family tree to the great

struggles of the Polish peasantry against the feudal nobility, the great landowners, and the Pilsudski Sanacja regime. In the 'thirties, in the struggle against the Sanacja, the merger of the three then-existing peasant parties—the Right-wing *Piast*, the Centrist *Wyzwolenie* (Liberation), and the radical *Stronnictwo Chlopskie* (Peasant Party)—into one peasant party, *Stronnictwo Ludowe* (People's Party), took place. During the occupation, the struggle against occupationists was carried on only by the groups that were close to the *Wyzwolenie* and the *Stronnictwo Chlopskie*. They formed the peasant battalions, *Bataljony Chlopskie*, which, together with the democratic military underground forces, carried on the struggle against the German occupationists, against fascism. Certain elements of *Piast* cooperated with London, with Mikolajczyk.

In July, 1944, the Peasant Party accepted the July Manifesto as a basis for cooperation, and entered the Polish Committee for National Liberation. To the responsible leadership of this party belongs the old peasant leader, Janusz.

The Democratic Party is the continuation of the Democratic Club which was formed several years before the war. This is a party that groups around itself the city middle classes, especially the intellectuals.

The Labor Party was established in 1945, after the formation of the Government of National Unity. It is

made up of elements of two pre-war parties, the *Chrzescjanska Demokracja* (Christian Democracy—C.D.) and the *Narodowa Partja Robotnicza* (National Workers Party—N.P.R.). Its base is petty-bourgeois. The party approaches the democratic camp with vacillations.

### TWO DECISIVE YEARS

The two years of existence of independent democratic Poland has been a period of struggle, internally and externally, of the Polish democratic camp against Polish reaction to isolate the reactionary forces from the Polish masses, to broaden as much as possible the political party base of Polish democracy, to strengthen the democratic achievements of the Polish people.

In this struggle, on the path of this development, three phases can be noted.

The first phase began when the Red Army, together with Polish military forces, freed the eastern regions of Poland. The National Council of Poland, which was established in the underground on January 1, 1944, created the Polish Committee of National Liberation, the first democratic government, headed by the present Prime Minister, Osobka-Morawski. When the famous July Manifesto to the Polish people was issued, all the political and military forces that had been working in the underground emerged. There was then created the bloc of four parties that placed itself at the helm of the

nation: the P.P.R., the P.P.S., the Peasant Party, and the Democratic Party. The armed military forces—the People's Army, the Peasant Battalions, and considerable parts of the democratically-inclined sections of the Home Army (A.K.)—poured into the democratic Polish military force that was formed on the territory of the Soviet Union and that marched together with the Red Army through Byelorussia and the Ukraine into Poland. Rola-Zymierski took over the command of the combined military forces. Only certain sections of the Home Army, that were unable to free themselves from their reactionary leadership, remained in the forests; and exactly as during the occupation, and in accordance with instructions from London, they waited with powder dry and did not take the field against the German occupationists. There they still remain—even though the liberating armies have freed Poland—having become active against the Polish democratic forces. They have called upon the Polish military to desert, and have tried to disrupt the carrying out of agrarian reforms, thereby striving to disorganize the political-economic life of the nation. Terror and violence, and murder of commanders of the Polish army, democratic leaders and Jews, have become the main form of their activity. Devoid of all patriotic feeling and constructive thought, they have become outlaws. The chief role has been taken over by the National

Armed Forces (N.S.Z.), the collaborationist elements that worked directly with the Germans during the occupation, and whose labor consisted of murdering Polish partisans and turning persecuted Jews over to the Germans.

To isolate these reactionary, politically degenerate gangs from the broad Polish masses, and to tear from their ranks the confused patriotic and democratic elements, became the goal of the struggle of the Polish democratic camp at that time.

With the grand offensive of the Red Army, aided by the Polish forces, in January, 1945, which with blitz-speed drove back the battered and demoralized armies in the east and ended in the raising of the Soviet and Polish flags over devastated Poland, there began the second period in the political and social life of resurrected Poland.

The whole of Poland was freed from German occupation.

The Lublin Government moved into destroyed Warsaw. The Polish Committee for National Liberation, up to then the administrative and democratic power, constituted itself officially as the Polish Government. The National Assembly created the current national government, with Osobka-Morawski at its head. The government rapidly established an apparatus for the freed regions. Into the Polish army there streamed new thousands from the underground armed forces, among them certain sections of the A.K. The country had

its industrial centers restored to it. The agrarian reforms were also applied to the new territories. The democratic camp strengthened its positions, and its authority increased.

In the camp of the Polish reactionaries in London a serious crisis developed.

The democratic camp did not depart from its consistent political line. It made every effort to broaden the base of the national unity of the Polish people, to bring into the work of reconstructing the nation all healthy, democratic elements that had up to then still remained on the sidelines because of indecision or even because of ties with the reactionaries.

Negotiations were begun with Mikolajczyk, and in the spring of 1945 an understanding was reached with him. Mikolajczyk returned to Poland, became vice-premier, and received the post of Minister of Agriculture.

Poland then entered the third phase of its new development.

#### THE ROLE OF MIKOLAJCZYK

The democratic camp had wanted to believe that Mikolajczyk's entry into the government of national unity was an expression of his complete break with reaction, of his desire to broaden the democratic basis of national unity in order to liquidate completely the remnants of the politically bankrupt forces of reaction at home and abroad.

That is what the democratic camp honestly believed; but such was not the case.

Mikolajczyk, it was revealed, had not broken with the reactionary camp. He began his activities in the country, not with constructive work, not with the aim of strengthening the democratic camp. On the contrary, his first serious political efforts were in an opposite direction, in the direction of attempting to split and smash the democratic camp. The first thing that he did was, in effect, to split the democratic Peasant Party and build a separate party of his own, the *Polskie Stronnictwo Ludowe* (Polish People's Party—P.S.L.). But this in itself was not his aim. His aim was to break the national unity of the Polish people, undermine the foundations of the Polish democratic state, and thereby destroy the political and social gains of the Polish people and open the doors for reaction.

Mikolajczyk did not merely split the Peasant Party. He placed himself in opposition to the democratic camp, to the government of national unity, of which he himself was a member.

Certain elements among the Polish reactionaries were pleasantly surprised. If they had perhaps feared that Mikolajczyk's cooperation with the democratic camp might seriously "confuse" him, they were at last reassured.

Instead of breaking with reaction, instead of joining with the entire democratic camp in struggle against it, Mikolajczyk has become, as head

of the "legal" opposition, the spokesman for Polish reaction.

There is not now, nor has there been, scarcely a single important governmental problem on which Mikolajczyk and his party have gone along with the democratic camp. In his general declarations of policy, Mikolajczyk is constrained to show that nothing separates him from the democratic camp. But on concrete issues and actions, he is directly in contradiction to it. In the last analysis, he has become the expression of the opinions and hopes of the bankrupt forces of feudal and monopoly-capitalist reaction. The P.S.L. is a party which Polish reaction wishes to make its instrument to recapture its lost political and social positions in the country, to transform Poland once again into a place d'armes against the Soviet Union.

It should be noted that in the P.S.L. there are democratically-inclined elements that are not happy about the present position of the party. Signs of discontent have been noticeable for some time. The Silesian vice-governor, Arka Bozek, a prominent leader of the party, has come out against Mikolajczyk and advocates participation by his party in the democratic bloc in the coming parliamentary elections. Bertold, Rek, and other leaders of the party were sharp opponents of the bicameral parliament slogan in the recent referendum. Large youth sections are, in general, against the reactionary line of Mikolajczyk and his group.

The defeat which Mikolajczyk sustained in the referendum, therefore, did not come out of a clear sky, but was a deserved punishment for his splitting, anti-democratic policies, for his opposition to the democratic camp, for his unwillingness to break once and for all with Polish reaction and with its foreign supporters a la Churchill. If for certain American and British journalists, who frequent the Polonia Hotel in Warsaw, the defeat of Mikolajczyk came as a surprise, it is because they listen to people who believe that a locomotive moves because smoke comes out its smoke-stack and not because of the power generated below. They see only the smoke. They do not see that the P.S.L. is being torn by an organic contradiction.

*This contradiction is developing, and will continue to develop, because the Polish village has changed its social physiognomy.* At long last—after a retardation of 157 years as compared with the French peasant, after passing through the unsuccessful peasant uprisings of 1846 in Galicia and of 1863 in Crown Poland, after experiencing the false agrarian reforms of 1918-21—the parasite element, the feudal lord, has been irrevocably eliminated from Polish agricultural life and his land distributed among the landless and landpoor peasantry. Thus has the Polish village been unshackled and democracy been strengthened in the village.

One must consider as an expression of this change the formation of the

strongest peasant organization in Poland, the Society for Peasant Self-Help, the cooperative movement in the village. The goal of this organization is—with the help of a higher agriculture technique, with the help of cooperative and government credit—to provide the new land-owners with agricultural machinery and with seeds in order to raise the living standard of the Polish peasant and, at the same time, to favor the development of urban industry on the basis of reciprocal service. Millions of peasants are thus being drawn into the production process as conscious co-builders and co-masters of the new state. Herein lies the strength of democracy in the village. Herein lies the wrecked trough of reaction. Herein lies the defeat of Mikolajczyk.

It should be noted that the land of the church has remained in its possession and has not been distributed. In the relations between the church and the government certain changes have been introduced. Civil marriage has been established. Religious matters are regulated through a special department of the Ministry of Public Administration. The Vatican, well-known for its ultra-reactionary position, assiduously works to rally reactionary clerical forces against the people's democracy in Poland. (The Vatican still maintains at its court an "ambassador" of the repudiated London-Polish group.)

An expression of this is the notorious public statement by Cardinal Hlond in regard to the Kielce po-

grom. That pogrom but highlighted the general drive of reaction to exterminate the remaining Jews in Poland. Instead of condemning these tragic events that result from the Hitlerite-racist policies of Polish reaction and that blacken the name of Poland abroad, Hlond, the Catholic Primate of Poland applauded the unspeakable crime of reaction. By this, Hlond has shown that he is less concerned with Christianity than with supporting the policies of Polish fascists. Defeated in open battle in the referendum, reaction resorted to the ritual-murder fable of the middle ages, to the savage instincts of backward Jew-baiters—and won the blessings of Hlond.

#### THE NATIONALIZATION OF INDUSTRY

But not only the village has changed its face. The city, too, has a new appearance. Not only has the German military occupationist been driven from Poland, but the German industrial occupationist has also been forced out. The Polish worker has remained and has become the proprietor of the factories. If we bear in mind that the key positions in Polish industry were formerly in the hands of foreign monopoly capital, in the first place German, it will become clear that the nationalization of large and medium-sized industry became necessary and natural, creating the conditions for the rapid development of the liberated industries.

The nationalization of industry in-

cluded, as already indicated, the big industries, and the undertakings that employ more than fifty workers in the medium-sized industries. In highly developed industrial countries, such enterprises belong to small business. In Poland, however, where foreign monopoly capital restricted the industrial development of the country, such enterprises comprised the strongest sector of the national economy and composed the main part of medium-sized industry.

The nationalization of industry has already produced positive results. The whole of industry is involved in the movement. Coal production has already increased by four per cent over the pre-war output. The metal and textile industries have already reached 60 per cent and 70 per cent of their pre-war production. If account is taken of the looting and destruction, of the devastation and the robber-economy of the German occupation, then this relatively rapid growth of production is an expression of the nationalization reforms which have been carried out.

Poland today is a new Poland, a people's Poland. To the two principal reforms dealt with above must be added a third factor of major importance—the new western borders of Poland, looking out on the Oder and Nissa rivers, with a broad coast on the Baltic Sea. This factor is important because, together with the return to Poland of former Polish territory which had been the object of Germanization for centuries, the

country received a new, strong industrial center which will help significantly in the reconstruction of the people's economy in general, and will create the economic base for a Poland truly sovereign and politically independent.

Precisely these implemented economic reforms will, together with the democratization of the military and administrative apparatus, together with the planned school reforms, place Poland among the states of a new type.

#### A PEOPLE'S POLAND

Poland is a people's democratic republic.

The economic relations in the country are, in general, capitalist. Nationalization of the big and medium-sized industries, has, however, eliminated parasitic monopoly capital, which retarded the development of the economy. The agrarian reforms have eliminated the feudal-capitalist remnants from agriculture. The productive forces of the country today face unlimited possibilities of development. Planning is beginning to be a factor in the people's economy. Private initiative, however, remains a constituent part of the economic motive forces. These economic changes have resulted in the changed political-economic role of the two basic classes of the Polish people, the working class and the peasantry.

Poland therefore represents, in conformity with its new political-economic structure, a republic whose

dominant character is that of a people's democracy of a new type. This new form of people's democracy occupies a position in between the two existing forms of democracy: the socialist democracy of the Soviet Union and the bourgeois democracy of England and the United States. The prototype of such a people's democracy was seen in the Spanish Republic of 1936, which struggled against fascism and for national sovereignty. The Second World War, which ended with military victory over fascism, brought into being the new peoples' democracies of Europe, which safeguarded the national sovereignty of the countries in which they arose.

With the establishment of the eastern borders of Poland on the basis of the Curzon Line, not only were millions of Ukrainians and Byelorussians liberated, but the Polish people liberated themselves. They freed themselves from the reactionary traditions of the ruling classes of Poland, and in the first place from the Polish feudal nobility that had—in the name of its own class interests, and always in opposition to Polish national interests—oppressed millions of Ukrainians and Byelorussians. Poland has become a national state without territorial minorities. With the removal of the Polish feudal lords, the large latifundia-owners, from political-economic life, the Polish people have finally freed themselves from the social stratum that had caused the imperialist adventures

in the east of Poland and had subordinated the real interests of the nation to its own narrow class interests.

### THE JEWISH PEOPLE

The only national minority in Poland today is the Jew. They now have equality not only in civil and political rights, but also in regard to national rights. After the terrible catastrophe they have lived through (Hitler annihilated more than three million Polish Jews in Poland and three million Jews in other European countries) they now find themselves in such a condition as demands special consideration. This special consideration the Jews are receiving from the Polish government. It is making every effort to enable the Jewish people in Poland to be productive, and to enable them to participate fully in the political life of the nation. It is also making possible the satisfaction of the desires of those Jews who wish to emigrate to Palestine, the U.S., and other countries.

The "Jewish question" in Poland, in the old sense of the term, has been eliminated. Anti-Semitism, which before the war was bred by Polish reaction and had poisoned the backward sections of the Polish people, became even more deep-rooted because of Hitler's total-annihilation policy with regard to the Jews. Hitler taught that Jews could be murdered with impunity; on the contrary, those who murdered Jews were compensated for it. The Polish fascists

very quickly adopted this "art" as their own.

The N.S.Z. gangsters, the inheritors of Hitler, continue to attack Jews today, and murder and rob them, in order to discredit the Polish democratic government in the eyes of the outside world as responsible for these events, and as such incapable of guaranteeing peace in the land.

If, before the war, anti-Semitism was the official governmental policy of Sanacja, it is today the illegal movement of the N.S.Z., a movement which is being strongly attacked by the government. A decree has been issued which strongly forbids propagation of race-hatred, and bandits are punished with death for anti-Jewish outbreaks, pogroms or murder.

If the fascist General Anders' armies, which are supported by British and American reactionary circles, did not systematically send arms and agents into Poland, the gangs of N.S.Z. would long ago have been destroyed.

But despite this, conditions are being created in Poland which make it possible for Jews to remain in the country, to become productive and to live in freedom, economically, politically, culturally and nationally.

### HISTORY GOES FORWARD

Through the recent referendum, the Polish people categorically expressed themselves in favor of Polish democracy and against Polish reaction. The people accepted the imple-

mented reforms. The people have only one enemy—imperialism.

British and American reactionary circles are attempting once again to revive the menace of German imperialism to Poland's national freedom, integrity, and independence. The country needs peace and security. The peasant wants this, and the worker wants it.

These desires, however, are in opposition to the egotistic class interests of the Polish feudalists and the Polish cartellists, who are working for the restoration of their power. These forces are interested in unrest and chaos. They speculate on a third world war.

The favorable outcome of the referendum brings joy, not only to the

Polish nation, but to the democratic, freedom-loving nations of the entire world. A people's democratic Poland means a strengthening of the position of world democracy, means a strengthening of possibilities of peace between nations, means a victory for the laboring masses. A people's democratic Poland is a strengthened link in the general chain of democracy and peace that cannot be broken. Just as the Polish feudal landowner may well forget about getting back his parcelled-out land, so may he and his good friends abroad forget about trying to make Poland a place d'armes for war. History does not go backward, it goes forward, and whoever stands in its way will be thrust aside.

