

# POLITICAL AFFAIRS

*A magazine devoted*

*to the theory and practice of Marxism-Leninism*

## EDITORIAL BOARD

MAX WEISS, *Editor*; V. J. JEROME, *Associate Editor*

ALEXANDER BITTELMAN, HENRY WINSTON

VOLUME XXVI, NO. 7

## *Contents*

JULY, 1947

The Marshall Plan	James S. Allen	563
The Fourth of July, 1947	Abner W. Berry	571
A Democratic Solution for Palestine	Alexander Bittelman	576
Foster's Contribution to Trade Union Theory and Practice	Jack Stachel	586
American Imperialism and the Colonial World	George Phillips	596
What's Happening in the South	Nat Ross	612
Current Economic Trends	Labor Research Association	624

### FROM THE COMMUNIST PRESS OF OTHER LANDS:

On the Gradual Transition from Socialism to Communism	A. P. Lyapin	632
----------------------------------------------------------	--------------	-----

### BOOK REVIEWS:

Facts That Expose Fiction	Joel Remes	650
An Indispensable Labor Handbook	Joseph Roland	653

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

PRINTED IN U.S.A.

 209

A. COMMUNIST LEADER REPORTS ON—

# THE NEW EUROPE

By WILLIAM Z. FOSTER

*A new book, based on first-hand observation and investigation in nine countries, personal interviews with government leaders, meetings with trade union officials.*



*The New Europe* contains fifteen rewarding chapters covering such vital problems as the upsurge of postwar democracy; the new democratic governments; the mass Communist parties; political unity of Communists and Socialists; Catholics in the new democracies; Soviet influence in Europe; the European policy of the United States; the American people and Wall Street imperialism; and many other subjects.

Initial printing of this new International book is 100,000 copies.

Price: 35¢

"Three for a Dollar"



NEW CENTURY PUBLISHERS • 832 Broadway • New York 3, N. Y.

THE  
MAR  
PLA

Does r  
in any  
vise th  
depart  
since t  
liberate  
ment  
along  
Does t  
serious  
Europ  
step to  
the so  
Minist  
Or  
force a  
Novem  
the T  
Europ  
Weste  
arsena  
acader  
sions  
many  
In v  
has su  
is wel  
on J  
launc

# THE MARSHALL PLAN

By JAMES S. ALLEN

DOES THE MARSHALL PLAN for Europe in any way supplant or basically revise the Truman Doctrine? Is it a departure from the policy which since the death of Roosevelt has deliberately prevented Big Three agreement and already dragged us far along the path away from peace? Does the Marshall plan represent a serious offer for the reconstruction of Europe and world recovery? Is it a step toward a German settlement at the scheduled meeting of Foreign Ministers next November?

Or is it a deliberate attempt to force a showdown in advance of the November meeting, to implement the Truman Doctrine in Western Europe with the aim of erecting a Western Bloc around the Ruhr arsenal and thus seek to render academic and futile further discussions in November of a unified Germany and a European settlement?

In view of the general hokum that has surrounded the Marshall plan it is well to recall the speech at Harvard on June 5, when the General launched the scheme. His proposal

was publicly formulated after two months of preparation, during which talk of the "failure" of the Moscow Conference rose in crescendo and retiring Assistant Secretary Acheson was expounding a plan for "Continental" European recovery centered on the restoration of the trustified Ruhr. In his speech Marshall offered assistance, later unofficially placed at five billion annually for the next four or five years, providing "a number, if not all European countries" would jointly draft a program which would prove both practical and acceptable to the United States. In itself, large-scale American assistance to European reconstruction is necessary and desirable, both from the viewpoint of hastening world recovery and of softening the impact of the coming depression in America. But inevitably the question immediately arose as to the political conditions attached to the offer. Marshall denied that his plan was directed against anybody and asserted that its only purpose is world recovery, of a kind which would "permit the emergence of political and social conditions in which free institutions can exist." Nevertheless, the Secretary of State proceeded in the next breath to threaten "any government which maneuvers to block recovery," and "governments, political parties or groups which seek to perpetuate human misery in order to profit therefrom politically or otherwise."

Contrary to the impression willfully propagated that his was a pure

economic plan with the loftiest humanitarian motives, it is at once apparent that the offer of American aid is hedged in with the same reactionary political considerations that have characterized American policy during the past two years. If not sufficiently plain from the preceding and current actions of the United States, the political strictures in Marshall's speech should make it clear that this was an offer not to Europe as a whole but to Western Europe, and that the Soviet Union, the countries of Eastern Europe, and the Communist Parties and anti-fascist movements of Western Europe and Italy were again being threatened and bullied.

\* \* \*

If there was any doubt on this point, subsequent events could leave no room for doubt. Marshall supplemented his Harvard offer with a hearty endorsement of Churchill's scheme of a United States of Europe, including the admonition that this should be left to the Europeans themselves. Churchill was quick to congratulate Marshall, and his warmth no doubt arose from the invitation, inherent in Marshall's pronouncements, for Britain to take the initiative in the organization of the West European bloc.

Equally revealing was the sleight-of-hand by which the Russian rabbit was finally pulled out of Marshall's hat. The Harvard speech aroused much interest but little enthusiasm, and British official circles showed re-

luctance to take up the cue. It was only a week later, on the insistence of Bevin as later reported, that Marshall casually added his footnote at a press conference, defining Europe as "West of Asia." This was the touch that enabled Bevin to eulogize the plan, in the face of deep and unallayed distrust of American intentions within his own Party, and rush off to Paris in an atmosphere of artificial enthusiasm to improvise with the Ramadier Cabinet within two days, and before the formidable French opposition to an anti-Soviet bloc could fully register, an unconditional acceptance of the American offer.

Like Marshall's afterthought about the Soviet Union, the invitation to Molotov to discuss the plan within a week ("Speed is my guiding principle," Bevin told Parliament), came only after Bevin and Bidault had accepted the Marshall plan and drawn up their own scheme for its implementation, even down to the various economic committees that would be entrusted with the task, within the "framework" of the U.N. European Economic Commission, but at the same time independent of it.

Marshall had not seen fit to mention at Harvard a single agency of the U.N., nor at any time to discuss the matter with Moscow. Indeed, as the Paris correspondent of the *New York Times* reported (June 18), it was generally suspected "that the aim was to open to Russia a door

that  
not  
work  
ing  
spee  
befo  
know  
partic  
sion  
grea  
forc  
Brit  
mee  
pare  
forc  
bloc  
plai  
tirac  
Con  
retu  
chal  
"org  
pate  
or p  
left  
Mo  
of t  
to  
peo  
S  
this  
Ma  
ing  
Mo  
ton  
gra  
So  
be  
tha  
fin  
say

that Washington felt sure she would not enter." Bevin and Bidault worked on the same principle, reaching their joint conclusions with such speed and in such a manner, even before the American terms were known, as to render Soviet participation even in preliminary discussions more difficult. If Bidault under great external pressure was soon forced to deny an agreement with Britain in advance of the projected meeting with Molotov, it was apparent that Bevin was attempting to force a decision in favor of a Western bloc. If this were not sufficiently plain, Bevin's truly Trumanesque tirade against the Soviet Union and Communism in Parliament on his return from Paris, and his blustering challenge that he would proceed to "organize this business" with dispatch and without regard to "finesse or procedure or terms of reference," left no doubt that the invitation to Molotov was merely formal, a trick of the trade by which it was hoped to pull wool over the eyes of the people.