# THE TACTICS OF THE PARTY IN THE NEW YORK STATE ELECTIONS

By WILLIAM WEINSTONE

THE NEW YORK State election struggle this year is of tremendous significance. Because of the candidacy of Dewey, the role played by the Farley forces, and the alignment of progressive forces, the campaign in the Empire State is one of national significance which will bear heavily upon the political developments in the country. For this reason, the tactics pursued by the New York State Committee of the Communist Party are of utmost importance to Party members and the progressive forces generally.

*The aims of the Party in the election campaign are:*

1. To defeat Dewey and the Republicans and to pile up a big vote on the labor ticket.
2. To elect progressives for Congress and for the State offices and especially to help elect Marcantonio and Powell.
3. To achieve a big vote for the Communist ticket and to strengthen the Party and its press.

4. To bring the election issues clearly to the people and to lay the basis for the emergence of a new independent majority political party.

It will be seen that these are inter-related tasks and that their fulfillment is dependent upon the widest possible front of struggle against Dewey and the G.O.P.

*Why is it essential to defeat Dewey?*

Because Dewey is the spearhead of reaction. Around his candidacy, and around the G.O.P., the most reactionary forces in the country and in New York State are rallying—the N.A.M., the Hearst press, the *World-Telegram*, the main forces of the Catholic hierarchy, and the reactionary A. F. of L. leaders.

We should be clear as to the nature of the Democratic and Republican parties. Both are parties of monopoly capital. Both parties serve the interest of the capitalist class. There are, however, a number of differences which must be taken into account if our tactical line in the elections is to be correct. The Republican Party—the historic party of big capital—is serving now as the chief rallying point of the most aggressively reactionary, war-mongering and pro-fascist sections of monopoly capitalism.

The Republican Party has all along been the center of struggle against the progressive policies of Roosevelt, both foreign and domestic, against the New Deal and against labor. Committed to the ultra-reactionary course of Hoover, it is the party which is most aggressive in its stand against

the Soviet Union, not indirectly, but openly. It is the party controlled lock, stock, and barrel by the monopolists. Despite the fact that some of its leaders pose as liberals, we have in the Republican Party the chief banner-bearer and open spokesman of a pro-war, anti-labor, anti-Soviet program.

The Democratic Party has always been a coalition of varying elements, ranging from the extremely reactionary groups typified by the Southern Bourbons and the Catholic hierarchy, to the New Deal wing which has worked in alliance with the labor movement and other progressive forces. At the present moment, the Tory section of the Democratic Party is in alliance with the G.O.P. for a reactionary bipartisan policy on the home and foreign fronts. This wing is flatly opposed to working with progressive labor and, like Farley, would not be averse to throwing the election victory to the Republicans in order to achieve its ultra-reactionary objectives. Then there are the elements who, while supporting the imperialist policy of the Truman Administration, nevertheless, for their own reasons are in favor of maintaining relations with the labor movement. Finally, there are the followers of President Roosevelt's policies such as Wallace, Pepper, Sabath, and Ickes, who oppose the present course of the Truman Administration. In its approach to the elections, the labor movement cannot be indifferent to the conflict between the elements in the Democratic Party.

American monopoly capital in its entirety is striving toward imperialist world domination and has become the center of world reaction. It operates through the subservient Truman Administration, as well as the Republicans and poll-tax Democrats, and has established a bipartisan combination in foreign policy. It is following a "get tough" policy with Russia in order to realize its objective.

A section of monopoly capital, whose chief spokesmen are Hoover, Vandenberg and Dewey, are pressing for a speeding up of the "get tough with Russia" policy, and are pressuring the Truman Administration in the direction of undertaking an early war against the Soviet Union.

For these reasons, monopoly capital wants the Republicans in power. For these reasons, a victory of the Dewey forces means an acceleration of the drive toward war and the reactionary offensive against the labor movement. On the other hand, the defeat of Dewey means a progressive victory in the United States, means to consolidate the forces of progress and create more favorable conditions for the building of the new progressive coalition in which labor will play a new and independent role.

#### FOR A PEOPLE'S MOVEMENT AGAINST DEWEY

We must recognize that it is not only necessary to defeat Dewey, but that it is also possible to defeat him. This was shown in the 1945 elections when the Dewey candidate suffered

a debacle in New York City. It is shown by the fact that the top leaders of the A. F. of L., despite all their maneuvers on behalf of Dewey and despite Dewey's attempts to pose as a friend of labor, could not get through an endorsement at the recent State Convention of the A. F. of L. We must recognize, however, that the Dewey machine has been strengthened and has gained to a degree by the disillusionment with the Truman Administration, as expressed in a considerable abstention from the polls in a number of primaries. For that reason, we must enter the fight to clarify the people and create a *real people's movement that can defeat Dewey*.

What combination can defeat Dewey? As Comrade Robert Thompson, Chairman of the Communist Party in New York State, pointed out in his September 10 radio speech:

The hard reality of the present political situation in our state leaves open only one path whereby this can be achieved. The path is the formation of the widest possible anti-Dewey electoral front—an electoral front consisting of a coalition of all labor and progressive groups together with the Democratic Party. Such an electoral front, and only such an electoral front, can send Dewey and his reactionary ticket down to defeat this November.

Dewey is being opposed in this election by the Democratic Party, the A.L.P., C.I.O., P.A.C., the Communist Party and other independent forces, including the Liberal Party.

What is the nature of this electoral line-up against Dewey? It has been pointed out by Comrade Thompson that this electoral front must not be confused with the *coalition* which we are trying to develop and which is emerging in the country. The coalition which the people need is an anti-monopolist, anti-imperialist, anti-fascist coalition which will represent a political realignment to achieve a *new third party*. The present electoral combination in New York is not such a coalition, though it has elements of it. *What we have is an election alliance to defeat Dewey*. The common basis of this alliance is that all groups in it are opposed to Dewey.

There are other factors that unite this alliance. The candidates have been put forth with the agreement of the labor forces. Mead and Lehman have taken a stand favorable to labor on a number of issues. In the program, too, there is a reaffirmation of the Roosevelt domestic program and the economic bill of rights.

The Mead-Lehman ticket and cooperation of the Democrats with labor means a defeat for the reactionary Farley elements, despite the fact that Farley did not carry his struggle fully into the open. However, the Farley elements are present in the whole setup. Farley is conducting an undercover struggle for the carrying through of his program. The growth and strengthening of these elements within the Democratic Party is shown in the foreign policy plank

and the "Communism equals fascism" plank. These facts, as well as the endorsement of the Truman Administration by the Democratic Convention, represent strong reactionary features and create difficulties for rallying the people against Dewey.

Therefore, it must be clear that we have in the state an electoral front that is progressive in that it is fighting the most aggressive forces of reaction, but has terrific weaknesses in the fact that the Democratic Party in the State has not broken with Truman and has confirmed the Truman foreign policy. Such an electoral front can defeat Dewey only if the progressive forces in it conduct the most effective struggle to make it a *real people's fight against Dewey and reaction*, which is possible because the A.L.P. and C.I.O. have a different line from that of the Democrats on foreign policy and because they are opposed to making Communism a divisive issue, which is what the Farleyites and the Liberal Party are attempting to do. It can be done because the A.L.P. and progressives are stronger than in previous campaigns and play more of an independent role in local elections (Marcantonio and others), and also because of the dissatisfaction of the workers with the Truman Administration and their growing trend toward independent political action.

These are the conditions which make possible a winning campaign.

It is obvious that this situation calls for the greatest activity on the

part of the Communist Party which through its independent role can influence the course of the campaign in the direction of making it a people's fight against reaction.

#### THE INDEPENDENT ROLE OF THE PARTY

The Party will work in all ways possible to defeat Dewey and reaction. It puts forward two candidates, Robert Thompson and Benjamin J. Davis, Jr., in order to help the alliance, to strengthen the role of labor and the progressives, to clarify the issues, and to make the struggle against war and reaction, against the lynch terror against the Negroes, against the attacks on the living standards of the people and the veterans' needs, the major issues of the day. At the same time the Party will advance its socialist aims. It will strive to build up its membership and press. The efforts of the reactionary Democrats and Republicans to get the Party off the ballot must be fought resolutely.

The Party's position is thus to develop the maximum strength of the labor-progressive coalition forces and of the electoral front represented by the progressive coalition in alliance with the Democratic Party in order to defeat Dewey and reaction. Within the framework of this aim, its policy is to give only *qualified* support to the Democratic Party candidates, criticizing its platform on foreign policy and condemning Mead's Red-baiting. The Party will not abate but

will continue and intensify the fight against the Truman-Vandenberg-Byrnes foreign policy. It will criticize any policies and speeches in the course of the campaign which serve the cause of reaction, doing so as far as possible within the framework of support for the alliance.

The Party has withdrawn its candidates for the leading positions—the U.S. senatorship, and the governorship and several other state posts—in order not to help a Dewey victory, since its votes may be decisive. (In the 1938 gubernatorial contest Lehman won against Dewey by only 68,000 votes.) The Party has also withdrawn the major part of its slate in order to be part of the alliance against Dewey, to work with it, and to influence it in the correct direction. Otherwise, the Party would be fighting, not only the Republicans and Democrats, but also the A.L.P., thus splitting the front against Dewey and at the same time *deserting the workers and progressives of the A.L.P. and leaving them to the Democrats and the dangers of Farleyism.*

#### ATTITUDE TO THE LIBERAL PARTY

The Liberal Party supports the Mead-Lehman ticket. This is because its leadership feared to support Dewey in view of the opposition of its members and the debacle it suffered in the municipal elections last year.

On the questions of foreign policy and the Left forces in the labor movement, the leadership of the Liberal

Party adheres to a policy which is similar to that of Dewey and Farley. This is clearly evident from their position on Wallace, whose Madison Square Garden speech they repudiated.

The leadership will undoubtedly attempt to inject Red-baiting and anti-Sovietism as major issues. These attempts must be resolutely opposed by our Party and all progressive forces as aiding Dewey. In doing so, we must appeal to the followers of the Liberal Party directly over the heads of the reactionary Social-Democratic Rose-Dubinsky group.

#### THE QUESTION OF THE LESSER EVIL

Is the policy we are pursuing a lesser-evil policy? What is the lesser-evil policy and why is it disastrous? We must understand this harmful policy clearly, not judging it by the phrase alone, but grasping its full content.

Some comrades think the so-called lesser-evil policy is objectionable because it is a policy which chooses one kind of evil—the lesser in place of the greater—whereas we should be opposed to all evil and refuse to choose between them. But this is false. We fight for socialism which will do away with the evils of capitalism. But as long as capitalism exists we always prefer lesser to greater evils. We defend bourgeois democracy against fascism, though both are forms of bourgeois rule, because bourgeois democracy is a lesser evil

compared to fascism. Or, in matters of wages, we favor higher wages as opposed to lower wages, even though with higher wages there is still exploitation and wage slavery. We have always preferred lesser exploitation for the workers to greater exploitation.

Evidently, then, this is not the reason why the so-called lesser-evil policy is false. The lesser-evil policy to which we object and against which we warn the working class is the traditional policy of Social-Democracy of *relying upon bourgeois parties* on the pretext that this will avert the victory of extreme reaction. It is the policy of dragging behind, supporting, and depending upon bourgeois parties as the chief barrier to extreme reaction and fascism. It opposes the policy of organizing, uniting, and developing the independent political action of the working class and its allies as the chief means of fighting capitalism and defeating reaction. This has proved to be a catastrophic policy, which facilitates the victory of reaction and fascism. The classic example of this policy is pre-Hitler Germany.

German Social-Democracy in the period before Hitler's rise to power opposed unity with the Communists which would have united the whole working class. Instead, it joined forces with the parties of Bruening and others and supported, in turn, Bruening, Schleicher, and Hindenburg. It opposed strikes and mass actions against the reactionary emer-

gency decrees and thus demobilized the workers. It created illusions that those essentially reactionary forces would fight Hitler, and it surrendered one working-class position after another. It opposed unity with the Communists on the grounds that this would "alienate the middle classes" and drive them into the arms of Hitlerism. What happened is history. Social-Democrats helped elect, brought Hitler to power.

That is not our policy. Our policy is one of developing to the utmost the independent forces of progress. We give only qualified and critical support to the Mead-Lehman ticket, but we *do not* place reliance upon the Democratic Party. We criticize and oppose the policy of the Truman Administration. This is evident in Comrade Thompson's cited speech "saying *no* to Dewey does not mean saying *yes* to the Democrats." Our slogan is "Vote Communist, Vote Labor." In fact, our policy is directed against any tendency toward the lesser evil. That is why we are working in the alliance, aiming to unite the labor and progressive forces. *That is why we are pressing, within the anti-Dewey electoral front, for the maximum unification and activation of the forces making up the labor and progressive coalition in New York State. It is these forces that must assume special responsibility and initiative in developing the anti-Dewey campaign into a real crusade, in which the Roosevelt policy of Big Three*

*unity is made a fighting program. We are working in the election alliance and supporting it in order to crystallize the independent forces, which can be done best on the basis of a fight against Dewey, and by going with labor and not by standing apart and fighting labor.*

We must, of course, be alert to the dangers of illusions regarding the Democrats and the Truman Administration, which are present in the ranks of the independent labor forces.

*How can these dangers be met?*

In addition to the campaign of the Party, they can be met:

1. By the A.L.P. playing a leading role in the campaign, differentiating itself from the Democratic Party on program, criticizing the government's foreign policy stand, and asserting itself in all phases of the campaign with its own progressive policies.

2. By having the progressive forces (A.L.P., C.I.O., I.C.C., P.A.C., etc.) establish a common center and energetically push their own program and activities.

3. By bringing into this common center new independent forces from among the railroad workers, the A. F. of L., the Negro people's organizations, and national minority groups, thus broadening the base of the independent political movement.

4. By involving the masses themselves in the struggle around the key issues—peace, democracy, Negro rights, housing, veterans' needs, price control, etc.—and by trying to de-

velop mass actions and struggles in the shop and in the community.

5. Especially by getting out a huge registration.

It is possible in this campaign, as distinct from that of 1945, for the progressive forces to play a greater independent role and emerge far stronger. It was correct for the Party to give qualified support to O'Dwyer in the 1945 Mayoralty campaign, for, in so doing, it helped to defeat the Dewey-Liberal Party reactionary combination and strengthened the A.L.P. The fact that O'Dwyer is Red-baiting today does not cancel out the positive gains. The weakness was that the A.L.P. did not take a stronger independent position. It did not issue its own material nor attempt to build up its own organization sufficiently, nor did the other independent organizations participate adequately.

If the above five major independent policies are carried out, the dangers of a lesser-evil policy can be avoided and the results will be extremely favorable, expressing themselves in the greater crystallization of the labor-progressive forces, the defeat of Dewey, the election of progressives for Congress and the State Senate, and the broadening of the basis for the true progressive coalition for 1948.

#### RIGHT AND "LEFT" DANGERS WITHIN THE PARTY

In order to rally the Party membership for the elections, it is imperative

to conduct a struggle against the Right and "Left" tendencies which oppose the Party's policy. The Right danger is, of course, the main danger in this postwar period, but there is also a "Left" danger which is today of growing concern to the Party, and it must be firmly combatted if the Party is to progress.

The New York leadership of the Party considers it especially important to warn sharply against this "Left" danger, because its work in the state has suffered, as was noted by the July meeting of the N. Y. State Committee, from a "Failure to be sufficiently alert and quickly enough work to overcome certain leftist, go-it-alone moods in the ranks of our Party membership."

The Right danger springs from the growing offensive of imperialism and the dangers of opportunistic capitulation to this offensive, and expresses itself in various manifestations of remnants of Browderism. The Right danger in the matter of election policy expresses itself in a reluctance to push forward the independent role of labor, in tendencies to regard critical and qualified support of certain candidates as interfering with execution of a coalition policy, and in resistance to assuming seriously the vanguard role which the Party must play, including mobilization of widespread mass support for the Party's independent candidates.

The "Left" tendency arises from a feeling of despair resulting from an underestimation of the capacity

of the masses to fight. It is likewise capitulation to imperialism, though it takes the form of revolutionary-sounding phrases. These pseudo-Left attitudes influence some members who have not gone through the experiences of many political struggles and who tend to over-simplify our principles and tactics, using Marxism as a dogma and not as a guide to action. These comrades are being confused by Right elements who mask themselves behind "Leftist" revolutionary phrases because they dare not reveal their open opportunist views. The root of both "Left" and Right dangers is the influence of bourgeois ideology which is still strong in the Party. Our Party must at all times wage a simultaneous struggle on two fronts—against both Right opportunism and "Left" sectarianism.

"Left" tendencies reveal themselves in such ideas and moods as:

1. That the Party should *go it alone* and put a full Party slate in the field. They therefore oppose the withdrawal of part of the slate. But if we were to put a full slate in the field it would mean a Dewey victory. It would also mean that we would be fighting not only the Republicans and Democrats but also the A.L.P. and the C.I.O. This position is taken in the name of the vanguard role of the Party. But what kind of vanguard role is it to lead only the Party and to cut the Party off from the Leftward-moving mass of the workers? To play a vanguard role

means to make the Party the vanguard of the masses—the vanguard in the fight against war and fascism, against the offensive of the monopolies on the home front. What such “Leftism” represents is not vanguardism, but *sectarian isolation* from the masses.

2. The pseudo-Left ideas *reject in principle any alliance with bourgeois forces*, even though it be temporary and for limited objectives, as in this case with the Democrats. They reject any coalition with bourgeois elements on the grounds that it is Browderism. But such views distort the Party’s fight against Browderism.

Browderism regards monopoly capital as progressive and would establish a coalition with it, whereas the Party regards monopoly capitalism as reactionary and works for a coalition to fight against it. Browderism would subordinate labor to the bourgeoisie; whereas the Party’s coalition policy is based on labor as the leading force. Browderism bases itself on the perspective of the permanence of the capitalist two-party system; whereas the Party’s policy, while including at the present moment alliance with those progressive elements who are not yet ready to break away from the two old parties, is fundamentally based on the perspective of the earliest possible formation of an anti-imperialist, anti-fascist third party.

But here matters must not be oversimplified. To be effective, such a third party, while based on the work-

ing class, must be wider than the trade unions and the proletariat, wider than the former conception of a “labor party.” It must be a people’s party, which means that it must embrace the small farmers, the Negro people, and large sections of the city petty bourgeoisie. Therefore, in its formation we must expect that political groups and leaders representing those strata will have to be drawn into it; otherwise it will not be a mass people’s party. But can cooperation with such groups be established only on the condition that they first sever relations with the old parties? An approach of this kind would be ludicrous; for such groupings *do* exist in the old parties and are not likely to break away from them at one stroke. That is why cooperation with such groupings must be established, despite the fact that it takes the form of alliances and common fronts with the party itself.

Thus, in the development of independent political action and a third party, temporary alliances with bourgeois groups for limited objectives, as in the case of the New York elections, are essential and correct; for in reality it is an alliance, not so much with the Democratic Party itself, as with the progressive forces inside that party, with masses of workers that support it, as well as progressive independent forces that are outside it.

The conception of the development of independent political action toward a third party only by a perfectly

straight and smooth road, is one which disregards and, in fact, opposes compromises or the necessity of compromise, and is unrealistic.

Lenin pointed out repeatedly that compromises are permissible and, in fact, necessary. He stated that we must not reject compromises, but must examine each case on its merits and determine whether it be beneficial or harmful. He further stated that it was absolutely necessary to take advantage of division in the ranks of the bourgeoisie in order to advance labor's cause. In "*Left-Wing Communism*," Lenin shows how to approach this question in a Marxist and not an opportunist way, and gives many examples of necessary compromises and alliances made by the Bolsheviks with bourgeois groups. The Bolsheviks, however, *never forgot at the same time to carry on the struggle against these groups ideologically*. It would be well for all Party members to read and re-read this masterly work carefully and thoroughly, especially its chapter on compromises.

#### "LEFTIST" FALLACIES

"Leftist" fallacies arise basically from the failure to see the true relationship of forces. They do not try to analyze the position of the working class. What is that relationship of forces from which Marxists must start in the working out of tactics? It is that there is still a relatively *slow* regrouping of the progressive forces,

a relatively slow realignment of a new coalition—that the working class and progressive forces are *in transition*. This means that there are still uncertainties and illusions in the ranks of labor and the progressive forces with regard to the Democratic Party. To win these forces, particularly in the ranks of labor, for independent political action and the crystallization of a third party, requires the correct tactics based on the needs of the situation, centrally the struggle against the drive toward war and fascism.

The historic break with the old parties is in the process of development. Its acceleration depends in a large measure on the Communists and how they work. Right opportunism says: let us *drag* behind the workers or labor leaders who want no break with the bourgeoisie; "Left" sectarianism says: let us *abandon* the progressive workers and labor leaders who have not yet broken away from the old parties and let us go it alone. The Party says, let us put forward our own independent policy in the fight against reaction and war, and fight for it, but work with the masses and *lead them* toward the goal which they must inevitably reach.

In the case of both the Right and "Left" positions, the result of the policy is to abandon the workers to the bourgeoisie. That is why the so-called "Left," which may sound very "revolutionary," is in reality only a shadow of the Right danger, and that is why those who fight against the Party policy from the "Left" help the

bourgeoisie just as do the Right opportunists.

#### FOR A MILITANT PARTY POLICY

The Party must patiently and thoroughly point out the errors of the "Left" and Right positions, but it must fight against these ideas and vigorously oppose any resistance to its policy.

We must establish a disciplined carrying out of policy. There will be many difficulties and provocations created by both Republican and Democratic reactionaries. However, they will have to be met without changing the main course, without falling into traps. We must go for-

ward into this campaign militantly, confident that reaction can be defeated.

We must go into the campaign without equivocations and waverings, with united, disciplined action, with enthusiasm, and impart confidence to the alliance and to the masses, arousing them to fighting pitch against reaction and its policies of disaster.

The workers, and progressives generally, will understand us when we say: For a mass registration in October! Defeat Dewey and his gang of war-makers! Build the anti-Dewey electoral front! Strengthen the labor-progressive coalition within that front! Vote Communist and vote labor!

# The Declaration by the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China on the Ninth Anniversary, July 7, 1946, of the Marco Polo Bridge Incident

Countrymen and patriots:

TODAY IS THE first anniversary of the Marco Polo Bridge Incident since the victorious conclusion of the anti-Japanese patriotic war by our people. Nine years ago, the patriotic people and the troops of our country forced the reactionary clique within the Kuomintang to end the civil war and the policy of non-resistance, and began the war of united national resistance against Japan. During the eight years of war which ensued, they upheld the war of resistance, unity and progress, fought against surrender, division and retrogression, and finally saved the country from the national crisis created by the reactionary clique's policy of half-hearted resistance. They collaborated with the allied armies on the European and Asiatic fronts and achieved victory in the war against fascist aggression.

What did the millions of our people and officers and men fight for throughout the eight years of bloodshed and sacrifices? For the realization of national liberation, the extermination of foreign aggressors and the consolidation of peace in the Far

East, so that our country might not again become the colony or protectorate of the imperialist countries or a tool for an international war of aggression. For the democratization of the country and the elimination of feudal fascism, so that the fascist despots and war lords, secret police, corrupt officials and depraved gentry might no longer be able to ride roughshod over the people and bleed them white. For the establishment of internal peace and unity and the final elimination of civil war and for the growth of the national economy and the speedy realization of national industrialization. In brief, our people fought for independence, peace and democracy.

Although the conclusion of the war of resistance found the forces of the people growing unprecedentedly in strength and vigorously rising to demand independence, peace and democracy, it also found the reactionary clique of our country, supported by the Japanese fascist remnants and backed by the American reactionary clique, utilizing all means to usurp the fruits of victory and uphold dictatorship and civil war. At the same

time, the American reactionary clique, working hand in glove with the reactionary clique in China, is trying to take the place of Japan and convert China into a colony of American imperialism. Consequently, the victory of the people's patriotic war has not brought independence, peace and democracy to the whole country and the grave national crisis still exists. Sacred tasks left unfinished during the war against Japan still wait for our further efforts to be completed.

During the eleven months since the Japanese surrender, the people's policy of independence, peace and democracy has been in tortuous struggle against the reactionary clique's policy of national betrayal, civil war and dictatorship. On August 25 last year, the declaration of the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party first brought forward independence, peace and democracy as the fundamental policy for postwar national reconstruction. To realize this policy, Mao Tse-tung, Chairman of the Chinese Communist Party, flew to Chungking and negotiated for over forty days with Chiang Kai-shek, Chairman of the National Government. As a result, the minutes of the Kuomintang-Communist negotiations were signed on October 10.

The Kuomintang authorities were forced by nationwide public opinion and the world democratic forces openly to accept the important proposal of the Chinese Communist

Party designed to achieve long-term cooperation, avert civil war, and political tutelage, convene the Political Consultative Conference (P.C.C.), safeguard the people's freedom and equal status of all parties and groups, strictly prohibit secret police activities, release all political prisoners, actively further democratic self-government, reform and reduce the armies in the whole country, severely punish traitors, disband the puppet troops, etc., in the Double Tenth Agreement. However, at the same time, the Kuomintang authorities, relying on the armed intervention policy of the Hurley-Wedemeyer clique in America, launched large-scale offensives against the liberated areas for three months in succession. The people, however, repelled these attacks of the reactionary clique, while the American people and democratic forces abroad also condemned the Hurley-Wedemeyer policy. Through the efforts of the entire nation, the demands of the Three-power Foreign Ministers' Conference in Moscow last December and the participation of General George Marshall, Special Envoy of the United States, the Kuomintang authorities were, however, forced to issue the cease-fire order jointly with the Chinese Communist Party and convene the P.C.C., participated in by representatives of all parties and groups and prominent members of society.

The P.C.C. unanimously passed a resolution calling for the reorganization of the Government on a demo-

cratic basis, the reorganization of the National Assembly, the carrying out of the program of peaceful national reconstruction, the reform and reduction in size of the armies throughout the country, and the revision of the draft constitution, so that the very bright future of a democratization of the country appeared. The entire nation, the Chinese Communist Party, the Democratic League, the elements advocating democracy and peace within the Kuomintang, and the peoples of America and other allied countries unanimously supported the cease-fire order and the P.C.C. resolutions. Only the reactionary clique within the Kuomintang declared that this was a defeat which had to be "remedied."

Since the breaking up of the meeting celebrating the P.C.C. in Chungking on February 10, ten days after the closing of the P.C.C., and especially since the Second Plenary Session of the Kuomintang Central Executive Committee last March, the reactionary clique have step by step torn up all their own pledges. Their attacks mounted in violence when they discovered the U.S. Government unfaithfully violating the decisions of the Moscow Conference and increasing further military aid in support of their acts, thereby actually nullifying the peace efforts of General Marshall and reducing his peace efforts to mere show. During the past six months, they seized over 40 cities and towns and over 2,000 townships and villages

in the liberated areas and moved over 1,000,000 troops to North China and Manchuria. They continued to conscript recruits and employ the puppet troops. They openly called for a nation-wide civil war and forbade the people to oppose the civil war. They openly demanded seizure of more territories from the liberated areas and the overthrow of the plan for national reorganization of armies so as to widen the civil war and preserve their warlord system.

Although they sometimes announced that political questions should be settled through political means, what they actually applied was armed settlement of all questions.

Force was used even toward the mild petition of the scholars and industrialists. They enforced an ever more savage, fascist, terroristic rule and enacted innumerable frightful bloody incidents in Chungking, Peiping, Sian, Nantung, Sikang, Yunnan, Kwangtung, Shanghai, Nanking and other places. They openly demanded the overthrow of the P.C.C. resolutions and the framing of a dictatorial constitution and openly rejected the reconvening of the P.C.C. Thousands have perished of starvation under their dark rule, while large numbers of factories have closed down under the concerted pressure of bureaucratic capital and foreign capital. Even middle-ranking government officials and university professors had to go on strike because they could no longer live under this

dark rule. The reactionary clique have however continued their corruption, extortion of grain from farmers and inflation to supply the needs of civil war. The reactionary wave is temporarily swamping our country and people on a wide scale.

Why are the reactionaries in China able to maintain their dictatorship and carry on civil war after the victory of the people's patriotic war? It is well-known that they are able to do this only because of the military intervention of the American reactionaries. It is well-known that without the so-called "aid to China" by the American reactionaries, our country would have long ago attained democracy and it would be impossible for civil war to break out at all or continue. All the so-called aid to repatriate Japanese war prisoners, to assist in the rejuvenation of our country, to aid the entire people of our country, and all other pretexts of the American reactionaries actually, without exception, aid dictatorship and civil war and the reactionaries in China.

But why are the American reactionaries so mysteriously eager to furnish what seems to be gratuitous "aid to China," and so heedless of the repeated condemnation by the Chinese and American peoples? It is well-known that this is because the American reactionaries have imperialistic, aggressive aims which they dare not disclose. It is merely because the Chinese reactionaries, versed in the art of betraying their

country, permit aggressive interests in the United States actually to control our military, economic, financial, internal and diplomatic affairs, ruin our national economy and freely to penetrate, occupy and utilize our land, sea, airways and inland rivers.

Since American imperialism is more powerful than Japanese imperialism, its methods of aggression outwardly seem more "civilized" and "lawful". Moreover, because it can capitalize on the anti-fascist war and the traditional friendship of the Chinese and American people to foster more traitors, it is more dangerous in nature. It is therefore evident that the existence of the Chinese nation is threatened both by the Chinese and foreign reactionaries who are plotting together to transform China into an inferno, a colossal concentration camp, a colony and base for new imperialist wars of aggression. All patriots, all anti-Japanese heroes and all adherents of Dr. Sun Yat-sen should be on guard and rally together to repulse the combined offensive of foreign imperialism and the Chinese reactionary clique and fight to attain independence, democracy and peace in China.

Independence, democracy and peace have become the three inseparable objectives of our people. Those who deny us independence and democracy will first of all deny us peace, for only through civil war can they curb the forces of the Chinese people demanding independence and democracy and ex-

pedite their military dictatorship and military intervention. Without democracy there can be no genuine independence and peace in China; while without complete independence in China, all talk of peace and democracy will be even emptier.

The Chinese Communist Party is determined to uphold independence, democracy and peace in China. To save the independence, peace and democracy of our motherland in the present critical moment, we wish to make the following urgent appeals to all people at home and abroad:

(1) Immediately reissue the order for unconditional cessation of hostilities, troop transportation, erection of fortifications, and conscription of recruits without time limit in the whole country without exception (including Manchuria).

(2) Reconvene the P.C.C.; implement all decisions adopted at its last session; reorganize the one-party government into a democratic coalition government from top to bottom, reorganize the National Defense, Foreign Affairs, Financial, Economic Affairs, Interior Communications and Education Ministries; dissolve all secret police organizations; clean out the fascist, war-thirsty and corrupt elements; eliminate bureaucratic capital, carry out protective tariffs; confiscate the properties of big traitors and grafters; relieve national industry; relieve the unemployed, refugees, starving functionaries and teachers.

(3) Effect the maximum and

speediest demobilization and reduction of armed forces under the supervision of the P.C.C., thoroughly abolish the warlord system of armies belonging to a few individuals, immediately cease levying of military grain taxes and return levied grain to the people, cut down military expenditures to the minimum so as to increase relief and educational expenditures, store and seal up all surplus weapons, cease the purchase of arms and ammunitions, return all the lend-lease arms and ammunition to the United States, decline the services of the U.S. Military Advisory Mission, notify the United States to evacuate immediately all U.S. land, sea and air forces from China and proclaim that the Chinese people will not bear responsibility for any American loans to China made before the establishment of a democratic coalition government.

(4) Demand that the United States, the Soviet Union and Great Britain reinforce the faithful implementation of the Moscow Big-Three Foreign Ministers' Conference decisions, demand that the U.S. Government cease its military intervention in Chinese internal affairs and stop furthering civil war in China, cancel the loan to China, cancel the sending of military advisers, and immediately evacuate voluntarily all U.S. land, sea and air forces from China.

Countrymen! All fighters for the independence, peace and democracy of our motherland! Although we are

at present confronted with a grave national crisis, and although struggle is still before us, our future is however infinitely bright. History never repeats itself. Never during its past hundred years' struggle for independence and democracy has our people been so powerful and so filled with bright hope as now.

During the eight years of the patriotic war, there were situations much more difficult and dangerous than that of today, but we successfully passed through those severe tests. Despite the concerted attacks of Japanese imperialism and the reactionaries in China, we have built and defended the powerful bastions of the cause of independence and democracy in our country—the liberated areas with their total population of 140,000,000. Today's struggle for peace and democracy in China is still a patriotic struggle of the whole nation, but the strength of the people is now many times greater than during the Sino-Japanese War. The struggles of the people in the liberated areas and of all classes in the rural and urban Kuomintang-controlled areas are now being fused into one widespread conflagration.