Simultaneous developments on this side of the Atlantic clarified Marshall's footnote further. Following the Anglo-French invitation to Molotov, Assistant Secretary Clayton in charge of the economic program pointedly remarked that if the Soviet Union came along she would be expected to export food rather than be a recipient of American financial aid, which was as much as saying that the Soviet Union was

excluded from Marshall's offer. And to leave no doubt as to the real political objectives of the Marshall plan, Clayton gave official endorsement to Vandenberg's proposal for a bipartisan committee to pass upon the program, linking this proposal with endorsement of Hoover's warning against "over-export" of American goods, by which Hoover meant that the building up of the Ruhr heavy industries with American capital and under United States corporate supervision should take precedence in the plan.

But even more eloquent than these developments were the continuing United States actions in the general sphere of foreign policy, which should have stopped the irresponsible chatter even in well-meaning circles about the death or failure of the Truman Doctrine. The reactionary offensive of the United State continued right on past June 5, the supposed turning point and the beginning of the alleged "new approach" said to be marked by the Harvard speech. The epoch of "new beginnings" was opened by the ferocious political assault upon Hungary and Bulgaria, on the occasion of the action by these governments against the Nagy and Petkov conspirators. Marshall's notes to the Soviet authorities were even more insulting and interventionist than before June 5. Nagy was cordially welcomed to the United States by the State Department, and the welcome was no less cordial after he pro-

claimed himself "a trustee for the cause of Hungary."

In his speech at Ottawa on the inter-American bloc, President Truman repeated some of the key phrases of his Doctrine, and at Princeton on June 17, well after Marshall's tiny footnote about the Soviet Union, the President urged universal military training to show the world that we have the "will to fulfill our pledge to aid free and independent nations to maintain their freedoms" and to help them resist "totalitarian pressure."

In the midst of Bevin's flights between London and Paris on the wings of the Marshall plan, an agreement was concluded with the Greek dictatorship providing for American officials in every government department at Athens, with such strict powers of supervision as to constitute actual American rule over Greece. The military mission in Turkey closed contracts for the construction of airfields large enough to take American super-bombers, while a \$25,000,000 loan for purchase of war equipment was granted Iran, and the President resumed his pressure for Hemisphere arms coordination, following the farcical reconciliation with Peron of Argentina. Marshall sent a note of congratulations to de Gasperi of Italy on the formation of a government without the Communists. And if the nations participating in the International Trade Conference at Geneva had illusions about American "free trade" working both

ways, these were efficiently smoothed by the passage of a high-tariff wool bill in Congress.

• • •

If in some progressive circles there is a tendency to accept the Marshall plan as a basic departure from the Truman Doctrine, it is because the tactical maneuvers of the Marshall plan have been mistaken for a change of policy. A certain coating has been superimposed upon the crude anti-Communist slogans and ill-concealed expansionist ambitions which now typify American propaganda. More refined language, together with "positive" slogans about recovery and reconstruction, have been found necessary in view of the universal ill-will towards the United States aroused by the Truman Doctrine, and especially in view of the deep uneasiness and concern among the American people that they are being cheated out of peace and being led toward a great depression and a new war.

The keen response to Wallace on his triumphal tour of the country, following his warm reception abroad, showed that millions of Americans wanted to break with the reactionary leadership of both parties, were seeking a way to return to the major premises of the Roosevelt program, and in an organized way, even through a third party, save the country from traveling headlong along the path of reaction and aggression where it is being dragged by the Truman Doctrine.

The Marshall plan is therefore conceived by its authors and supporters, not only as a means of obtaining the specific objective of a Western bloc in Europe, but also as a means of assuaging the mounting opposition to the program of imperialist expansion. It is thought to conceal the specific anti-Soviet intentions of the program, as well as its interventionist objective for all Europe, under the pretention of leaving it to the Europeans to work out their own plan and to create some kind of central agency through which the United States could operate without revealing too blatantly its direct intervention in the affairs of other nations, as was the case in Greece and Turkey.

These maneuvers should not be permitted to hide the real nature of the Marshall plan, which is itself an outgrowth of the Truman Doctrine and a further application of it. Like the proposed Four-Power Treaty initiated by Vandenberg and Byrnes, and carried forward at the Moscow Conference by Marshall, the new plan is designed to bypass a joint German settlement and the real problems of democratic reconstruction in Europe, while furthering the aims of dollar diplomacy for a West European sphere. It is addressed specifically to the problem of creating a West European bloc, centered on the Ruhr and owing its existence and loyalty to American capital, just as the immediate objective of the Truman Doctrine speech of March

12 was to establish the United States as a permanent Mediterranean power through the penetration and control of Greece and Turkey.

The Marshall plan is directed, not only against the Soviet Union and the East European democracies, but also against the democratic movements of western Europe, including Britain, and the national sovereignties, economic resources, and colonial spheres of the leading capitalist powers. It is a challenge thrown down, not only to Big Three cooperation, not only to the democratic aspirations of all Europe, but to the efforts of Britain and France to overcome their inner crises, reassert their full national independence, and take their place again as leading world powers.

The entire pedigree of the plan shows that it is the American imperialist alternative to a German settlement along the lines of the Potsdam accord. It is in the direct line of descent from Byrnes' speech at Stuttgart a year ago, during the Paris Conference of Foreign Ministers, when the then Secretary of State first advanced the general policy leading toward the partition of Germany, its splintering into semi-autonomous states, and exclusive Anglo-American control of the Ruhr arsenal.

Along this line the Anglo-American zonal merger was carried through, with the aim of making it "self-sustaining" by 1950, followed soon after the Moscow Conference by the setting up of a separate West German administration or govern-

ment under the guise of an Economic Council. The Marshall plan in its present form was already present in embryo in the corridor hints from the American delegation at the Moscow Conference that because of the impending "failure" of the Conference the United States would proceed with its own plans for Western Europe. Its essential outlines were contained in the innuendoes of Marshall's report on the Moscow Conference, and especially in the speeches of Dulles, the Republican cartel politico who was Marshall's chief adviser at Moscow and who was reported as urging the immediate rupture of the Conference following Truman's "doctrine" speech.

The Marshall plan is inherent in the American drive, underlying its entire European diplomacy, for hegemony in Western Europe based upon control of the Ruhr industries, and from there penetrating into the decisive economic positions of France and the Low Countries as well as their colonies. Despite their pretensions as leaders of the "Western" powers, the Truman Doctrinaires are determined to wrest control of the Ruhr from the British, depriving them of their main base in Europe, and rendering still-born Bevin's pronouncement about the impending "socialization" of the Ruhr, while bludgeoning France into a bloc under American control.

Of all reactionary projects the most elusive is a West European bloc,

for it is at once obvious that such a bloc can be built only at the price of rearing again the German imperialist threat to France and the rest of Europe, at the price of American political intervention and penetration by the corporations in the member countries, and at the price of world recovery and peace. If Bevin, solidly backed by the Tories, rushes into the project, which he also sees as a club that can be used against the Labor Party rebels, it is also plain for everybody to see that "collaboration" with the United States in Germany has led to only greater chaos in the Ruhr and the constant submission of Britain to American policy. And with every increase of American reactionary pressure, including intervention in French politics, political resistance has grown to such an extent in France that it has become the main obstacle to the realization of Wall Street's pet project.