Not only have we an internal united front of the whole nation; we also have vast allies abroad. In any event, the main force of international fascism—furnished by Germany, Italy and Japan—has already been destroyed, and the peoples' democratic forces of all nations are springing up. They will finally exterminate

all the fascist remnants and defeat all the aggressive, pro-fascist reactionary cliques. The struggle of the Chinese people has received and will continue to receive their fraternal aid. The American people and the democratic groups in the U.S., side by side with the Chinese people, have opposed and will continue to oppose the reactionary cliques in China and the U.S. because the military intervention by the American reactionary clique, the military dictatorship of the Chinese reactionary clique, and the Chinese civil war seriously menace the security and the interests of the American people.

Even with foreign aid, the reactionary clique in China cannot overcome their numerous difficulties. The present fierce violence of the Chinese reactionaries does not indicate their might and vitality, but the feebleness and momentary brightness of the sunset. The reign of fascism in any country is of this nature, and China is no exception. Fascism is the most vicious force, yet the most weak and lifeless. Therefore, the attempt of the Chinese reactionary clique to exterminate the popular forces and perpetuate their fascist rule is doomed to failure. Similarly, the Chinese people will never allow the foreign aggressors to attain their goal of converting China into a colony, or an "independent country" after the pattern of the Philippines.

Countrymen! All patriots in the liberated areas and whole China! Victory is beckoning us and the great

spirit of the recent sacred patriotic was is inspiring us. Let us unite more firmly and act more courageously! We have no demands other than independence, democracy and peace. We have made enough concessions for peace during the recent negotiations; but if the insatiable reactionary clique insist on provoking war, then let us prepare and hurl back all the reactionaries who are provoking war! All our fellow-countrymen should know that the attempts of the Chinese and foreign reactionaries can be frustrated. We must realize independence, peace and democracy. We must implement the Cease-fire Agreement, the P.C.C. decisions and the plan for national reorganization of armies. We welcome all those who are willing to carry out the above-stated tasks, no matter who they are, and we will oppose all those opposed to carrying out those tasks, no matter who they are. Our demands are so reasonable and our cause is so just,

that our demands are bound to be realized and our cause is bound to win.

Oppose civil war, uphold peace! Oppose dictatorship, uphold democracy! Oppose national treachery, uphold independence! Support the cease-fire order, support the Political Consultative Conference decisions! Support the decisions of the Moscow, Big Three Foreign Ministers Conference! Strengthen the friendship between the Chinese and American peoples, strengthen the unity between the Chinese and American democratic groups! Oppose foreign military intervention, oppose foreign aggressors! Long live the victory of the patriotic anti-Japanese war! Long live the great patriotic national unity! Long live independent, peaceful, democratic China!

CENTRAL COMMITTEE,  
The Communist Party of China.

July 7, 1946.

# TOWARD A PROGRAM OF AGRARIAN REFORMS FOR THE BLACK BELT\*

By HARRY HAYWOOD

## PART II

*Hoover "Primes the Credit Pump."* Safeguarding the Wall Street credit structure and preserving the plantation were the essence of government policy during the worst years of the great economic crisis. To this end, the main bulk of Federal emergency funds for agriculture was directed. Between 1929 and 1933, 46 per cent of the total \$225,000,000 appropriated for agricultural credit went to the Southern states.\*\* The raid on public funds by big financial interests deep in the cotton gamble was begun under Hoover and continued during the period of the A.A.A. The pattern was set by Hoover through the Regional Agricultural Corporation, launched by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. The security demanded for loans under this policy was either a landlord lien waiver or

a first mortgage, which automatically put loan benefits beyond the reach of the masses of tenants and small owners, inasmuch as the landlord usually held the lien and the small owners were already mortgaged up to the hilt. Particularly was this so in the case of the Negro, whose inferior economic status served automatically to exclude him.

*The Crisis.* The collapse of agricultural prices following the 1929 stock market crash dealt a staggering blow to the South's cotton economy and marked the beginning of a decade of disaster for its people.

For years preceding this collapse, the South's economic condition had been deteriorating. Storm signals had been raised, forecasting the inevitable disaster. King Cotton, the sick man of American agriculture, had taken a turn for the worse. His ailment, a chronic case of "plantationitis" coupled with the "Boll Weevil Blues," had reached a critical stage, aggravated by the uninterrupted decline of world agriculture dating from the end of World War I. All nostrums of Dr. Hoover, and before him Harding and Coolidge, had proved of no avail. The patient failed to respond.

The catastrophic decline in the consumption of cotton was registered in the drop of the index number of gross cash income from cotton marketings from 100 in 1925-29 to 41 in 1939.\*

Along with this decline, there was

\* The first section of this article was published in the September, 1946, issue of *Political Affairs*.

\*\* James Allen, *The Negro Question in the United States*, International Publishers, 1936.

\* Gunnar Lange, *Trends in Southern Agriculture*, Unpublished MSS, prepared for the Myrddal Study.

an increase in the carry-over from 5,000,000 to 13,000,000 bales in the American cotton crop between 1929-30 and 1932-33. In the five years following 1929 the total farm returns from cotton and cotton seed fell by 70 per cent. The result was a sharp reduction in the average gross income of Southern farm families. The family income which had been \$735 in 1928 was only \$216 by 1932, in which year cotton averaged 4.6 cents per lb.\*

*The Agricultural Adjustment Program.* The A.A.A. was instituted in May 1933. Its artificial pegging of cotton prices in the interest of the big planters and Northern credit institutions, served to aggravate the social aspects of the crisis, spurring the process of impoverishment and class polarization.

This sharpening of the agrarian crisis was most startlingly revealed in the absolute drop in the area of cultivated land. The harvested area of land declined from 43,000,000 acres in 1929 to 36,000,000 in 1932. In 1933, as a result of the A.A.A. acreage reduction program it declined to 29,000,000. There was a further decline to 22,000,000 in 1941.\*\* On the other hand, the decline in rural population was relatively small. Between 1930-40, the Negro rural population declined by only 4.5 per cent. The decline was relatively smaller than during the decade 1920-30 (8.6 per cent).

But most illustrative of the desperate plight of the Negro during this period is the fact that his "flight" from the land could go on at all in the face of the lack of opportunities for work in industry in the cities.

The stark tragedy behind these figures, their meaning in terms of human suffering and destitution, beggars imagination. Although the census reveals a decrease of over 235,000 in the number of Negro and white share-cropping families, what happened to them still remains a mystery as far as census returns are concerned. But we may reasonably assume, given the prevalence of widespread unemployment in the cities at the time, that a large number remained in agriculture, reduced to the sub-tenant standards of casual wage laborers. But the plantation system was saved, as was Wall Street's credit structure.

The planter's interest was further safeguarded by his dominance of local agencies administering the A.A.A. program. This in turn was based on the Negro's political impotence. The planter's control of these local agencies enabled him to grab the lion's share of the benefits. Thus, the average benefit per plantation tenant family was reported in 1937 to be only \$27 a year, that is, about 10 per cent of the total cash income of the average tenant farmer.\*

*The Farm Security Administration.* The F.S.A. programs of social

\* Johnson, Embree and Alexander, *Collapse of Cotton Tenancy*, 1935.

\*\* Bureau of Agricultural Economics, *The Agricultural Situation*, August, 1942.

\* W. C. Holley, E. Winston, and T. J. Woolfer, Jr., *The Plantation South*, 1934-37, 1940.

reforms, purporting to bring relief to the "little man in the farm business," did, however, represent a progressive departure from the standard practices of American capitalism, and did bring some measure of relief to the most destitute of the South's agricultural population. But it brought no appreciable amelioration of the conditions of the masses of cotton producers.

The glaring inadequacy of appropriations for these programs is shown in the fact that while \$5,300,000,000 was appropriated for A.A.A. policies during the period of 1934-41—a disproportionate share of which went to the big landlords—during the same period the outlay for F.S.A. amounted to only about one-fifth of this amount, \$1,122,000,000.\*

Here again the discriminatory pattern was followed. The programs were made to conform with dominant planter interests. The local administration was mainly in the hands of local people. The F.S.A. clients, to be accepted, had to be passed upon by local farmers' committees, over which the Negro had practically no influence. This was the case with regard to the so-called rehabilitation programs, which included assistance of various kinds on an individual basis, and which took up the major part of the work and appropriations of the F.S.A. Differential treatment of the Negro in the operation of this program was

also shown in the fact that by December, 1939, there were in the South 154,000 white and 45,000 Negro "standard rehabilitation borrowers." Thus, while more than one-fourth of the Southern rural population is Negro, the number of Negroes on the program constituted a somewhat smaller proportion (23 per cent) of the total number of clients. Compared with the total estimated number of white and colored farm families which were either on relief or had an income of less than \$500, the participation in the program amounted to 22 per cent by the whites and 11 per cent by the Negroes. This shows that a low-income white family had about twice the chance of a Negro family in the same circumstances of being accepted on the program. Higher average amounts of loan advances for whites than Negroes were also shown, \$659 for whites and \$606 for colored.\*

There are other F.S.A. programs such as Settlement and Rental Cooperatives. These programs, however, are insignificant as far as the Negro is concerned. By mid-1940 there were fewer than 2,000 Negro families on various types of F.S.A. Settlement and Rental Cooperatives, constituting about one-fourth of all such families in the South. About 1,900 Negro families were on the so-called tenant-purchase program, on which there were four times as many whites. Thus, there was about the

\* Carl T. Schmidt, *American Farmers in the World Crisis*, 1941.

\* Richard Sterner and Associates, *The Negro's Share* (prepared for the Myrdal Study), 1943.

same amount of discrimination in these cases as in the rehabilitation work. On the whole, the New Deal social reforms in Southern agriculture, while furnishing some relief to the totally destitute, proved woefully inadequate and did not begin to repair the original damages suffered by the masses of Negro and white soil tillers as a result of the A.A.A.

Raper's appraisal of New Deal reforms in the South's agriculture still holds good. Writing in 1936, *i.e.*, before the 1940 census, he nevertheless saw in his field studies the main facts later verified by census returns. He summarized them thus:

The New Deal with its cotton restriction program, its relief expenditures, and its loan services . . . has rejuvenated the decaying plantation economy. Those who control the plantations are now experiencing relative prosperity. On the other hand, the landless farmers . . . are not only failing to escape their chronic dependence but are actually losing status. Many tenants are being pushed off the land while many others are being pushed down the tenure ladder, especially from cropper to wage-hand status.\*

*Critique of Reformist Programs.* The F.S.A. program foundered on the jagged rock of plantation landlordism, strengthened by the A.A.A. policies. Such must be the fate of all programs that have for their aim the benefit of the common man in the South's agriculture, *unless they are*

*planned as part of a basic attack upon the plantation and the forces of big monopoly capital behind it.* And that is the job of a militantly led mass movement of Southern toilers, Negro and white, supported by the labor movement in the North.

The failure fundamentally to formulate the land question is characteristic of bourgeois liberal and reformist "remedies." Liberal theorists point up the plantation evil, only to shy away from it and avoid drawing the obvious conclusions. Plainly, abolition of the plantation and land redivision among the "primary" soil tillers is basic to any genuine agrarian reform. The reason for their evasion of this inescapable conclusion is that a radical democratic formulation of the South's land question impinges upon that "holy of all holies," large-scale private property, around which the imperialist bourgeoisie has thrown an aura of sanctity. Thus, their efforts are reduced to pitiful attempts to carry through a peaceful, gradual conversion of semi-feudal land ownership into capitalist landlordism through a "painless" transformation, which does not challenge or even question the monopolist property rights of the big planters and their Wall Street backers.

The war witnessed a veritable flood of literature and propaganda from these sources, heralding the short-lived war prosperity and its industrial boom as the beginning of a "technical and industrial revolution," the opening up of a "new era" of in-

\* Arthur F. Raper, *Preface to Peasantry*, 1936.

dustrial expansion and modernized farming for the South.

It is in these bourgeois-liberal theories that we must seek the well spring of Browder's thesis of the "progressive elimination" of the semi-feudal remnants in Southern agriculture and the peaceful solution of the Negro question under the aegis of a "benevolent" imperialism. These theories represent a rejection of the profound, agrarian, anti-imperialist content of the Negro question, whose roots are struck deep in the soil of plantation thralldom. These optimistic expectations were shattered on the granite rock of reality by the imperialist offensive unleashed after V-J Day.\*

*World War II.* World War II witnessed a slackening of the trends outlined above. There ensued an interlude of relative stability based upon the extension of the market through increased consumption and hence the rise in cotton prices. The war industries furnished an outlet for agrarian migration out of the Black Belt, thus relieving to some degree the pressure on agriculture. But behind the flimsy façade of industrial boom and war prosperity lurked the fundamental forces of agrarian crisis which had by no means been solved by the war. Not only have the basic problems posed by the permanent agricultural crisis not been solved, but in some

cases they have become aggravated. And today all signs point to a resumption of basic trends. Already signs are in the wind, the warning signals of a new and even more devastating crisis are raised. Cotton has not recovered its place in the world market. It faces sharper competition than ever. In this context *Labor Fact Book No. 7\** points out:

In general, the demand for . . . American cotton has been sharply cut by the development of rayon and other artificial fibers and by increased production of cotton in other countries. In the foreign markets, which have been important for American cotton, this can no longer compete successfully at American prices with cotton from less developed countries having lower standards of living and lower money costs.

The present cotton prices are inflated, artificially pegged up. The outlet for agrarian overcrowding is closing as a result of the shutdown of war industries following V-J Day.\*\* As regards Negroes, the reversal of New Deal trends has resulted in the scuttling of the FEPC and the proposed return of the U.S.E.S. back to state control. The postwar months have been marked by a resumption of the war against the Negro at home. The widespread resurgence of Negro-baiting and lynching has reached new and more menacing proportions, as revealed by recent lynching of two Negro couples

\* A factual refutation of these crass distortions is to be found in the special materials recently released by the National Negro Commission of the C.P.U.S.A. and in the article by Nat Ross, "The South Faces Today," *Political Affairs*, March 1946.

\* International Publishers, New York, 1945.

\*\* Nat Ross, Cited work.

in Monroe County, Georgia. The fascist-like pattern of this new wave of anti-Negro violence is evidenced by the fact that it is being carried out with the open participation of the armed forces of the State, as witnessed in Freeport, Long Island, and, particularly, Columbia, Tennessee.

The other side of the picture is the unprecedented political awakening of the Negro people and the growth of Negro and white labor unity, a process greatly stimulated by the victorious war against fascism. The leavening force in this new militancy is the Negro industrial worker, whose ranks have been tremendously augmented during the war. On the political scene, the Negro worker is rapidly coming into his own as the spark plug of the battle for Negro freedom. As an integral part of organized labor (the Negro constitutes one out of every fifteen organized trade unionists) he is the only force capable, under Communist guidance, of rallying the masses of Negro people for consistent and uncompromising struggle for liberation. This all adds up to the sharpening of the basic contradiction between the growing democratic impulses of the Negro people and the tightening yoke of oppressive imperialist policy. It presages ever-heightening struggles for Negro rights.

*Social-Political Consequences of the Plantation System.* Our analysis points up the Black Belt Plantation system as the root source of the Negro question in the U.S. In this ana-

chronistic pattern of slavery thrust into modern life lie the seed sprouts of modern Negro oppression. The plantation system is the generator continually reproducing Negro inequality and backwardness in all walks of life, condemning America's colored tenth to a poverty-ridden, Jim Crow existence in the North as well. The shadow of the plantation falls upon the Negro in the streets of Harlem and Chicago's South Side.

It is likewise on this soil that is to be found the breeding pen of the South's ruin and poverty. The social controls, originally devised to keep the Negro down, penalize the masses of Southern poor whites. Every measure passed to curb the Negro has also served to destroy the civil rights of the poor white. At the bottom of the cultural backwardness and poverty of the Southern white is the position of his Black neighbor. The Tobacco Roads are the "American Way" in the Black Belt.

Facts unearthed and widely publicized, including the report of the National Emergency Committee to the late President Roosevelt, have thrown new light on the "paradise" of racial bigotry below the Mason-Dixon Line. They show that the "White Supremacy" of the South is synonymous with the most outrageous poverty, misery and degradation of Southern white people. They show the staggering price of "white superiority" in terms of health, living and cultural standards of the great masses of Southern whites. They show that

"keeping the Negro down" means for the entire South the nation's lowest wage and living standards. (The average income for Southerners in 1937 was only \$314 as against \$606 in the country as a whole!) "White supremacy" means the nation's greatest proportion of tenants and sharecroppers, its highest rate of child labor, its most degrading and widespread exploitation of women, its poorest health and housing record, its highest illiteracy and lowest proportion of students in high schools and colleges, its highest death and disease rate, its lowest level of union organization and its least democracy. The unsolved Negro agrarian question in the South is the springboard for the fascist salient into the flank of our country's democracy, spear-headed by the Bourbon poll-taxers and their Tory Republican backers of the North.

These incontestable facts, which give the lie to the Bourbon racist myth of "white superiority," show clearly that the South can progress only by breaking the oppression of the Negro. A nation which oppresses another forges its own chains, said Karl Marx. In colloquial language, as put by Booker T. Washington, "You can't keep a man in the gutter without getting down there with him."

#### TOWARDS FUNDAMENTAL AGRARIAN REFORM

Clearly, far-reaching changes are essential if the Negro is to be free,

if the South is to rise out of its slough of grinding poverty to equality with the rest of the country. Radical agrarian reform, long overdue, is the prime need of the South's people.

The plantation system, a relic of chattel slavery surviving into the modern age, *must go*. It is this system which traps millions in the Black Belt prison under the oligarchic heel of a caste of white landlords, local merchants, and bankers; and it is its attendant evils of share-cropping, peonage, outmoded and wasteful methods of soil usage, and its single-crop system which the world over spells slavery and which, in the South, leaves the mass of agricultural poor the prey of every speculative fluctuation of the world cotton market.

There is no room in modern life for such a system. A fundamental reorganization of the whole existing land system of the South is glaringly necessary. *The breaking up of the large plantations and the redistribution of the land in favor of the poor cultivators, Negro and white, who till it becomes indispensable* for the solution of this question. Such a radical overhauling of the South's system of land ownership and its agrarian relations would result in the following:

1. It would create the condition for the establishment of a system of small independent farming, bringing immediate relief to the masses of Negro and white soil tillers. Thus the social base for political democracy

would be formed. It would destroy the most important material base of the imperialist-Bourbon oppression of the Negro people, springing the whole system of color caste which dictates inequality for the Negro in all walks of life and which condemns him to Jim Crow poverty even in the North.

2. It would break the backbone of Bourbon Junkerism whose representatives in Congress are bent on assaying a role in American politics similar to that played by their dethroned counterparts in Eastern Europe and the Balkans. It would shake loose the putrid soil which nourishes the whole foul breed of fascist Negro-phobes of the stripe of the Rankins, Talmadges, Bilbos, *et al.*

Land redivision, the agrarian revolution, is incontestably the *pivotal* demand of Negro liberation; its realization is a prerequisite for any genuine democracy or equality in the South. This primacy of basic agrarian reform in the fight for political democracy in backward or semi-feudal areas is borne out by all historical experience and in recent times by the examples of the liberated countries of Eastern Europe and the Balkans. In these countries the breaking up of the big feudal estates proved fundamental to democratic political transformation.

In the South, this task, left undone by Reconstruction, is on the order of the day for labor and the democratic people.

*Imperialism — the main enemy.*

The achievement of fundamental agricultural reorganization in the deep South is inextricably bound up with the question of political power.

Today the fight for land takes place in the new social setting of imperialism. The big monopolies and trusts are in the saddle. The Morgans, Rockefellers, du Ponts, etc., are the real owners of the South. They are the exploiters supreme. It is they who dominate the commanding heights of Southern economic life, its steel, coal, railroads, utilities, etc.\* It is their banks that control the credit structure without which the plantation could not live. Big Business, resident in the North, is the real power behind the throne of the Bourbon landlords. It has underwritten the plantation system and its odious color-caste system.

The "front men" in the South, the junior partners in plunder, are merely the riding bosses of the absentee Yankee overlords. In this sinister tie-up between the parasitic and predatory sections of Northern Big Business and the feudal-agrarian Junker interests of the South are merged the two main pro-fascist currents in the country today. Its political expression is the Congressional coalition of poll-tax Democrats and Tory Republicans.

*Self-government for the Black Belt.* Plainly, a fundamental solution of the land question in the Black Belt

\* See The National Emergency Council's *Report to the President on Economic Conditions of the South*, July, 1938.

is inconceivable within the framework of the existing Bourbon-imperialistic political setup.

Our analysis has shown that the fight for even the most elementary demands in the sphere of agrarian reform immediately runs afoul of the entrenched political power of the landlord based upon the plantation and its anti-Negro social and legal sanctions. This emphasizes the indissoluble connection between political and economic reform in the South. Here, as nowhere else in the country, the fight for the smallest demand to relieve the sufferings of the people assumes almost immediately a political character. The highly political nature of the struggle in this region is attested by all experiences. It has been emphasized in all mass movements of the agricultural toilers, from the Elaine, Arkansas, massacres in 1919, up through the Camp Hill and Tuscaloosa battles of the Alabama share-croppers (1931-34), to the anti-eviction demonstrations of Arkansas and Oklahoma tenants in 1936.

This essentially revolutionary character of the demands of the Negro soil cultivator arises from the semi-slave economic and political setup in that region. There, every democratic demand becomes at once a challenge to the feudal rights and privileges of the Bourbon ruling caste and is immediately countered by terror and the wildest racist provocation. This is underlined in the heightening lynch wave now engulfing the South. The observation of Lenin re-

garding the struggles of the Russian peasantry against feudal Czarism applies fully to the fight of his modern Negro-American counterpart—the share-cropper. Their demands, he observed, are more revolutionary than the partial demands of the city industrial workers, because they represent the belated and unfinished struggle against serfdom and feudalism.

The implication of these conditions in regard to the fight for the land in the Black Belt is clear. Any program looking forward to the ultimate solution of the land question in that region must project as its long range objective the breaking of the class rule of the Wall Street-supported Bourbon oligarchy and the destruction of the vicious system of color-caste by which it is maintained. This means that the corrupt rule of monopoly capitalism and its cronies must be supplanted by the democratic rule of the majority, that is, the Negro people. Without governmental and administrative control in the hands of this most oppressed section of the people, fundamental agrarian reform is impossible. Only a government representing the interests of the preponderant Negro population, expressing its special interests and enjoying its confidence, can effectuate the radical change in the structure of Southern landownership so urgently needed by the masses of the Black Belt's people.

Obviously, the recasting of the agricultural setup of this region along democratic lines involves parallel

chang  
ment  
wit  
tion,  
must  
spon  
form  
whic  
jority  
Wh  
politi  
ment  
poor  
if pro  
led, n  
gle fo  
self-g  
mum  
seriou  
This  
tablis  
Negro  
cal a  
achiev  
volve  
and c  
Belt.  
is arb  
gover  
cial ar  
divisi  
spond  
needs  
artific  
mand  
the av  
the po  
predo  
giona  
redrav  
formi

changes in its political and governmental structure. Therefore, along with the demand for land redistribution, and integrally tied in with it, must be placed demands for corresponding political reforms, *i.e.*, reforms in the realm of government which will enable the democratic majority to achieve political power.

What then should be the central political demand? The mass movement of Negro share-croppers and poor farmers for land and freedom, if properly organized and militantly led, must take the direction of struggle for some form of local or *regional self-government* as the absolute minimum political requirement for any serious tackling of the land question. This demand means simply the establishment of the jurisdiction of the Negro majority over all questions local and regional in character. Its achievement would necessarily involve the revision of the present state and county boundaries in the Black Belt. The continuity of this region is arbitrarily broken up by a maze of governmental, administrative, judicial and electoral sub-divisions. These divisions, which in no way correspond to the economic and political needs of the oppressed majority, are artificially maintained and gerrymandered by the South's rulers with the avowed purpose of perpetuating the political impotence of the region's predominant Negro population. Regional self-government implies the redrawing of these boundaries in conformity with the needs and demands

of the oppressed majority. This can by no means be construed as separation. Quite the contrary, it is a prerequisite for genuine democratic unity; for the Black Belt represents an historically-formed economic and ethnic unity distinguished by the special economic and living conditions as well as by the national or racial composition of its majority Negro population.

Plainly, the realization of regional self-government would pave the way for the abolition of the most despicable forms of slave bondage and for the free democratic development of the Negro people. It would create the conditions for the full unleashing of self-initiative, stifled by the degrading restrictions of a color caste system designed to blur the underlying issues of the class struggle. It is the unassailable demand of the Negro people of the Black Belt.

This demand likewise represents the basic interests of the impoverished white minority in the Black Belt. The masses of poor and landless whites in that region can only win land and freedom on the basis of full support of the rights of the Negro who, by virtue of his special oppression, represents the decisive force for democratic change in the South. The historical confirmation of this truth is contained in any objective evaluation of the Reconstruction period.

It was in that period, when the newly emancipated Negroes, in alliance with the Southern poor whites and supported by Northern democ-

racy, stepped forward to take their place in government, that the South had the only democratic rule it has ever known. The unity of Negro and white achieved in that period, which held forth the promise for rapid development of the South out of its morass of reaction and backwardness, was crushed by the victory of the counter-revolution, sealed in the Hayes-Tilden "Gentlemen's Agreement" between Northern capitalism and Southern reaction in 1877.\* A key task of the Party and the working class is to rescue the liberating truth implicit in the lesson of that period for present-day democracy from the heap of distortions and misrepresentations under which contemporary bourgeoisie "scholarship" has sought to bury it. The popularization of the real lessons of the Reconstruction period is an essential part of the fight for Negro-white unity in the South, for a *new* democratic reconstruction of that region.

This direction of the struggle for Negro rights in the Black Belt is already implicit in the elementary stages of the fight for political democracy in the South. In the Black Belt, the fight for electoral reforms, such as the right to vote, to hold office, and against all restrictions on the freedom of the ballot, indicate the next stage to be a struggle for regional self-government.

Already the fight for these imme-

diated political demands is reflected in the all-round sharpening of social antagonisms in the South and in evoking the most desperate fascist reprisals on the part of the Bourbon overlords and their K.K.K. myrmidons. The organization of the fight for the economic and social needs of the Negro masses and white toilers on the land and the establishment of close links between that movement and Southern organized labor is the next task of the Party and militant labor in the South.

In the development of the movement for the land under condition of sharpened terror and lynch incitement, the Negro people will be brought more and more to the realization of the necessity for local *self-rule* as an essential safeguard for the protection of their common interests and for their free and unhampered economic and political development.

It should be clear that without the recognition of the Negroes' right to self-government, the slogan of social equality, or full citizenship rights, in the South and the Black Belt is but a misleading signboard, divested of all revolutionary content, behind which bourgeois humanitarians and pacifists, as well as the Social-Democrats and Trotskyites, can hide their sabotage of any genuine struggle for Negro rights and democracy.

In this context it should be pointed out that the demand for local self-government does not replace the slogan of the right to self-determination of the Negro people in the Black

\* See James S. Allen, *Reconstruction: The Battle for Democracy*, International Publishers, 1937.

Belt. On the contrary, it is a *transitional slogan* in relation to the right to self-determination, which remains the ultimate programmatic demand for the solution of the Negro question. Local self-government constitutes the concrete application of our full program for Negro emancipation to the present stage of the development of the Negro people's movement. It is, of course, by no means excluded that higher demands within the general context of the right to self-determination will not at some future date be raised by the Negro people. Such an eventuality is contingent upon the development of the Negro liberation movement and the course of the class struggle in the country as a whole.

The demand for self-government is based upon the conception of the Negro people in the Black Belt as a nation, with all the essential characteristics of nationhood present among them, as outlined by Stalin, that is, they are "a historically evolved, stable community of language, territory, economic life, and psychological make-up, manifested in a community of culture."

It is necessary, however, to guard against the schematic and undialectical interpretation placed upon this correct definition by Comrade Francis Franklin. Comrade Franklin, particularly, seems to think that the economic base for the formation of the Negro nation in the Black Belt is the fight of the bourgeoisie for markets. He says: "Forced to pro-

duce for a separate Negro market, there has thus developed a slight Negro capitalism. *It is this separate Negro capitalism which has formed the economic base for the emergence among the Negro people of the Black Belt of separate national characteristics of their own.*"\* (My emphasis, H.H.)

Quite the contrary! The most important economic factor behind the "emergence among the Negro people of the Black Belt of separate national characteristics of their own" is precisely the semi-feudal plantation economy peculiar to that region. Involved in this difference of approach is the question of the peasantry—the agrarian base of the Negro national liberation movement. Failure to bring this out means distortion of Leninism.

It is precisely against this sort of distortion of the national question that Stalin warned. According to Stalin, the national question in the present period is in "essence a peasant question," one in which the "competitive struggles between the bourgeoisie" have "not a decisive significance," "and in certain cases not even a serious significance." ". . . the chief point here," he points out is "that the imperialist group of the ruling nationality is exploiting and oppressing the greater mass, and above all the peasant mass, of the colonies and dependent nationalities, and that by oppressing and exploiting

\* "The Status of the Negro People in the Black Belt," *Political Affairs*, May, 1946, p. 443.

*them it is drawing them into the struggle against imperialism and making them allies of the proletarian revolution.*"\* (Emphasis mine, H.H.)

Failure to understand the "peasant essence" of the Negro national question, is to divest the Negro movement of its profoundly revolutionary, anti-imperialist character, to reduce it to a feeble struggle for Constitutional reforms. In practice, it means to trail after the bourgeois reformists and liberals.

The Negroes are a young nation whose maturity is being artificially and forcibly retarded by imperialism which has shrouded its policy of ferocious national oppression of the Negro Americans in the form of racial persecution. We must assume that the national consciousness of the Negro people will develop to higher levels in the course of the sharp class and Negro liberation battles bulking on the horizon in the South. In the course of these battles the Negroes will inevitably be brought to a clearer understanding of their status as an oppressed nation and will put forward corresponding demands, *i.e.*, self-government, including the full right of self-determination as part of the world-wide awakening of subject and colonial nations and peoples for realization of the Four Freedoms and the Atlantic Charter, against the status quo of Messrs. Byrnes and Churchill.

It is, therefore, the duty of the

\* Joseph Stalin, *Marxism and the National and Colonial Question*, International Publishers, p. 225.

Communists, as pointed out by Comrade Foster\*, to give all possible aid to that development as a means of unleashing the full anti-imperialist potential of the Negro people, thereby strengthening the fight of the American working class for democracy and socialism. For the liberation of the Negro people can be brought about only through their alliance with labor and all other democratic forces.

The demand for self-government and the land can be realized only under conditions of an advanced stage of the class struggle of the white and Negro workers against monopoly capitalism. This fight for national liberation is directed at the heart of imperialism and is therefore an important phase of the working-class struggle for socialism, although its realization is not contingent upon the attainment of socialism, as, for example, the postwar people's democracy of Yugoslavia shows. Only socialism, however, can *permanently* solve the land question in favor of the Negro majority and overwhelming masses of poor whites in the Black Belt. For a living confirmation of this truth, we have only to look at the successful solution of the agrarian and national questions in the Soviet Union.

Our analysis has sought to bring out the long range needs of the Negro people, which, when realized, will spell freedom—the solution of

\* "On Self-Determination for the Negro People," *Political Affairs*, June, 1946.

the Negro problem. In short, these needs are full economic, social and political equality throughout the country. This, in terms of the concrete economic and historical conditions of the struggle in the Black Belt, can only mean the completion of the agrarian revolution, that is, redivision of the land in favor of the masses of Negro and white tillers of the soil.

This struggle, taking place under conditions of shameless, open, and bestial national oppression, is a fight of the Negro people in the Black Belt for political power. Here it can mean only regional self-government, including the full right to self-determination of the subject Negro nation as a sovereign people.

These fundamental demands of Negro liberation are objectively tied in with the needs of the overwhelming majority of the American people who are striving for a decent world in which to live.

The fight for Negro freedom is an integral part of the struggle of the entire American working class for socialism, which alone can permanently solve the Negro agrarian and national questions in the South.

From this flows the urgent need for the formation of a fighting alliance between militant class-conscious labor and the Negro people, without which neither the victory of the working class nor the freedom of the Negro people from the imperialist yoke can be achieved.

This emphasizes the pressing task

of the Party—the education of the workers, Negro and white, in the spirit of international solidarity. It means the waging of a relentless fight within our own ranks and among the workers generally against the poison of white chauvinism, *i.e.*, the idea of “white superiority,” of “white supremacy,” the chief instrument of the ruling imperialist bourgeoisie and its Bourbon cohorts for mobilizing the masses of American white people in active support, or at least condonance, of the policy of Negro oppression.

The corrupting influence of white chauvinism has operated to maintain the most harmful division in the ranks of American labor, acting continuously as a brake upon the class struggle. It is a mainstay of capitalist domination over the working class and the masses of American people, a major obstacle to labor unity. The fight against this imperialist and essentially fascist ideology must be waged in conjunction with the task of mobilizing white labor, *i.e.*, the working class of the oppressing nation, for energetic, uncompromising, and all-out support of the full demands of the Negro people. Herein lies the road to the formation of the solid, unbreakable front of labor and the Negro people so urgently needed to beat off the growing offensive of fascist monopoly capitalism. It is the only path that will enable the class-conscious Negro contingent of American labor to assume the offensive against the racial or national narrow-

ness, suspicion and distrust fostered by its own bourgeoisie against all whites. It will enable it to win leadership and hegemony in the Negro liberation movement—in the interest of that movement and of the American labor movement as a whole.