The Marshall plan is an attempt to override this resistance by forcing Britain and France to undertake the organization of the bloc on the pain of being cut off entirely from American economic aid. It is an attempt to organize a Western bloc by blackmail, to force at least the first steps in that direction before the Foreign Ministers meet again in November, to demonstrate that the alternative policy to Big Three understanding is possible, that it is in fact already in operation.

It seeks to follow up quickly on

the in  
Doctri  
minist  
ernme  
against  
Labor  
opposi  
of wh  
over  
would  
ership  
it into  
"show  
well i  
meetin  
Just  
went  
with n  
ment  
case f  
every  
to cre  
ment  
possib  
Europ  
dence  
partit  
Molo  
men  
dang  
desira  
prom  
split,  
ize t  
ment  
side  
of p  
ons,  
ordin  
Sovi  
peac



the initial successes of the Truman Doctrine in France, where the Communists were ousted from the Government, and the victory of Bevin against the "rebels" at the Margate Labor Party Conference, before the opposition strikes back. By the offer of wholesale bribery, and dangling over Britain the pledge that she would be permitted to assume leadership of the bloc, it is hoped to rush it into being, while pushing a final "showdown" with the Soviet Union well in advance of the November meeting.

Just as the American delegation went to the Moscow Conference with no intention of reaching a settlement but instead of building up a case for blaming Russia for "failure," every problem and difficulty is used to create the impression that agreement with the Soviet Union is impossible. Political events in Eastern Europe are pounced upon as evidence of Soviet "intervention" and partition of Europe, although Stalin, Molotov, and other Soviet spokesmen constantly decry talk of a war danger, insist on the possibility and desirability of agreement and compromise, resist every provocation to split, and urge negotiations to realize the aims of the wartime agreements. While official talk on this side of the Atlantic is constantly of preparedness, of new war weapons, of strategic bases and arms coordination with other countries, the Soviet Union reduces its army to peactime strength and abolishes cap-

ital punishment on the main premise that "peace is assured"—a calm and powerful retort to the constant bullying and cajoling which has become the trademark of American diplomacy.

\* . \* . \*

The main strategy carried forward by the Marshall plan clashes head on against the democratic movements and aspirations, the national independence and security of all Europe.

This bold act of dollar piracy is another attempt to divide Europe and the world into hostile blocs, endangering the economic well-being and security of the American peoples as well.

The so-called "positive" aspects of the plan are deceptive, calculated to allay the growing popular uneasiness at home, and to avoid as long as possible the irretrievable political setback for the American expansionists that would result from a final rupture, on United States initiative and pressure, of the Three-Power arrangements remaining from the war.

It is an attempt to undermine with new illusions and cripple with new divisions the upsurging Wallace movement with its program for large-scale economic aid to European reconstruction, based upon a central understanding with the Soviet Union, and offering in its domestic as well as foreign program the alternative to the peace-defeating and depression-hastening Truman Doctrine.

This is the meaning of the Marshall plan, and that is the sense in which the bipartisan and government committees set up by the President will attempt to implement it. How far it is possible to proceed along the path remains to be seen, in the face of the determination of European democracy to achieve reconstruction and recovery through cooperation with the Soviet Union, as well as with the United States and Britain. Bevin's effort to take Western Europe by storm was soon met with the reluctance or outright refusal of most European countries to enter a project from which the Soviet Union is excluded and in which they perceive the implicit threat to their own sovereignty and security.

On her part, by agreeing to preliminary discussions with Britain and France on joint reconstruction of Europe, the Soviet Union showed that she would not be provoked by new maneuvers calculated to bring about a complete rupture of the wartime alliance. Her agreement to participate in exploratory talks at Paris not only was a rebuff to the advocates of a Western bloc but affords still another opportunity to undertake jointly the collective task of European recovery and democratic reconstruction, look-

ing toward a Big Four settlement of the German question in November.

There is no question but that our tremendous resources should be employed to improve our own living conditions and to aid in the reconstruction of the world through large government grants and loans. But it is as plain as day that the forces now in control of the Administration and Congress, and of both major parties, are devoted to opposite ends—to the beating down of the American economic and democratic standards and to imperialist expansion abroad. This is what must be blocked and changed if the country is to be saved from reaction and aggression, implicit in the Truman Doctrine and its various obligations. The alternate course, defense of our democratic liberties and living standards and world cooperation for reconstruction and peace, is represented in the fight led by the unions against the new slave labor law, and by the Roosevelt-Wallace progressives. The welding of these forces into a single progressive coalition and their rapid development into a people's party, independent of the reactionary leadership of both major parties, will lead us along the road to world recovery and peace.

THE  
OF

JULY  
ning  
can  
'76 p  
bour  
beca  
crati  
and  
Wes  
"pris  
tion  
ligh  
racy  
In  
them  
rich  
diti  
larg  
adv  
the  
for  
eigh  
for  
don  
the  
imp  
wh  
den  
and  
in  
An

# THE FOURTH OF JULY, 1947

By ABNER W. BERRY

JULY FOURTH, 1947, marks the beginning of the 172nd year of the American Revolution. The Revolution of '76 presented the world with the first bourgeois-democratic republic and became the inspiration of the democratic masses—artisans, merchants, and peasants—from Haiti in the West Indies to Czarist Russia, the "prison house of peoples." Revolutionary America was the beacon-light of national freedom and democracy for the world.

In the course of the decades since then the American workers have enriched America's revolutionary tradition with gigantic struggles, enlarging the horizon of the people and advancing the democratic gains of the American nation. In the fight for a free labor movement, for the eight-hour day, for free schools and for the establishment of human freedom in the true American tradition, the American working class left its impress on American history. The whole body of New Deal laws is evidence of the growth of the strength and influence of the working class in the further development of the American tradition.

Monopoly capital, today, would reverse this process.

As never before, this July Fourth finds the American tradition under attack by the reactionaries. Big Business, through its Congressional servants and its executive committee, the American Government, is feverishly working with enslaving legislation to shackle the entire labor movement and to destroy the hard-won gains of labor and the people. Southern mill and plantation owners, trying desperately to maintain the remnants of their former slave empire, are resorting more and more flagrantly to lynch law.

The year 1947 is the year of the Truman Doctrine, of the Marshall and Hoover Plans for bullying and destroying the European democracies. Reaction would turn America from the standard-bearer of liberty in 1776 into the oppressor and hangman, into the fomentor of fascism, that more vile modern descendant of the oppressive 18th century monarchies so hated by our forefathers. This is the year when men who fight and die for freedom in China, Greece, Spain, and throughout the colonial world, fight against feudal and royalist reactionaries supplied from the American till, and die by American bullets.

The bankers and generals of the State Department call this "stopping Communism." It is the modern form of the "Holy Alliance" to stop Republicanism. The Truman Doctrine has just as much to do with the wel-

fare of the American people and the furtherance of the American tradition as the program of the "Holy Alliance" had to do with freeing the serfs of Europe.

But this anti-American program of reaction, this crusade for world domination, is palmed off as a "patriotic" campaign. The anti-Americans drape themselves in our country's flag, while they kill the essence of which the flag is a symbol.