Lenin pointed out that the center of gravity in the education of the workers of the oppressing nation must inevitably consist in the propaganda and defense by these workers of the right of self-determination for the oppressed nation. "It is our right and duty," he said, "to treat every Social-Democrat of an oppressing nation who fails to conduct such propaganda as an imperialist and a scoundrel."

In this article we make no pretense to a complete and definitive treatment of the Negro agrarian-national problem. We have attempted to set forth only the broad outlines of its solution. Many aspects still remain to be examined. The answer to many questions can be gained, not alone through study, but through the actual experience of organizing the struggle of the Negro and white agrarian masses of the South against landlord-imperialist oppression.

#### MINIMUM PROGRAM

An agrarian program must chart the main road toward the liberation of the masses of Negro and white soil tillers in the Black Belt from the yoke of imperialist-Bourbon landlord exploitation and oppression.

The program must proceed from a

precise estimation of the line-up of the various classes, strata, and groups, Negro and white, in relation to this goal, defining the role of each in the struggle for the above-outlined fundamental demands. In other words it must answer the questions: What groups and classes among the Negro and white population of this region would benefit from these reforms and could thus be moved into struggle for them. Which strata among them, by virtue of economic and social conditions, are the most consistent fighters for this program? Around what immediate issues can the struggle be organized and developed? Through what types and forms of organization should this struggle be channelized and developed?

We make no attempt here to answer these questions fully. However, our analysis makes clear that the entire Negro people of the Black Belt urgently need these reforms and that, as a whole, they constitute a decisive force in the struggle for their achievement. The most consistent fighters for radical change must be those lowest on the agricultural ladder, the most exploited, *i.e.*, the sharecropper and the farm laborer. Among the white minority, our analysis brings out that the masses of farm hands and croppers, as well as the small owners and renters (those not employing labor), are penalized by Negro oppression, and that their only road to freedom and the land is through the freedom of the Negroes.

These are, therefore, potential allies of the Negro people.

Around what immediate issues can joint struggle of the Negro people and the exploited sections of the white minority be organized and built?

Sharply differentiating ourselves from bourgeois-liberal, reformist programs, the line of the Communist Party in the formulation of a partial program for agrarian reforms must have as its objective the bringing of the basic masses of Negro and white land cultivators into position for the frontal assault upon the enemy's main bastion, the plantation system and its semi-feudal social and legal controls.

Proceeding from this premise, the following are some of the key issues toward which immediate struggle should be directed:

1. *Share-croppers*: Abolition of the share-cropping system, its economic and legal supports. Reduction of land rentals; lower percentage of crop yield for rentals; abolition of crop lien laws; for the legal right of the tenant to the crop, his right to sell it on the open market at his own will; for written contracts between landlord and tenant, abolition of usurious credit rates, the right of the tenant to buy where he pleases, abolition of all law- and practices supporting peonage; allocation of adequate acreage to each tenant for the raising of essential food crops.

2. *All Tenants and Small Farmers*: Reduction of land rents, the placing

of land purchasing services within the reach of small owners and of tenants. Extension of the Farm Security Program, and its rehabilitation, settlement and rental cooperative programs; increased Federal appropriations for the F.S.A., liberalization of loan services by reduction of collateral and interest rates so as to bring these loans within the reach of the masses of small farmers and tenants. A democratic reorganization of all F.S.A. local administrations, with proportional representation of Negroes on all local F.S.A. Boards. The use of idle land for settlement of displaced farm families; extension of social security to include small farmers. Free access to the land, and the removal of all privileges protecting the planters' land monopoly.

3. *Farm Laborers*: The removal of all semi-feudal proscriptions, for a living cash wage, and application of the Federal Wages and Hours Law; extension of Federal Unemployment Insurance to compensate for the seasonal character of the work; abolition of all vagrancy laws and all practices enforcing peonage; application and enforcement of the National Labor Relations Act, *i.e.*, the establishment of the right to organize, bargain collectively, and strike.

4. *Housing, Education and Health*: Federal and State support for adequate educational, housing, and health programs; equal allocation of the educational funds, equal facilities, and abolition of the Jim Crow school system.

5. *Public Works Programs*: The launching by the Federal, State and local governments of widespread public works programs, including the Missouri Valley Authority and other river valley power, flood control, and irrigation projects; rural electrification, highways, schools, hospitals, etc.

6. *Modernization of Farm Methods*: For a rational system of farming, and abolition of the single crop system; crop rotation and diversification of farming, the introduction of dairying, fruits, vegetables and new industrial crops, full production and effective farm price program.

7. *Political Democracy*: Abolition of the Jim-Crow caste system, and the establishment of full equality for Negroes in all spheres; for electoral reforms, the right to vote, hold office, abolition of white primaries, the immediate passage of Federal and State anti-poll tax legislation. The enactment of the Federal anti-lynching bill, Federal prosecution of lynchers, death penalty for lynching, the banning of the KKK and other such extra-legal terroristic organizations, The organization of joint defense, Negro and white, for active resistance to lynch terror, as an imperative task of the moment. Enforcement of the freedoms of speech, press and assembly, and the right of all farming people to organize.

The carrying out of this program means that the Party and organized labor must proceed at once to build their organizations among the agri-

cultural toilers of the Black Belt. It means the building of organization among the primary soil tillers, Negro and white. Unions of share-croppers and poor tenants must be revived and extended throughout this region. Such a program calls for the extension of the C.I.O. drive, "Operation Dixie," to embrace the masses of agricultural workers. Our line must be the building of joint organizations of Negro and white. But under circumstances should this objective be made a condition for the actual organization of the people. Experience, as in the case of the share-croppers union in the Alabama Black Belt, shows that as a result of terroristic national oppression the Negroes may desire their own separate organization. This, in some cases, may be necessary as a stage toward joint organization. Our organizational line, however, must include the building of all sorts of committees of action, uniting the agricultural masses, Negro and white, around immediate and specific issues. It must include the establishment of firm organizational links between the exploited masses in agriculture and the city industrial working class.

The carrying out of this program, in terms of our immediate tasks, means the orientation of the Party, organized labor and the National Negro Congress to the South. *It means all-out support politically, as well as concrete and practical aid, to the development of the struggle of the Negro Black Belt population for*

*land and national freedom. It means a final and decisive break with the Browder revisionist negation of the revolutionary, anti-imperialist role of the Negro people.*

The vast potential of the Negro Americans for anti-fascist democratic struggle has not been really tapped. Their full resources can be brought to bear in the cause of labor and American democracy only to the extent that white American labor understands and uncompromisingly supports their full and just demands. It is the job of militant labor and the

Communists to break down all barriers to the full unleashing of the struggle for Negro liberation.

It is their job to destroy the tank traps, set by the imperialist rulers and their wily agents, which block the bringing up of these strategic reserves of democracy and socialism. It is incumbent upon organized labor and, above all, its Communist vanguard, to knock from the hands of the enemy its secret weapon—the unsolved Negro question—and thus lay bare the Achilles heel of American imperialism.

---

On page 859 of the September issue of *Political Affairs*, the end of the first paragraph of the second column should be corrected to read: "they comprise only one-fourth of the cash tenants."

---

# THE ORIGIN AND CHARACTER OF THE 2ND WORLD WAR\*

By A. LEONTIEV

## I

THE SECOND World War, only recently ended, left deep traces in the life of all nations involved in it. The war brought about radical changes in the international situation. It is therefore clear that questions concerning the causes and nature of this war assume for us a very real importance. In fact, these questions are in every way very closely connected with any attempt to evaluate the most burning problems of today's reality.

On February 9 of this year, Comrade Stalin, reporting on the activities of the Party for a recent period, turned the bright spotlight of Marxist-Leninist science upon the questions concerning the origin and character of the Second World War. Comrade Stalin's speech is a most valuable contribution to the treasury of Marxist-Leninist theory. The speech sums up the experience of the historic developments of recent times, a period overflowing with events of greatest sig-

\* A stenographic record of a public lecture delivered on March 29, 1946, in Moscow. Translated from *Pravda*, issue of March 31 and April 1, 1946.

nificance. Comrade Stalin's speech not only arms the Soviet people with full knowledge and understanding of the sum total of recent experiences, and the perspectives and tasks connected with socialist construction in the U.S.S.R. but it also furnishes the key to a correct understanding of international relations in the recent past, as well as the tendencies of the postwar period.

## NOT AN ACCIDENT

Can the Second World War be looked upon as an accident, something that happened independent of the laws of development of contemporary capitalism? To consider that an event of such gigantic significance could have been brought about by accidental causes would be to deny any scientific explanation of social life.

The advent of the Second World War cannot be considered accidental. It arose, as Comrade Stalin demonstrated, as the inevitable result of the development of world-wide economic and political forces on the basis of contemporary monopoly capitalism. Marxists have repeatedly pointed out, as Comrade Stalin said, that the capitalist system of world economy is characterized by crises and military catastrophes.

It is explained by the fact that, during the contemporary epoch of monopolistic capitalism, individual bourgeois countries develop unevenly and by leaps. Because of this situation, the correlation of economic, po-

political and military forces between the individual states is constantly and inevitably changing. Some states may spurt forward, outstripping their opponents, while others may lag and gradually remain behind.

At the present time, under present-day conditions the complete territorial division of the world has already been accomplished. There are no free, unowned territories. Meanwhile, the highly developed capitalist countries, in which the system of monopoly capitalism rules, needs raw materials, fully secured foreign markets, and profitable spheres of capital investments. Therefore, every major capitalist power constantly strives to extend its sphere of influence. But under existing conditions, with the whole world already divided, with all colonial, semi-colonial and dependent countries already ruled by one capitalist power or another, any extension of a sphere of influence is possible in only one way—by capturing someone else's possessions. Thus, the completion of the division of the world merely serves to pose the question of the re-division of the world.

These two conditions—(1) the uneven development of individual capitalist countries and (2) the completed territorial division of the world—bring about the inevitability of clashes and conflicts between groups of capitalist powers. Because of the unevenness of development, the existing division of spheres of influence from time to time inevitably enters into contradiction, into a

conflict, with the correlation of the economic, political and military forces of individual countries. The equilibrium within the world capitalist system is thrown off balance. The given group of capitalist countries which considers itself less secured with sources of raw material and foreign markets undertakes an attempt to change the situation in its favor and bring about a corresponding re-division of spheres of influence.

In the abstract, it is possible to conceive of avoiding wars, granted there existed a possibility of peaceful, periodic re-division of spheres of influence by agreement, a re-division based upon the changing correlation of forces between individual countries. But as long as capitalism continues to exist, such means are impossible.

Even during the First World War, Lenin underscored the fact that under capitalism there is no way to re-establish the often upset equilibrium except by crises in economy, or by wars in politics.

#### BACKGROUND OF WORLD WAR I

The following is a brief, factual record of the changes in the political map of the world, caused by the uneven development of capitalist countries during the epoch of imperialism. In 1860 England held first place in the world's industrial production. This oldest of all capitalist countries held an undisputed monopoly

in the world's industrial production. It used to produce more textiles, steel, cast iron, and coal than France, the U.S.A., Germany, Italy, Russia, and Japan combined. England was the world's industrial workshop. It ruled the seas and the world's markets. It was the world's greatest colonial power. France held second place. The U.S.A. and Germany were making only the first serious steps in the sphere of industrial development.

Within a mere decade, the rapidly growing land of young capitalism, the U.S.A., outstripped France and changed positions with her. But England still held first place. Within another decade, in the 80's of the past century, the U.S. surpassed England and firmly took up first place in the world's industrial production. At the same time, Germany outstripped France and took up third position, following the U.S. and England. Within the first decade of the 20th century, Germany managed to crowd England out, and took up the second position, behind the U.S. Then Germany became second in the world's industrial production, and first in Europe.

German imperialism was late in its arrival upon the arena of colonial politics. The best tidbits had already been captured by the other powers. German imperialism, brought up in the historic traditions of Prussian robber-militarism, from the very beginning conducted an extremely aggressive policy. Its aim, as expressed

by Von Buelow, one of the chancellors of Germany, was to capture for itself "a place under the sun." For this purpose Germany established a tremendous war machine, ready for aggressive actions. Kaiser-Germany feverishly built a navy capable of disputing England's sea supremacy.

In summing up the historical experiences of this, Comrade Stalin pointed out that the First World War resulted from the first crisis of the capitalist system of world economy, and that the Second World War was caused by a second, similar crisis.

It is clear that we are not at the moment talking about the economic crises of "overproduction" which periodically shake the capitalist world, even though it is certain that the First World War broke out in a situation when the economic crisis was ripening, while the Second World War developed in the conditions of the economic crisis which began in a number of countries in 1936-38. Neither are we speaking about the general crisis of capitalism, representing the whole historic epoch, even though the two world wars, reflecting this general crisis of capitalism, undoubtedly contributed to the further deepening of the crisis. We are speaking of very concrete crises, representing the forced explosion of contradictions accumulated in the process of development of the world-wide economic and political forces of present-day capitalism. In the existing conditions of

cont  
these  
solvin  
and t  
rium  
italist

THE

Th  
perial  
tions  
duce  
tween  
land  
betwe  
war,  
and  
ondar

Un  
nomic  
lishes  
advan  
pacitie  
Simila  
establ  
the co  
and n  
the d  
betwe  
the ot  
establ  
Germ  
tempo  
fightin

How  
that G  
feated  
not co  
contra  
uation

contemporary capitalism, each of these two wars was the only way of solving the ripened contradictions and re-establishing the upset equilibrium within the world system of capitalism.

### THE FIRST WORLD WAR

The First World War was an imperialist war on the part of both coalitions participating in it. It was produced by a basic antagonism between Germany on one side and England on the other. The contradictions between the other participants in the war, particularly between Germany and Czarist Russia, were of a secondary character.

Under capitalist conditions, an economic crisis temporarily re-establishes the equilibrium between the advanced industrial productive capacities, and the limited markets. Similarly, the First World War re-established the equilibrium between the correlation of economic, political and military forces on one side, and the division of spheres of influence between the capitalist countries on the other. This equilibrium was re-established through the defeat of the Germany of the Kaiser, which thus temporarily deprived Germany of its fighting strength.

However, it is commonly known that German imperialism, though defeated in the First World War, was not completely vanquished. On the contrary, the new international situation enabled the German capitalist

robber-state to get on its feet again within a short time, and even to grow new tusks. It is characteristic that even the least attentive observers noticed and understood very soon that in this situation lurked the most serious menace, for England first of all. . . .

### THE SECOND WORLD WAR

After Hitler's advent to power, it became perfectly evident that Germany was preparing for a new war. The new war became inevitable.

We must, however, bear in mind the fact that, ever since wars have existed, their true causes are always found deeply hidden within the complex labyrinth of social and political relations, as well as in the ideological concepts of the given epoch. During the First World War, Lenin repeatedly stressed the fact that the origin of the war was wrapped up in secrecy, and that it was essential to teach the masses to understand and analyze this mystery.

This principle is applicable, not only to contemporary, but also to more remote epochs. Even in remote epochs there existed a clear contrast between the real nature of wars, and the ideological guise in which wars were presented to the active participants and to the peoples of the times.

Thus, the Second World War, as well as the first, was not an accidental event. It would be entirely superficial to assume that it came about merely as a result of the errors of any

given statesman of the bourgeois countries. Is it possible then to conclude that these errors have had no significance, and therefore may be discarded from historic considerations? Not at all! The short-sighted, greedy, narrow-minded policy of the reactionaries, ruling during the period between the two wars, especially in England, as well as in other bourgeois-democratic countries, to a very great extent eased the Hitler murderers' task of realizing their conspiracy against the freedom and the very life of other nations. These errors secured for the German and Japanese imperialists the most favorable conditions for unleashing the Second World War, gigantically sharpened its danger to the peace-loving nations, extended the length of the war, and increased the number of its victims and the volume of devastation.

This chain of fatal errors began with the Versailles peace treaty, when the political leaders of the victorious countries, blinded by their enmity against the new world born in Russia, left the economic and political base of German imperialism intact. These ruinous errors led to Locarno, the Four-Power pact, the sadly remembered farce of "non-intervention" during the Italo-German fascist intervention in Spain, and the disgraceful Munich agreement between Chamberlain, Daladier, and Hitler.