Since when is it patriotic to plot wars against our most needed friend for peace under the pretense of searching for peace? Since when can one claim patriotism and Americanism for a Congressional Committee which smothers criticism of warmongers and imperialists? How can the attempt to destroy the democratic attainments of labor over the years be squared with love of country?

No! That is not the road to the fulfillment of the American Dream. That is the road to disaster for the country. The Communist Party and the advanced workers, as well as the progressives generally, by refusing—like the Founding Fathers before them—to accept a political strait-jacket fashioned by the economic royalists, are performing a patriotic duty. July Fourth, to them, is more than an occasion for campaign oratory; it is a rededication to the struggle for the kind of America that will build upon, not reject, the revolutionary and democratic heritage of our nation's past.

At no time has the Communist Party been deluded into thinking what the Founding Fathers thought, that the institution of capitalism, the so-called "free enterprise" system, was the vehicle by which we were to reach the consummation of democracy. That consummation is attainable only under socialism, which ushers in a democracy of a qualitatively higher kind.

Capitalism, during the past 171 years, has not been able to give every American the ballot. It has not been able to wipe out the crime of lynching. It has not been able to guarantee even a minimum of security to the common people of our country. Instead of working toward a nation of free citizens with freedom of speech, freedom from want, freedom from fear, and freedom of religion, the big capitalists and their Southern poll-tax allies are striving to negate these principles. With their slave labor law they want to crush labor's very right to organize and strike! Indeed, they now seek to pull the entire country down to the level of living in the Black Belt; and more, they would export this concept of the "American way" to the world and enforce it with bayonet and bomb.

The Communist Party and a growing section of the democratic camp in America is militantly opposed to this program of capitalist oppression at home and expansion abroad. For this opposition the Com-

munists  
patrio  
Presi  
for gov  
ample  
the mo  
ers say  
it's sub  
The  
is bein  
"totali  
in the  
in esp  
mate  
democ  
most  
tween  
the da  
economi  
cratic  
diction  
tion.  
tion  
capita  
demo  
out as  
cham  
fram  
Henc  
the f  
tarian  
direc  
who  
attac  
right  
direc  
M  
ginn  
Pres  
on t  
at t

Communists are maligned by the dollar patriots.

President Truman's loyalty oath for government employees is an example of such vilification. Through the mouth of the President the bankers say to America, "Stop thinking—it's subversive!"

The attack upon the Communists is being conducted as a war upon "totalitarianism." The Communists in the United States, as everywhere, in espousing socialism as their ultimate program, are thereby, not less democratic, but, on the contrary, most consistently democratic. Between the struggle for socialism and the daily struggles of the people for economic security, peace, and democratic advance, there is no contradiction but a dialectic inter-connection. Because of their basic opposition to capitalist exploitation and capitalism's systematic curbing of democracy, the Communists stand out as the most consistent and valiant champions of democracy in the framework of the bourgeois system. Hence, there is a perverse logic in the fact that the charge of "totalitarianism" and un-Americanism is directed at the Communists by those who constitute the spearhead of the attack upon the people's democratic rights, by those who drive in the direction of fascism.

More and more people are beginning to realize with former Vice-President Wallace that the attacks on the Communists represent blows at the unity of the people against

reaction. The colonists had their Committees of Correspondence and their Minute Men. These made up the democratic leaven in the upswell against imperial oppression. The organized movement for democratic action today has its basic force in the working class. The vanguard, the political outpost, of this class is the Communist Party—minute men on the alert for class, people, and nation.

The revolutionary tradition of our nation embraces the tradition of internationalism. The torch of freedom, kindled in '76, aroused acclaim in the breasts of all freedom-loving men and women overseas. Our nation was born and nurtured in progressive international alliances. Those alliances, vital to the nascence and life of the American republic, were then defamed and attacked by the Royalists and Tories—the forebears of the present-day reactionaries and fascists symbolized by the Un-American Committee.

A magnificent chapter of democratic internationalism in the annals of our nation was the Anglo-Soviet-American coalition which achieved military victory over the fascist Axis. Today, the struggle between democracy and reaction in our national life is keynoted by the struggle for the peacetime unity of the Big Three powers, especially American-Soviet friendship, against the imperialists and fascists who wish to heap ruins upon this internationalism which is

indispensable to world peace and democratic advance.

The Communist Party is viciously maligned because it fights for the program of such vital internationalism and exposes the essential anti-Americanism which seeks to substitute for international amity a course of imperialist intervention in the affairs of other nations as steps toward world domination.

Can it be that our tradition has been so distorted by a monopoly press and reactionary propaganda that we have forgotten our heritage? Men of France and Germany and Poland fought in the American Army of Independence. European democrats, Haitian Negroes, American artisans and Negro-American slaves mingled their blood on the colonial battlefields. And we should never forget that when Republicanism was under concerted attack on the continent by the "Holy Alliance" led by Metternich, revolutionary America stood in solidarity by revolutionary France.

Our "imperialist internationalists" of today would reverse that tradition by seeking ties with the hangmen of European democratic revolutions, the monarchists and fascists. They would trumpet these acts as the "American way."

The Communists challenge and oppose this position of the U.S. in foreign affairs. Internationalism in the truly American and working-class tradition means establishing ties with the oppressed and exploited in

the interest of democratic rule. The test of internationalism today is the way in which relations are maintained with our wartime allies—Britain and, especially, the Soviet Union. Any attempt to split the world in two, to separate East from West, to establish friendly relations only with quislings who will sell out their countries' national interests to American capitalists is to abandon internationalism for imperialist expansionism! And when this policy is buttressed by a warlike campaign of threats against the Soviet Union, the people should beware. This is the opposite of internationalism; it is rabid nationalism, establishing the United States as the reactionary center of the universe and demanding that all other nations revolve about it—or perish. It is nationalism of the same type as that which Hitler paraded as German patriotism and which ultimately brought ruin to the German nation. America can ill afford this latest type of "stop Communism" imperialism.

The working class and the people generally should resolve that this July Fourth shall mark the intensification of the struggle of the democratic camp in the U.S. toward furthering the American tradition.

The final outcome is up to the people.

The workers and all true progressives in America must break away politically from the parties of Big Business. The workers, together with their allies, will have to find a

way ind  
a people  
in the  
be one  
new de  
the peo  
July  
fore m  
struggl  
vancin  
Americ  
be stre

way independently, through a third, a people's party, to express their will in the life of the nation. That must be one of the first steps toward a new declaration of independence by the people.

July Fourth, this year, should therefore mark the beginning of a new struggle for safeguarding and advancing the American tradition. American and world democracy can be strengthened by wiping out lynch-

ing and outlawing Jim Crow and the poll tax. "Life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness" can be made a fact in the lives of the people by guaranteeing the security and well-being of the working men and women. And democracy is endangered as long as there is an Un-American Committee establishing itself as a thought-control police organ.

# A DEMOCRATIC SOLUTION FOR PALESTINE

By ALEXANDER BITTELMAN

SOMETHING HIGHLY IMPORTANT happened at the special session of the United Nations General Assembly, in May, with regard to Palestine. At that session, a just and democratic set of principles for the solution of the Palestine crisis was projected by one of the most powerful countries on earth—the Soviet Union—and supported by representatives of other democratic states. Thus, a just and democratic solution for Palestine became a practical and realizable possibility in the not too distant future. This is a fact of tremendous importance to the two peoples of Palestine—Jews and Arabs—as well as for the entire Middle East and for the world in general. As to the Jewish masses, these developments were greeted by them as opening a new chapter in the history of the Jewish people.

This was not at all what the British and American governments were

expecting and planning. The decision of the British government to refer the question of Palestine to the United Nations, without committing itself to the acceptance of that body's recommendations, was generally understood as a maneuver to gain time. The imperialists of Britain and the United States still have to reach agreement on such major issues as the division and control of the Near East oil reserves, air traffic, air and naval bases, commerce, and capital investments. Failure to reach agreement on these issues, even though the international oil cartel has been re-established under Wall Street domination, is the major cause for the failure of the British and American governments to reach a much sought for political agreement for an Anglo-American imperialist domination of the Near East. Hence the failure thus far of the Anglo-American bloc to reach agreement on Palestine, except that the solution must be an imperialist one and that, as far as the imperialists can manage, the influence of the Soviet Union must be kept out.

In the light of the foregoing, it is undoubtedly the purpose of the British and American governments to make use of the time gained to try to iron out their differences behind the screen of the United Nations' investigating committee, and to attempt also to reach an understanding with those reactionary groups among the Arabs and Jews respectively that are most likely to join



up with the imperialist schemes for the further domination of Palestine. If these designs succeed, it may also be the intention of these two governments to seek United Nations approval of their mutual behind-the-scenes understandings. These seem to be the expectations and plans of the British and American governments for the prevention of a democratic and anti-imperialist solution in Palestine and for keeping the whole matter strictly in the hands of the Anglo-American bloc, whatever the exact forms of their intended "solution."

#### NEW FACTORS

But this is not likely to succeed. Whatever final agreements the American and British monopolists and cartelists may reach—and this, too, will not be an easy matter—the solution of the Palestine crisis is no longer completely and exclusively in the hands, and under the control, of the British and American governments. The Palestine issue is now before the United Nations, and new factors have already entered actively into the situation, major factors of a democratic, non-imperialist, and anti-imperialist nature. These factors are bound to affect materially, if not decisively in the immediate future, the solution of the Palestine question.

What Gromyko's famous speech on Palestine did was not only to project a democratic and just solution for Palestine as a guide to the United

Nations. This it did, of course, and it was supported by the new democratic governments of Europe represented in the General Assembly. But it did more than that. It demonstrated before the whole world that a democratic solution for Palestine will enjoy the backing of powerful democratic, progressive, and socialist forces all over the world; that, therefore, a democratic solution is a practical and realizable solution in the present world situation. This demonstration will most certainly help consolidate the democratic and progressive forces among the Jewish and Arab peoples of Palestine. In fact, it is already doing so, thus contributing powerfully to an eventual Arab-Jewish understanding for a democratic solution. Finally, the Gromyko proposals have also demonstrated that it is possible for Great Britain, the Soviet Union, and the United States to work together to help the United Nations attain a just settlement, on the basis of complete equality, with due and consistent regard to the independence of Palestine and to the equal national rights of the two peoples inhabiting that country. It remains for the democratic, labor, and progressive masses of the United States and Britain to see to it that the governments of these countries work with the Soviet Union, not against it, for the solution of the Palestine problem as well as all the other problems affecting the peace and democracy of the world.

### FOR A DEMOCRATIC AND INDEPENDENT JEWISH-ARAB PALESTINE STATE

A just and democratic solution of the Palestine crisis is the establishment of what Gromyko called "one dual, democratic Arab-Jewish state" in Palestine. This is the only solution that is completely and basically sound from a democratic standpoint. It is the best and most permanent solution from the standpoint of the national interests of both peoples of Palestine.

There are, of course, other positions. Among the reactionary nationalists of both Arabs and Jews the popular solution is one that would turn Palestine into a state of only one people, ignoring and suppressing the national rights and interests of the other. This is the meaning of the demand of the reactionary Jewish nationalists for turning the whole of Palestine into a Jewish state and equally of the demand of the reactionary Arab nationalists for turning the whole of Palestine into an Arab state.

To begin with, these demands are undemocratic. They are pregnant with possibilities of national strife of a reactionary character. They endanger the peace and security of both peoples in Palestine. In addition, these demands are *impractical and unrealizable*. The democratic and anti-imperialist forces of the world oppose such demands because they are neither just nor democratic and because they are a threat to peace.

On the other hand, neither the British nor the American government, for imperialist reasons, supports the demands for turning Palestine into either an Arab or Jewish state.

Turning Palestine over to either Arabs or Jews, even under imperialist hegemony, does not fit the schemes of either British or American imperialism or both. This has been proved by life itself. The only solutions thus far brought forward or indicated by the governments of these two countries were these: From Britain—the Morrison Plan for turning Palestine into a so-called "federation" of provinces (Jewish, Arab, British, and a military reservation), retaining fully imperialist domination shared by England and America, and granting certain minor rights of local self-government to the Jewish and Arab provinces respectively. From the United States—the well advertised report that the Truman Administration favors the imperialist partition of Palestine, with the setting up of two so-called states (a Jewish state and an Arab state) under the hegemony, to be exercised either jointly or separately, of British and American imperialism.

The imperialists trust neither the Palestine Jews nor the Palestine Arabs. Not only do they oppose the national liberation of the two peoples and the independence of Palestine, but they are also fearful lest either of them become too strong for "convenient" handling if allowed

to beco  
Palest  
ish no  
suppor  
Palestin  
ples.

It is  
this qu  
the Un  
likely  
turning  
or a Je  
jor gov  
the sm  
far as  
cerned  
cal ar  
means  
genera  
forces,  
realiza  
is well  
the Zi  
the of  
for tu  
Jewish  
people  
ing th  
Arabs  
even  
nation  
deman

Con  
propo  
by var  
We si  
enjoyi  
the Z  
cently  
ion, o  
the J

to become the *dominant* people in Palestine. Hence, neither the British nor the American government supports the demand for turning Palestine over to one of its two peoples.

It is therefore legitimate to pose this question: what governments in the United Nations support, or are likely to support the demand for turning Palestine into either an Arab or a Jewish state? None of the major governments and very few of the small ones. This means that, as far as the United Nations is concerned, these demands are impractical and unrealizable. This also means that they are impractical in general; that there are no adequate forces, actual or potential, for the realization of these demands. This is well understood in wide circles of the Zionist movement, even though the official policy continues to call for turning Palestine over to the Jewish people. Among the Arab people, too, the realization is growing that turning Palestine over to the Arabs is not a practical proposition, even though the dominant official nationalist leadership continues to demand an Arab Palestine.

Consequently, other demands and proposals are being pressed forward by various Jewish and Arab groups. We shall examine here one that is enjoying considerable support among the Zionists. It is the proposal recently restated by David Ben Gurion, chairman of the Executive of the Jewish Agency for Palestine,

which calls for the establishment of a Jewish state in a part of Palestine—an "adequate" part—with the Arab part of Palestine remaining under British mandate. Other versions of the same plan provide for the Arab portion of Palestine organizing its own state or joining in one of the existing Arab states.