At the root of the policy of encouraging the German aggressor in Europe, as well as the Japanese aggressor

in the Far East, there lay the short-sighted calculation that it would be possible to direct the aggression against the Soviet Union. The further development of events showed Chamberlain, Daladier, and their followers in the camp of international reaction, that nobody had as yet invented such guns, tanks, and airplanes that would work only in an eastern direction and that could not be turned westward as well. Thus, the peoples of Western and Eastern Europe had to pay very dearly for the errors of the reactionary rulers of the bourgeois-democratic countries. Nor is there anything surprising in the fact that these peoples want no repetition of past errors.

#### ARE WARS INEVITABLE?

But if Marxists assume that wars are the inevitable result of the development of contemporary monopoly capitalism, can it be concluded therefore that it is hopeless and unnecessary to fight for the longest period of peace, to fight for the security of peace-loving nations? Any such conclusion would be tantamount to posing the question upside down.

It is well known that opponents of Marxism, unable to produce any essential arguments, prefer to caricature Marxist theory. We can think back to the Russian Narodniks, who, toward the end of the past century, seriously asserted that, from the point of view of the Marxist concept of

the in-  
velop-  
vance  
more  
thereb-  
table  
also r-  
of sop-  
argum-  
ception  
that,  
evitab-  
tronom-  
ity of  
lish a  
eclipse

Foll-  
simila-  
the for-  
trying  
Marxi-  
They  
hazy,  
ments  
Soviet  
amoun-  
possibi-  
they (  
inevita-  
ng ca-  
Hen-  
critical  
to the  
Union  
in the  
peace,  
hopeles-  
ions a  
the tr-  
nenini

the inevitability of the capitalist development of Russia, all that the advanced people had to do was to open more saloons in the villages, and thereby help to speed up the inevitable historic development. We can also recollect another, a different type of sophistry, often advanced as an argument against the materialist conception of history. These people said that, if the social revolution is inevitable, why fight for it? Do the astronomers, who assert the inevitability of an eclipse of the moon, establish a political party to organize this eclipse?

Following the authors of such and similar sophisms, a certain sector of the foreign press is at present likewise trying to distort the essence of the Marxist concept of the causes of wars. They make broad use of somewhat hazy, but sufficiently biased, arguments purporting to show that in the Soviet Union there exists a certain amount of pessimism concerning the possibility of a stable peace, insofar as they (the Soviet Union) assume the inevitability of wars under the existing capitalist system.

Hence, with a great deal of hypocritically assumed regret, they come to the conclusion that the Soviet Union is not inclined to participate in the common fight for a stable peace, insofar as it considers the task hopeless. Of course, all such assumptions are unpardonable distortions of the true meaning of the Marxist-Leninist concepts dealing with the

causes of wars, or else they are nothing but clumsy attempts to transfer the burden of guilt to someone else's shoulders.

Certainly no one would think of accusing a doctor or a lawyer who has discovered the origin of a disease or a crime, of producing diseases or crimes through these very activities. But it is just as senseless to accuse Marxist science of discovering the actual contradictions of the capitalist system, and then charge this science with the responsibility for the existence of these contradictions. Of course, the groups which are interested, not in the exposure of the contradictions of contemporary capitalism, but rather in concealing them, prefer to deny the inevitable character of wars. Thus, reactionary fomenters of a new war maintain that in all history there has not been a war which could have been more easily prevented than the recently ended Second World War. In fact, they assert that this war could have been prevented without the firing of a single shot, and that Germany could today still be a mighty, prosperous, and respected power. Unfortunately, however, nobody as yet has stated by just what magic means they could have resolved the contradictions between the altered Anglo-German correlation of forces and the division of spheres of influence of these powers. We do know that there are people who counted on German imperialism satisfying its appetites in the East at the expense of the Soviet

Union. However, the years of pre-war experience, as well as the war itself, have amply demonstrated the absurdity and unreality of any such expectations.

When Marxist-Leninist science exposes the deepest roots of wars, it not only does not necessarily follow that nations must cease to fight for the longest and most stable possible peace. On the contrary, exposure of the true causes of wars arms the broad masses with a true knowledge of the laws of social development; it enables the people to get rid of illusions which help only those who seek to provoke a new war, who seek to dull the vigilance of the fighters for a stable peace. It exposes the proponents of an ostrich-like policy, who prefer to hide their heads in the sand rather than face any danger. It shows to the common people of all countries, vitally interested in the longest and most stabilized period of peace, the true sources of the menace of a new war, the true sources of renewed attempts upon the security, life, and liberty of the people. Is it not clear that all this mobilizes all of the sincere friends of the peaceful existence of nations, mobilizes them for active struggle for a just and stable peace? And least accidental of all is the fact that the Soviet Union, which builds its policy on a scientific foundation, upon knowledge of the laws of social development, always has been and continues to be a true guardian of peace between the nations, a consistent fighter against all

attempts to instigate wars, wherever they come from.

## II

Even if the roots of the origin of the Second World War are to be found within the correlations of present-day monopoly capitalism, just as with the First World War, it still does not mean that the Second World War was merely a copy of the first in its character. On the contrary, as Comrade Stalin showed in his February speech, the character of the Second World War differed materially from that of the first.

The first World War, as we know, was an imperialist war on the part of both sides. The Second World War was primarily a predatory, robber, murderous undertaking on the part of Germany, Japan, Italy, and their satellites. At the same time, it was a just, liberation war on the part of those countries which fought against the fascist aggressors.

## TWO TYPES OF WARS

An indifferent, nihilistic attitude towards the question of the character of wars is alien to Marxism. Our great teachers always emphasized the thought that it is necessary to differentiate between two types of wars. There are just, liberating wars, whose purpose is either to repel the invading enemy, or to liberate a nation from foreign enslavement. There are also unjust wars of acquisition, whose purpose is to grab foreign lands, to enslave other nations. Lenin showed

that even during the imperialist war of 1914-18 the struggle of small countries like Serbia against foreign invaders was a struggle for liberation, even though this fact could in no way affect the character of the war as a whole. It should be noted that a very reverse situation existed in the Second World War, when even the fact of the presence of imperialistic elements within the camp of the anti-Hitler coalition could not change the just, liberation character of this war against fascist aggressors.

Communists hold sacred the traditions of wars of liberation, such as Russia's patriotic war against the Napoleonic invasion, the Soviet people's patriotic war against foreign intervention during the first years of Soviet power, the war of the North American states for independence, the war of the Slavonic peoples against German and Turkish enslavement, the war of the French Jacobins against the Austro-Prussian coalition, etc. Hence, it was not an accident that the Communist Party became the organizer and inspirer of all-national resistance against the German-fascist invaders, not only in the Soviet Union, but also in all European countries and in the colonies, where Communists were in the front ranks of the difficult underground and partisan war against the fascist oppressors.

#### CHARACTER OF WORLD WAR II

The character of the Second World

War was determined by the entire direction of the fascist aggressors' internal and foreign policy, the continuation of which resulted in the war. The fascists strangled all progressive elements within their own countries, destroyed the remnants of bourgeois-democratic liberties, established the rule of unheard-of tyranny, violence and murder, and then began the war in order to gain mastery of the world and spread their rule of terror and medievalism all over the world.

Under these conditions, the fight of the freedom-loving nations against the fascist aggressors became a fight for liberty and independence, for the very existence of nations.

From the very beginning, the Second World War assumed the character of an anti-fascist, liberation war. As Comrade Stalin emphasized in his February speech, this anti-fascist, liberation character of the Second World War became even stronger after the Soviet Union joined in the war against the axis powers.

Even at the very beginning of the Soviet-German war, in his radio broadcast of July 3, 1941, Comrade Stalin pointed out that it was not an ordinary war. He pointed out that it was not merely a battle between two armies, but a war of the whole Soviet people against the German-fascist invaders.

If the First World War in Europe in its very progress and outcome decided the question of the fate of the

colonies and the distribution of foreign spheres of influence, the Second World War was to decide the fate, the very existence, of the European nations themselves. The question at issue was whether these nations would be able to preserve their national freedom and state independence, or be transformed into slaves of the ill-famed German "Master race."

Fascism was the product of the most aggressive, man-hating, cannibalistic forces of international reaction of our epoch. Fascism personified extreme reaction, whose roots were deeply imbedded in the contemporary system of monopoly capitalism. It became a deadly menace to human civilization, to the very existence of human society. Hence, all progressive and democratic forces united in the fight against the fascist invaders.

Even during the First World War, Lenin wrote in exposing people who denied the significance of the contemporary struggle for the democratic rights of the broad masses:

Capitalism generally, and especially imperialism, transforms democracy into a mere illusion. At the same time, capitalism is forced to introduce democratic tendencies among the masses, is forced to establish democratic institutions. It thereby sharpens the antagonism between imperialism, negating democracy, and the masses who are striving for democracy.\*

\* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Russian Edition, Vol. XXX, p. 259.

The Second World War demonstrated with unexampled force this antagonism between imperialism, negating democracy, and the masses striving for democracy. The Soviet Union's decisive participation in the fight of the anti-fascist coalition against the armed forces of the Hitlerite bloc gave an especially sharp expression to this antagonism.

For this reason, as Comrade Stalin noted, the Second World War could not be of short duration, of the blitzkrieg type, because it was a war in which nations fought for their very existence. With truly remarkable blindness, the Hitlerite leaders worked out the plans of their infamous blitzkrieg without realizing that they were building on sand, for even the temporary victories of the blitzkrieg did not bring Germany's victory any nearer, but only delayed the moment of her inevitable defeat. Furthermore, the Second World War could not end in a draw, or a stalemate, even though there were many who would have been in favor of such an outcome, many not only in the camp of the Hitlerite murderers, but even among the reactionary groups in other countries. This war could not end in any form of a compromise, a cession of any territory, or any other kind of peace, under which both warring sides could survive. This war could end only in the destruction of one side or the other, and as we know, it did end in the destruction of the fascist aggressors.

So n  
charact

THE M

But  
recogn

this w  
democr

liberati  
fight a

this ca  
fluentia

land, t

It wou  
imagin

Democr

Roosev  
or the

ranks o  
Englan

fascist

the wa  
spare a

and M

upon f  
against

"Bolshe

progress

of the l  
ization

tempt  
colonia

foreign  
the Sov  
express  
and Ru  
death,  
any ob  
Anglo-  
world

So much for the question of the character of the Second World War.

### THE MUNICHMEN

But not all by far did or do recognize the anti-fascist character of this war. If the broad masses of the democratic countries did consider this liberation war as the vital task of the fight against the fascist aggressors, this cannot be said about the influential reactionary circles in England, the U.S. and other countries. It would be utterly ridiculous to imagine reactionary Republican and Democratic senators, opponents of Roosevelt and his policy in the U.S., or the seasoned Munichites in the ranks of the Conservative Party in England, as men inspired by anti-fascist ideas. On the contrary, before the war these reactionaries did not spare any effort in praising the Hitler and Mussolini regimes. They looked upon fascism as a reliable "barrier against Bolshevism." Of course, "Bolshevism" for them included any progressive movement, any tendency of the broad masses toward the realization of their vital rights, any attempt of the enslaved peoples of the colonial world to escape from the foreign yoke. When Hitler attacked the Soviet Union, these people openly expressed their hope that Germany and Russia would bleed each other to death, and thereby would eliminate any obstacle to the establishment of Anglo-American domination the world over. With this purpose in

view, they used their influence to create the maximum of delay in England's and America's participation in the war, and especially in the opening of the Second Front in Europe.

But even some of the other politicians, who considered it advisable to separate themselves from such an openly pro-fascist position, maintained even in the midst of the war that this war was not ideological, *i.e.*, anti-fascist. English conservatives looked upon fascism with more than a little favor, but even they could not continue with these views when they became convinced that the fascist aggressors threatened the very existence of England and its empire. This point of view reflected the concept of those ruling groups of England who would not have found any reason for war if Hitler had only confined himself to grabbing such territories which would not directly menace the vital interests of the British Empire.

Representatives of this point of view ignored or, more correctly, attempted to hide from their people the indisputable fact that fascism is not merely an "ideology," but that fascism represents, first of all, a definite physical force, inseparable from war, from aggression, and that, because of this, fascism becomes a deadly menace, not only to the countries where it is in power, but also to the security of all nations, to the cause of world peace. Reactionaries in Anglo-Saxon countries have main-

tained that there could supposedly exist a non-aggressive, peaceable, and absolutely respectable fascism. And these very circles, even today, continue, with a zeal worthy of a better cause, to defend the bloody, fascist hangman Franco.

It is interesting to note that only recently, on March 9, the reactionary newspaper, the *New York World-Telegram*, carried an article by Randolph Churchill, son of Great Britain's ex-premier, in which it was specifically stated that the past war was not against fascism as such, but merely a war against some aggressors who intended to conquer Europe.

But whether these particular groups in England and certain other countries did or did not want it, the war in reality, did assume the character of an anti-fascist war. The freedom-loving nations conducted it as a war against fascism, against the most monstrous product of international reaction, and this war ended with the defeat of the major bases of world fascism and world aggression.

As a result of the war, serious changes took place in the correlation between the forces of democracy and reaction in the international arena.

#### THE COALITION TODAY

The anti-fascist coalition won the war. The world press again and again poses the question now as to whether this coalition will also be able to win the peace. They usually refer to the experience of history.

They cite historic examples to show that as a rule, after victory over the common enemy, coalitions usually fall apart.

We must, however, take into consideration the fact that the anti-Hitler coalition has a number of peculiarities, which make it slightly different from other coalitions. These peculiarities proceed from the just, liberation character of the Second World War. The process of the anti-fascist war not only united the governments of a number of countries, but led the broad masses to feel the necessity of marching shoulder to shoulder to fight against fascist aggression, mankind's enemy. As a result of this, millions of people in all countries, who lived through the deprivations of war and brought their sacrifices to its altar, are now ready to defend peace with as much resolution as they demonstrated yesterday in the fight against the common enemy.

Even during the war, the leaders of the allied powers made repeated individual and collective statements to the effect that their aim was not only victory over the common enemy, but also the establishment of such a world order as would effectively prevent the danger of a new aggression on the part of enemy countries and secure for the world prolonged peace and safety.

But it is one thing to announce principles, and quite another thing to bring them into life, not only according to the letter, but also according to the spirit of adopted resolu-

tions. The period since the end of the Second World War has shown that these principles and resolutions from time to time become subject to serious tests and trials. Without dwelling on details, but considering events from the standpoint of their basic significance, we may come to the following conclusion.

## TWO TENDENCIES

In approaching any solution of international questions, two different tendencies are becoming more and more clear. Representatives of one tendency are trying to arrange things so as to have some powers set the tone, while others would have to submit to decisions forced upon them. These are the new pretenders to world rule. The war against the fascist aggressors was not yet over, when the reactionary American press already began to proclaim loudly and often that America must dominate in all international affairs and in all corners of the globe, that America has been called upon to establish her "ideological hegemony" and her "moral leadership" all over the world. In order to leave no doubt about the real basis for this "moral" and "ideological" leadership, all these declarations are supported, by quite plain hints at the destructive force of the atom bomb.

The English imperialist circles, evidently realizing that they can no longer hope for their own rule of the world, are for this reason ready to

satisfy themselves, as shown by Churchill's Fulton speech, with the role of a junior partner in the Anglo-American firm set up to dominate the whole world.

But the idea of domination by the "Anglo-Saxon" race, as promoted by English and American reactionaries, does not seem to suit the other peoples of the world, who constitute the world's majority, in comparison with whom the English-speaking people become merely an insignificant minority.

But along with this distinctly imperialistic tendency in contemporary world politics, there also exists another, a democratic tendency, based upon recognizing the necessity of cooperation among all peace-loving nations, great and small, in the interests of peace, security, and social progress. This tendency is clear to the Soviet people, because during the pre-war years the Soviet Union proved to be a resolute fighter for peace among the nations. During the war, the Soviet Union played a decisive role in the defeat of the major bases of world fascism and world aggression. Since the war, the Soviet Union has been conducting a consistent struggle for establishing international relations on a basis of democracy and for the solution of international questions through international cooperation.

As a result of the war, the Soviet Union's international prestige rose enormously. The Soviet Union puts the whole weight of its authority on

the side of favoring stable peace and security among nations, in favor of consistent application of democratic principles in the relations between countries, great and small. The Soviet Union looks upon the United Nations as an organization of great importance, judging it as a serious instrument for the preservation of peace and international security. This is shown in a number of Comrade Stalin's statements made during the war and after it was over. In reply to questions by a correspondent of the Associated Press, Comrade Stalin pointed out that the strength of this international organization lies in the idea that it is based upon the principle of the equality of states, and not on the principle of the domination of some states over others, and that if it will be able to preserve this principle of equality in the future it will undoubtedly play a great and positive role in the maintenance of general peace and security.