A rather frank Zionist argumentation for such partition plans is to be found in a recent article by Z. Aharonowitz, an important official of the Jewish trade unions in Palestine. Writing in the Hebrew trade union paper, *Davar*, he says:

It is obvious that there are no Zionist prospects of obtaining at present the recognition of our right to establish a Jewish state in the whole of Palestine. . . . The Zionist movement must clearly decide now on the creation of a Jewish state in a large part of Palestine as the sole Zionist solution of our generation (*New York Times*, June 2, 1947).

#### THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THESE SCHEMES

A significant feature of all these schemes of partition is that the central question of the *independence* of the partitioned state or states is left very much in the dark. It is assumed by the authors of these plans (Ben Gurion and others) that somehow Great Britain and the United States will "protect and assist" the Jewish state which will have to orientate on these two countries. Thus, it is clear that the partition

plans of a section of the Zionist movement do not call for an independent and democratic Jewish state but rather for an imperialist partition of Palestine, retaining and even strengthening British and Anglo-American domination in the partitioned state or states, with the so-called Jewish state receiving a certain measure of autonomy in local self-government. The crucial question of Jewish-Arab relations following partition is looked upon by its Zionist authors as a problem to be solved with the "help," and under the supervision, of Anglo-American imperialism.

Support for such partition schemes has come recently from the non-Zionist American Jewish Committee, the organization that is dominated by big capitalists and strongly influenced by some of the most reactionary monopoly circles. This Committee opposes the independence of Palestine, favoring a long-term trusteeship by the United Nations, and suggesting partition as an alternative to immediate independence. The plan of this Committee is quite obviously calculated to go along with the plans of the American imperialists for Palestine and is based upon Anglo-American imperialist collaboration.

Consequently, the following has to be said about these partition schemes: they are not democratic; they do not provide for the proper defense and safeguarding of the legitimate interests and equal na-

tional rights of both peoples of Palestine. They are based upon imperialist solutions of the Palestine problem, upon continuing imperialist rule by the Anglo-American bloc. These schemes definitely sacrifice the aspirations of the Jewish people for the development of a Jewish national homeland in Palestine because such a homeland can be realized *only in a free, independent, and democratic Jewish state, capable of living in peace, security, and collaboration with the Arab people of Palestine and with all Arab peoples.* And these conditions can be realized *only* in a Jewish-Arab independent and democratic state in Palestine.

#### THE ONLY DEMOCRATIC AND PRACTICAL SOLUTION

On the question of such a state, the point is raised in various quarters that while this proposal does supply a just and democratic solution, it may not be realizable because of the unwillingness or inability of the Jews and Arabs of Palestine to live together in one state. It is pointed out, further, that Gromyko himself anticipated such a situation and, hence, expressed readiness to consider the alternative of establishing two separate states. To this the main answer is the following. First, only in practice, *only in the struggle for Arab-Jewish understanding and for the establishment of a joint Arab-Jewish independent state in Palestine, will it be proved whether such a state*

is realizable and practical. Secondly, the democratic, socialist and progressive forces, consequently, must fight for such a solution. Thirdly, a separate independent Jewish state, as alternative to one dual Arab-Jewish state because of the deterioration of Arab-Jewish relations, would not be able to live a secure or normal national life, and the growth of a Jewish national homeland in Palestine would be seriously retarded and even jeopardized.

Consider this last point. The question of considering the establishment of two separate states as an alternative to one dual state will arise, among the supporters of a consistent democratic solution, only if it is proved that one dual state cannot now be realized because Arab-Jewish relations have seriously worsened. But what will this mean? It will mean that the tiny Jewish state will be surrounded by an ocean of Arab hostility which Arab reactionaries will not fail to exploit. These reactionaries will resort to all means to combat the Jewish state, including economic boycotts, political provocations, and armed conflict. On the other hand, Jewish reactionaries will not fail to exploit this condition of national strife to sharpen still further Jewish-Arab relations. Under such conditions, the reactionaries of both sides will be playing up to Anglo-American imperialism which will know how to make use of these rivalries and conflicts to exploit and

oppress both peoples and to maintain its rule in Palestine.

It must not be forgotten that even if the two separate states live in friendship and collaboration, they will have great difficulties in building up and developing their national economies because of their small size, the nature of the land, etc. But if these two states live in strife and conflict, which presumably must be the case if two separate states become necessary, then the economic difficulties will be almost insurmountable.

We must therefore conclude that the only adequate, democratic, and practical solution for both Jews and Arabs is the setting up of one Arab-Jewish independent and democratic state in Palestine, guaranteeing the equal national rights of both peoples. For the Jewish state, no other solution can provide sufficient guarantees for the peaceful development and growth of a Jewish national homeland in Palestine.

#### UNITY FOR A DEMOCRATIC SOLUTION

To achieve a democratic solution in Palestine means, to begin with, to free the country and its peoples from foreign rule, from the domination of British imperialism. It means to prevent the setting up of a combined Anglo-American imperialist domination of Palestine. As pointed out above, the British and American governments are seeking a private understanding behind the back of

the United Nations, later to be rubber-stamped by it, and at the expense of the freedom and well-being of the peoples of Palestine. Hence, it will require the united efforts of all progressive and democratic forces of the peoples of Palestine, the Arabs, as well as of the Jewish people, the American people, and all the United Nations to attain a just and democratic solution of the Palestine problem.

Only by such a unity of the democratic forces here and abroad can we achieve through the United Nations the abolition of the British mandate, the building up of an Arab-Jewish understanding, the setting up of one dual Arab-Jewish independent and democratic state in Palestine. For us, in the United States, the question of united action on Palestine involves the double problem of, first, stimulating the united activities of the labor-progressive coalition of the American people in favor of a democratic solution for Palestine, and, secondly, of helping to consolidate the united action of the American Jewish masses in favor of such a solution. Both of these closely related tasks have to be tackled in order to exert maximum influence upon the position of the American government in the United Nations on the question of Palestine.

What must the people demand of the Truman Administration on the Palestine issue? They must demand that the American government:

1. Fulfill the obligations assumed

by the United States to support the upbuilding of a Jewish national homeland in Palestine for the establishment of a Jewish state in Palestine;

2. Support the setting up of one dual Arab-Jewish state in Palestine as an independent and democratic state, free from foreign domination, with the complete abolition of the British mandate;

3. Support the demand for the immediate transfer of Palestine to the United Nations, which shall seek to bring about an Arab-Jewish understanding for Jewish immigration into Palestine and for the setting up of an independent Arab-Jewish state guaranteeing the equal national rights of both peoples;

4. Support the demand that the United Nations at once assume responsibility for the Jewish refugees in the D.P. camps and seek to open the doors of the United Nations to these refugees;

5. Collaborate with the governments of the Soviet Union and Great Britain for the attainment by the United Nations of a just and democratic solution for Palestine.

#### DEMANDS ALL PROGRESSIVES CAN SUPPORT

These demands upon our government can be supported by every progressive American regardless of whatever other ideas and proposals he or she may have on Palestine. Zionists as well as non-Zionists can support united action for the above-

stated demands because they incorporate the fundamental propositions that must form part of a just solution of the Palestine problem. Certainly only the united action of all progressive forces of the American people, regardless of ideology and party affiliation, can succeed in impressing upon the Truman Administration the need of a democratic solution, considering that the present policy of our government is reactionary and imperialist. Such united action can be attained only on a broad platform of demands which are already favored by the broadest masses of the American people. Certainly no united action can be realized on platforms of a strictly partisan nature, as is evident in the many, varied, and conflicting proposals submitted by a number of American organizations to the United Nations.

*We make a plea for united action toward a democratic solution.* This does not require the abandonment of party position or ideologies in the matter of Palestine. We Communists support the program of united action set forth above without giving up any of our ideological opposition to bourgeois nationalism (as well as to bourgeois assimilationism). We support this program of demands upon the American government because these demands are in accord with our position on the Jewish question in general and on the Palestine question in particular, as formulated in the resolution of our Party on "Com-

munist Work Among the American Jewish Masses."\* We support these demands because they are in accord with our general position on the struggle against imperialism and the Truman Doctrine, against the war incendiaries, against reaction and fascism, against anti-Semitism, for a democratic and stable peace, for equal rights, for national freedom and independence, for social progress and democracy.

#### NO DEPARTURE FROM MARXISM

However, it is claimed by certain Zionist writers that Communists can support the idea of a Jewish state only by departing from Marxism. This is not true, of course, as is demonstrated in the resolution just cited.

Moreover, when the Soviet government promulgated in 1934 the famous decree for establishing Birobidjan as a Jewish Autonomous Region, Kalinin explained that the purpose was to create a *Jewish state unit*, Jewish statehood, for the economic and cultural development of a Jewish nationality. Not only did this constitute no departure from Marxism, but, on the contrary, it was the development of Marxism applied to the solution of the Jewish question *in the concrete circumstances of the Soviet Union*. It follows inevitably from Stalin's historic contributions to the solution of the national question and from the entire

\* See *Political Affairs*, November, 1946—  
The Editors.

Marxist-Leninist policy of the Soviet government on this question.

This proves conclusively that there is no contradiction in principle between Marxism and the idea of a Jewish state. It also proves that Marxists brought forth and supported the idea of a Jewish state when the objective conditions became ripe for it, *when progressive forces had made their appearance on the historic stage, forces interested in, and capable of, realizing the aspirations of large sections of the Jewish people for a Jewish state.* This is what happened in the Soviet Union with regard to Birobidjan. This is what prompted Marxists in the recent period to raise the question of Jewish statehood and of a Jewish state in Palestine.

It was Stalin, in his polemics with the "Bund" in 1913\* and in other writings, who insisted and demonstrated scientifically that a people cannot live a normal and full national life—cannot be a single nation—if it does not have a common territory, does not have one national economy, language, and culture. Stalin was speaking about the Jewish people. This meant two things. First, the Jewish people cannot act as a single nation, much as they may desire it. Second, in the absence of a Jewish community anywhere on earth growing into nationhood, the Zionist policies for a Jewish state at that time (1913) were not only utop-

ian but profoundly reactionary since no progressive forces of any sort were then present in the objective situation interested in and capable of realizing the dream of a Jewish state. It is still true today that the Zionist conception that the Jews of all lands constitute one single nation is of a bourgeois-nationalist character.

But the most significant thing is this: when the Russian Marxists became the leaders of the old Russian state, and the Socialist Soviet Union was established, realizing the Marxist solution of the national question, these same Marxists raised the question of creating conditions for the establishment of a Jewish state. Why? Because, according to Stalin, no complete national life is possible without a common country and common statehood; because the Jewish people are as much entitled to a normal national life as other peoples; and because the Socialist Soviet Union had the necessary progressive forces for formulating and eventually realizing the task of developing a Jewish state unit in the Soviet Union.

As to Palestine, an examination of the *concrete circumstances* will demonstrate that in the present period, especially since the rise of Hitler-fascism and throughout the Second World War, the experiences of the Jewish people have made the dream of a Jewish state in Palestine the aspiration and desire of wide masses. A Jewish national community has grown up in Palestine during these

\* *Marxism and the National and Colonial Question*, International Publishers, New York.

years.  
gees in  
Palest  
progre  
are no  
ing st  
and A



years. Large groups of Jewish refugees in the D.P. camps want to go to Palestine. And—most important—*progressive and democratic forces* are now active in the world, including such forces among the Jewish and Arab peoples, interested in and

capable eventually of realizing a Jewish state in Palestine. The concrete problem now is: how can this best be realized? The answer is: by setting up one dual Jewish-Arab state in an independent and democratic Palestine.

# FOSTER'S CONTRIBUTION TO TRADE UNION THEORY AND PRACTICE

By JACK STACHEL

During the half century traversed by this book the American trade union movement has made great progress. From an organization of less than 2,000,000 members, which was constantly fighting a life and death struggle for survival, it has grown into a vast, well-established labor movement of 15,000,000 affiliates. From a narrow organization chiefly of skilled workers, it has now become representative of the whole working class. In doing so organized labor has also achieved substantial improvements in program, leadership, and social outlook. In the course of this evolution many of the progressive fights of the left wing were definitely victorious; but there are still many more big battles to be won if the labor movement is to be able to stand against the powerful, fascist-minded monopoly capitalists now arrayed against it.

THESE ARE THE opening words of the final chapter of the new book by William Z. Foster, just made available to us by International Publishers. In its 375 pages, *American Trade Unionism — Principles and Organization, Strategy and Tactics*, covers the history and problems of the labor movement of our country for the past half century. Except for its last chapter, entitled "Summary

and Conclusions," it is a collection of earlier writings of Comrade Foster. The selections are taken from his books *Misleaders of Labor* (1927) and *From Bryan to Stalin* (1936); from his important work published in 1922, *The Bankruptcy of the American Labor Movement*; and from his numerous pamphlets and articles written in the course of the great struggles of the workers up to recent days.

What is most striking in this book is the fact that, although it is a selection of earlier writings, it has, in its content and structure, the force of an urgent message addressed to the problems of today. It has the quality, not only of a rounded-out history of the trade union movement of the past 50 years, but also of a scientific manual, laying down, as the book's title indicates, the principles and organization, the strategy and tactics of American trade unionism.

Needless to say, no other American could have produced this book. It is the product of a man who has actively participated in all the major struggles of the American workers during the past half century. Sometimes this participation was direct,

as in the great struggles of the packinghouse workers, the great steel strike of 1919, and many others. At other times this participation, no less valuable, was through the role of the Communist Party, of which Comrade Foster has been an outstanding leader for more than a quarter of a century, and is now its outstanding leader and National Chairman.

In a very real sense, this book is the history, not only of this country's labor movement, but also of the contributions of Comrade Foster himself to that movement. In the last quarter of a century the role of Comrade Foster and the role of the Communist Party are merged into one. And when we study the earlier contributions of Comrade Foster, that is, before the birth of the Communist movement in the United States, we also see how inevitable it was that his future should be bound up with the Marxist party of the American working class. For it was from the forces developed by Foster and others associated with him that there came the best elements that formed the American Communist movement.

Quite early in his life we see the development, not only of a brilliant organizer passionately devoted to the interests of the workers, but also of a profound thinker, studying the past history of the labor movement in the United States and in other countries, learning from the victories and defeats of the working class, and developing the body of knowledge

which made him the outstanding figure that he was even before he became a leader of the Communist Party.