Sane, thinking people have always understood that at the basis of successful activity of the U.N. lies the preservation of unity among the leading powers of the anti-Hitler coalition, these powers being the initiators of the U.N., who are responsible for the work of this organization. It is also well known that this principle of the unanimity of the great powers, as an essential condition for the existence of the U.N., has been fixed in this organization's charter. Naturally, in connection with a number of questions, there may arise dif-

ferences of opinion, disagreements and contradictions among the great powers, in which case, of course, the task is to overcome these difficulties and find common solutions of international affairs. In order to achieve this, it is, of course, necessary to counteract any propagandists of new wars, who often abuse freedom of speech in acting against the interests of peace; it is necessary to expose their plots and repel them. It is also clear that a "war of nerves" directed against the Soviet Union never brought any laurels to its initiators. The nerves of defenders of just tasks are much too strong.

Notwithstanding the ceaseless and Soviet campaigns of lies and slanders which the many-voiced foreign reactionary press is developing, and which at times reaches the stage of hysteria and insanity; notwithstanding every possible attempt to distort the true meaning of Soviet foreign policy, the Soviet Union attracts the sympathy of millions of common people who are everywhere guarding the peace.

The Soviet Union stands high above the world, as the most important and resolute defender of the peaceful coexistence of peoples. It was the Soviet Union which played a decisive role in the victory over the common enemy. Now, too, the Soviet Union has no more important task than that of confirming and strengthening this victory. Following the defeat of its enemies, the Soviet Union began the task of peace-

ful construction, the renewal of the great task of building communism in our country, a task temporarily interrupted by the fascist invasion. The Soviet Union now stands as a mighty obstacle against instigators

of a new war. The just task of maintaining the freedom of nations and peace among the nations is firmly and consistently defended by the Soviet Union under the brilliant leadership of the great Stalin.

## BOOK REVIEWS

### THE "WORLD GOVERNMENT" REACTIONARY UTOPIA

Review by JOSEPH CLARK

THE ANATOMY OF PEACE, by Emery Reves. Pocket Books, Inc., New York. Price \$1.00.

In recent times the idea of world government has received widespread acceptance in liberal and intellectual circles. There are many idealistic and peace-loving people who believe that wars can be eliminated only through the establishment of a world sovereignty, which will supplant the varied and conflicting national sovereignties. These views have become increasingly popular on the campus. Some leaders of one of the important World War II veterans' organizations, the American Veterans Committee, hold strongly to this belief.

Two world wars in a single generation were enough to create an urgent realization that some kind of basic world change is necessary to preserve peace. There is recognition in many circles that, as they are now constituted, national boundaries tend to deprive some people of national rights and serve to maintain artificial barriers between peoples of different lands. To many, the idea of world government represents a sincere striving for fundamental change of a system which has

brought so much death and tragedy to the world.

For some exponents of world government, the idea is a means of combatting the United Nations Organization and an argument against big-power cooperation today. For others, world government is offered as a further development of the existing United Nations Organization and is not counterposed to big-power cooperation.

World government, for another group, is a convenient peg on which to hang their ruling class and national prejudices. Thus Clarence Streit's world government movement is a specific means for forming an Anglo-American bloc against the Soviet Union. It is quite ready to precipitate another world war under the banner of world government.

One of the most popular theorists of the world government doctrine is Emery Reves, author of the book, *The Anatomy of Peace*. This book has run through many editions, securing a tremendous circulation. It has been recommended by such diverse individuals as former Supreme Court Justice Owen J. Roberts; Senator Claude Pepper; Rev. Henry St. George Tucker, presiding Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal

Church; Dr. Louis Finkelstein, President of the Jewish Theological Seminary; Charles G. Bolte, chairman of the American Veterans Committee; Albert Einstein; Thomas Mann, Cord Meyer, Jr.; Carl van Doren; and Robert J. Watt of the American Federation of Labor.

We propose to discuss Reves' book here as one of the most important arguments in favor of world government. However, the views Reves presents are not necessarily the views of all adherents of the theory of world government.

#### THE IDEA OF A WORLD SOCIETY

Reves argues that capitalism has failed, but he asserts his belief in capitalism. He says religion has failed, but he recommends to the Christian churches that religion be rejuvenated through acceptance of Tom Paine's universalism. He believes socialism has failed, but contrary to his support of a capitalism which has also failed, he is very much opposed to socialism. He objects to internationalism, self-determination of nations, and collective security. He sums up his thesis:

"The fundamental problem of regulating the relations between great powers without the permanent danger of major wars cannot be solved so long as absolute sovereign power continues to reside in the nation-states. Unless their sovereign institutions are integrated into higher institutions expressing directly the sovereignty of the community, unless the relations of their peoples are regulated by law, violent conflicts between national units are inevitable."

The idea of a world society, of peace

through universal order, is an old one. It received a scientific basis in the teachings of Karl Marx. Ninety-nine years ago, Marx and Engels described the historical development of a world order:

"Modern industry has established the world market, for which the discovery of America paved the way. . . .

"The bourgeoisie has through its exploitation of the world market given a cosmopolitan character to production and consumption in every country. To the great chagrin of reactionaries, it has drawn from under the feet of industry the national ground on which it stood. . . . In place of the old local and national seclusion and self-sufficiency, we have intercourse in every direction, universal inter-dependence of nations. . . .

"Since the proletariat must first of all acquire political supremacy, must rise to be the leading class of the nation, must constitute itself *the* nation, it is, so far, itself national, though not in the bourgeois sense of the world. . . .

"In proportion as the exploitation of one individual by another is put an end to, the exploitation of one nation by another will also be put an end to. In proportion as the antagonism between classes within the nation vanishes, the hostility of one nation to another will come to an end."<sup>\*</sup>

Reves differs most decidedly with Marx. He believes that the elimination of the exploitation of man by man is not a necessary condition for establishing his "world government." Marxists, he holds, talk too much about class relations, about who owns the means of production. In fact, Reves cites the Bell Telephone Co. as an example of wide-

<sup>\*</sup> Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, *Manifesto of the Communist Party*, International Publishers.

spread ownership under capitalism\* and the similarity of class relations under capitalism and socialism.

Apparently Reves believes, with one group of Anatole France's angels, that before there was an apple, there was the idea of the apple. Thus the development of feudalism to capitalism is not viewed as the growth of another social and economic system. He does not see it as the transfer of power from one social class to another, but as the action of the people in enlarging the unit of sovereignty—from the feudal manor to the nation. So, too, in the development of his world government there is not needed the transfer of power from the capitalists to the workers, and the development of a classless society. All that is needed is an agreement to enlarge the sovereign unit, from the nation to the world.

It is necessary to play fast and free with history to support such a theory of social development. A hundred and sixty-nine years of economic, social, cultural and political growth preceded the Declaration of Independence which launched the American nation. But Reves sees the rise of the American nation merely as the triumph of an idea, a principle. The founding fathers "formulated a small number of fundamental principles regarded as self-evident and basic for a democracy society.

\* In this connection, it is pertinent to cite the following facts about "widespread" ownership of corporate stock under capitalism:

"Only 10,000 persons, (0.008 per cent of the population) own one-fourth, and 75,000 (0.06 per cent of the population) own one-half of all the corporate stock in the country. . . . The 1,000 largest dividend recipients received 10.4 per cent of the dividends while 61,000 persons (0.047 per cent of the population) received one-half of the dividends." (*Economic Concentration and World War II*, Senate Document No. 206, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, 1946, p. 16.)

These principles succeeded in arousing the vision and inflaming the enthusiasms of the peoples who, on the basis of these fundamental principles, empowered their representatives to translate them into reality and create the machinery necessary for a permanent legal order representing the triumph of these principles."

In reality, it took the development of agriculture, the rise of commerce, the beginning of manufactures; it took a historical process to shape a community of people with a common language, economy, culture, tradition and psychology, living in a contiguous territory. There was a century and a half of struggle between small farmers and great planters, between mechanics and handicraftsmen and rich merchants and speculators, and finally a revolution.

Until the American merchants, planters, and farmers wrested political power from the hands of the British merchants and planters there could be no large sovereignty, no independent United States of America. Nor was the formation of the United States a guarantee of peace in the larger sovereignty that was formed. Within that larger sovereignty there were two antagonistic social and economic systems. Out of the conflict came the Civil War, more widespread, destructive, and important than any of the wars fought among the smaller units of sovereignty, between the feudal lords, of Europe.

So, too, in European history, the development of feudalism to capitalism was not the triumph of an idea, law constituted as law. Only after the economic development of capitalism within feudal society itself, and only after the transfer of political power to the new capitalist class, were laws and

stitutions passed recording and perpetuating the new relations between classes.

### THE NATION AND WAR

To Reves "war is the result of unregulated contact between power units." The nation itself therefore is war. Nowhere does he examine the specific or underlying causes for war, except to assert that because there are various sovereignties, there has to be war.

Antagonism between nations today stems not from the mere fact that there are nations. The mountains of one country have not offended the valleys of another. Nor has a quarrel arisen between the people who inhabit one nation and those who dwell in another. The anarchy, conflict, and antagonism between nations result from the conflict between those who *dominate* the economic and political structure within each national unit.

The nations of the world are interdependent. Modern transportation and communication have brought nations closer together than ever before. But the greater the interdependence of nations in our imperialist epoch, the greater the antagonism between the monopolists who control the wealth and the productive machine from which they profit.

The clash between capitalist nations is essentially a struggle between rival monopolists for the redivision of the world. This has been on the order of the day throughout the 20th century because the world has already been divided up in the form of colonies and spheres of influence among the few dominant imperialist powers. Will the big business interests who made \$50,000,000,000 profit during the war be content unless they can secure and

dominate markets that will net them a similar, if not greater, return today?

This conflict for a redivision of the world, which brought about two world wars, is also a reflection of a deeper conflict, that between the productive forces today and the social system within which these forces are hemmed. Modern science and industry have developed to a point where world *productive capacity* is more than sufficient to supply the needs of the world. With the development of atomic energy for productive purposes, even greater prospects of plenty and prosperity are opened to mankind. But half the world hungers today, the world waits for a new world crisis and depression, and war scare follows war scare, because capitalism cannot use the science and production of the world for the benefit of mankind.

A world united and free from the specter of war, is a world freed from the power of the money-bags. Even the biblical prophet who spoke of the lion lying down with the lamb was dreaming of a classless society, of the elimination of the exploitation of man by man. But in Reves' world, imperialism lies down with its colonies, the monopolists comprise the same community with the workers, and the capitalist world ceases to dream of destroying the socialist world. Nothing is more erroneous, he says, than the conception that man must be united in economic methods "before he can be politically united in a state." However, not until the development of a market, and the rise of merchant capitalism, were national sovereignties created; and those nation states came into being only with the rise to political supremacy of the new dominant class, the capitalists. So, too, the real owners

and managers of capitalist industry will not become reconciled to socialism. They will not allow anything to interfere with their profit-taking, if they can help it.

### UPROOTING WAR

To free the world of national conflict is to eliminate the specific class forces which engender such conflicts. As long as the owners of industry profit from the labor of the workers they will seek to enlarge that profit by exporting capital to other countries. They will thus forge the economic and political chains that bind other nations to their yoke. Nation will oppress nation. Oppressed nations will fight for self-determination. And the big oppressing nations will fight among themselves to enlarge the area of their exploitation. They will strive for a redivision of markets, sources of raw materials, places for the profitable investment of surplus capital.

Marxism teaches that there is a basis for forming a durable world organization through the elimination of capitalism and construction of socialism. A world of socialist countries could plan world economy, organize the distribution of goods, make rational use of the world's raw materials and supply the bounties of modern productivity to the consumers of all lands. Such a uniform world economy would not imply uniformity of national characteristics. But it would create the cement to hold together the bricks of a world society. The economic conflicts which cause war would be eliminated.

Reves says it is a fallacy of communism that "we could divide total annual world production equally among the members of the entire human race..."

The result of that, he says, would be poverty. Where he found a Communist who wanted to divide beefsteaks equally among grown men and infants in swaddling clothes, he does not say. Nor is it a question of world production. But productive capacity today is great enough to eliminate poverty. American industry never worked at capacity, or anywhere near it, before the war. Furthermore, it is not merely a question of existing capacity, but potential capacity, when industry is freed from the fetters of the profit system. America could easily build homes for its people. But housing under capitalism is still another thing.

With all his criticism of industrialism, Reves believes that the system of "private enterprise" is necessary for democracy. He opposes not only socialism, but also the nationalization of industry; and by allowing the corporate owners to continue to dominate the economy of the nations he allows, indeed makes inevitable, the conflicts among the capitalists for markets and world domination.

Reves recommends world government for the preservation of the system of free enterprise. Modern industrialism, he shows, has created not only wealth, but poverty. It also produces the class struggle which goes on, Reves believes, "despite the fact that the entire controversy is based on a controversy."

The failure of capitalism, Reves holds "is not because capital is controlled by individuals and private corporations." The failure, according to Reves, stems from the regard for "freedom" as "an absolute instead of a functional concept," an objective constant in need of adjustment by law; law

must be passed to remedy the injustices of uncontrolled capitalism. From this he arrives at the idea of freeing capitalism from its shackles by eliminating sovereign nation-states.

By sanctioning the basis of capitalist enterprise, the exploitation of the worker by the capitalist, Reves' criticism of modern industrialists is so much soothing lotion applied to a running sore. And again the problem stands on its head, when nation states are held responsible for reactionary capitalism, and not these capitalists for the reactionary policies of capitalist nation-states.

#### A PROMOTER OF WAR

So far our argument with Reves has concerned itself with the premise and conditions of creating a world society. But more immediate and more dangerous are the views of Reves about the danger of war today. As a matter of fact, Reves joins that school of world government protagonists who promote another war. He writes:

"What chance have we to create a world government before the next war? Not much. Suppose we do make the problem clear to the democratic peoples—is it likely that Soviet Russia would accept a suggestion to enter into a common government organization with us? I believe the answer to be no. . . . But the alternative—another world war resulting in the destruction of all individual liberties and in the rule of a totalitarian state, either ours or Russia's—is a prospect that leaves no room for hesitation as to the action we must undertake.

"If war, horrible war, between the two groups of sovereign nations dominated by the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R. has to be fought, at least let it be civil

war. . . . Let us at least fight for an ideal. The end of such a struggle ought automatically to end international wars and bring victory for world federation."

One reads this blunt call for a holy war against the Soviet Union after poring through pages and pages of arguments supposedly telling us how to eliminate war. Reves clearly places himself among those advocates of world government for whom it is but a convenient method of creating the proper setting for the most terrible war the world has ever seen.

All the fine and fancy literary outpouring leads to the one conclusion that since world government cannot prevent the next war, we should wage it under a good slogan. The real owners of Bell Telephone and the du Ponts will not be too much worried about the ideological slogans advanced for such a war—it is the war they desire.

Reading Reves' conclusion, it becomes much clearer why he argues so strenuously against the Atlantic Charter, against treaties among nations, against collective security, against big-power unity and against the United Nations. From an argument which is supposed to give us the sine qua non of peace, he arrives at the inevitability—nay, at the necessity—of another war.

#### THE STRUGGLE TODAY

The war which threatens today can be averted. The very conditions which were forged in the terrible fires of the struggle against the fascist Axis can be applied to win the peace today. The grand design of a United Nations organization based on the unity of the big powers that won the war can still be put into life.

World imperialism today is no longer strong enough to deprive the peoples of the world of a fundamental role in shaping the destinies of the world. Socialism in the Soviet Union, which made the greatest contribution to defeating the fascist Axis, emerged stronger than ever from the war. New democratic forces were unleashed throughout the world, including great peoples like those of India and China striving for their own sovereignty and independence.

Social ownership of the means of production is an increasingly manifested aspiration of the great majority of European peoples. The working class in the capitalist countries is better organized and exercises a greater measure of influence on the course of history than ever before. These results of the successful struggle against fascism create a basis for realizing the goal of big-

power unity and an effective United Nations.

The struggle for such unity and peace is a difficult one. It is made doubly difficult by those advocates of world government who use it as a means of sabotaging United Nations action and Big Three unity today.

The major obstacle to such unity is the selfish desire for world domination of the financiers of Wall Street and their British class brothers. But their aims are facilitated by those who urge war under the guise of a great ideal, and who disrupt United Nations unity with "idealist" arguments.

In the course of the struggle for peace today, the working class and the peoples learn about the next steps in the march of history. They will learn in the fight against war today that socialism will guarantee peace tomorrow, in a world society of the brotherhood of man.

ive United

ity and  
t is ma  
advocates  
se it as  
ed Nation  
today.  
ch unity  
domination  
et and the  
their aim  
o urge we  
ideal, and  
unity with

gle for peace  
d the people  
n the man  
in the fight  
cialism was  
in a world  
of man.