This book will fill a pressing need. There is nothing comparable to it in existence. Time and again, those of us who teach classes on the history of the labor movement, on strategy and tactics, have felt the need for such a book. We have felt it, not only in our desire to facilitate our teaching, but also in the desire of the workers to master the scientific principles essential to the growth and struggles of the American trade union movement. We felt this need when the labor movement was only beginning to grow into its present size more than a decade ago, and we feel it even more now when the working class movement must cope with tremendous problems, as Comrade Foster indicates in the paragraph quoted above.

\* \* \*

Irrespective of the immediate outcome of the struggle against the Taft-Hartley Bill—as yet uncertain as these lines are written—there are fundamental lessons that the labor movement must draw from this struggle. Obviously, the problems facing labor will be different if labor is shackled with this vicious law—a step in the direction of fascism, as Philip Murray called it—than if this legislation is defeated. But the fact is that the labor movement, after years of struggle and advance, faces a life-and-death struggle for its

very existence, whether the Taft-Hartley Bill is enacted or not. For Big-Business hopes to weaken and, if possible, destroy the trade union movement; to wipe out labor's gains, not only of the last decade, but of many decades.

Labor's experience in this struggle points many sharp lessons. First, it shows that no progress made by the labor movement under capitalism is permanent and that constant vigilance and struggle are required to maintain the gains achieved. This holds true not only for the rights of labor directly menaced by the Taft-Hartley Bill; it also involves the economic gains of labor with respect to wages, hours, working conditions, etc. The employers want to weaken the unions, to re-establish, if possible, the open shop, for the purpose of reducing the living standards of the workers. And this they intend to do, not only through direct attacks against wages, hours, and working conditions, but also through legislation to wipe out or reduce the social benefits won by the workers, such as the Wages and Hours Act, the Social Security Law, etc.

Secondly, it shows that, as an integral part of their imperialist drive for world domination, the monopolies aim to drive down the living standards of the workers and establish more firmly their dictatorship over the American people. It can be expected that this attack will sharpen as the internal contradictions become sharper, as we move nearer to

a new economic crisis, the signs of whose maturing are beginning to manifest themselves. This attack will also sharpen as a consequence of the realities that the Truman Doctrine will come up against in the sphere of foreign affairs. It will also become more evident that this attack of capitalist reaction is not merely against the workers, but is a general attack directed against the economic interests and civil rights of the Negro people, the farmers, the middle classes, etc.

A third important lesson that emerges out of labor's immediate experiences is how bankrupt is the policy of reliance on the two old parties and how necessary it is for labor to organize itself for independent political action in alliance with all other democratic and progressive forces.

A fourth lesson, that will become more and more evident, is the importance of building the unions on the basis of a genuinely progressive program and along the lines of the fullest trade union democracy, all of which involves the class education of the workers, the development of their initiative and activity. Only unions built on such a basis will be able to withstand reaction's attack and organize the defense of the workers' interests. The inner weaknesses within the labor movement, the concessions to reaction, to Red-baiting and Negro discrimination, have played no small part in encouraging reaction in its present attack against labor. The labor movement

mus  
elec  
amo  
and  
agen  
thes  
mid  
Fr  
othe  
trad  
of la  
visio  
failu  
nati  
of t  
maj  
bra  
this  
to l  
of  
Bill  
req  
to c  
bor  
def  
pec  
ent  
it.  
I  
situ  
mo  
app  
tra  
wr  
his  
no  
wo  
sha  
fer  
exi

must therefore fight against those elements within its own ranks, among them, those Social-Democrats and other reactionaries who act as agents of the employers, who inject these divisive tendencies into its midst.

Finally, paramount among many other lessons is the necessity for trade union unity and united action of labor. Who will deny that the division in the labor movement, the failure to achieve united action on a national scale under the great threat of the Taft-Hartley Bill, has been a major factor contributing to the brazenness of Congress in passing this legislation? How can labor fail to learn from this lesson, irrespective of the outcome of the Taft-Hartley Bill? If the bill becomes law, it will require the strongest unity of labor to defeat its aim of smashing the labor movement. Even if the bill is defeated, it can reasonably be expected that the majority of the present Congress will again try to enact it.

\* \* \*

It is against the background of the situation facing the trade union movement today that one can best appreciate this work on American trade unionism. Reading this book, written by the Marxist Foster with his vast practical experience, one is not surprised that the American workers have to go through the sharp struggle they now face to defend their gains, to defend the very existence of their trade unions. Even

to those who are not fully acquainted with the Marxist analysis of classes and class relations, the role of capitalism, and the inevitability of socialism as the next stage in social progress, the lesson of the struggle today drives home the point that the capitalists yield to the workers' demands only when they must, and that they will attack the workers again at the first opportunity. This stands out clearly in Comrade Foster's book. Foster, the Marxist, also illuminates why this is so and, above all, what the workers can and must do about it.

Reading Foster's book, workers can also learn much from the experiences of the working class after the First World War. They will learn how their organizations were attacked by the Big Business interests, how government by injunction was used to smash their strikes and their organizations. They will see how the first postwar depression that preceded the great crisis of 1929 was used to weaken the trade unions. They will learn much as to the policies pursued by the dominant leaders of the trade unions at that time and how costly this misleadership was. They will see how many of these leaders accommodated themselves to the policies of the open-shoppers after World War I, resulting in the loss of most of the wartime gains of the workers and the millions of new members that joined the A. F. of L. during the war and in the first years after the war. They

will learn the real meaning of class collaboration as against the policy of struggle in defense of the workers' interests.

Obviously, the situation today on a world scale and within the United States is not identical with that which prevailed after the First World War. Yet, if the experience of that period be mastered and used as a guide to action today, labor will go far in adopting policies and tactics that will stand it in good stead in its efforts to defeat reaction's attack today.

From the history and experiences of the labor movement unfolded in this book it becomes clear what role was played, first by the Left-wing in the Socialist and labor movement and then by the Communists and those influenced by them, in the progress of the labor movement, as well as the role played by such giants of the labor movement of the past half century as Eugene V. Debs, Bill Haywood and Foster. How ridiculous becomes the charge of Communist interference in the internal affairs of the trade unions, and how patently reactionary the attempt to separate the Communists from the labor movement, when one learns of the contributions made to the trade union movement by these pioneers.

How can one separate these men and what they stand for from the final achievements in organizing the 15 million workers who comprise the trade unions today? How can one disassociate these men from the fight

for industrial unionism as the only means by which the millions in the basic and trustified industries could have become organized? In this regard, the outstanding contribution of Foster was two-fold. First, he never adopted a doctrinaire approach to industrial unionism. He was willing to work with the existing craft unions to achieve the organization of the unorganized even if this meant practical compromises such as were arrived at in the organization of the steel workers in 1919. He never gave up the fight for industrial unionism, but always kept foremost in his mind the goal of organizing the workers, depending on life itself to drive home many of the bitter lessons that had to be learned.

Because of this, Foster very early became a bitter foe of dual unionism, in contrast to most of the Left forces in the Socialist and labor movement of the early part of the present century. He fought against a policy that would separate the more progressive and Left sections of the labor movement from the mass of the workers in the reactionary-controlled unions. He was the first to organize the progressive forces for achieving the organization of the unorganized through the existing unions, and he had great successes in this endeavor in the period during and immediately following the First World War.

The trade unions were defeated in the major struggles of that period, and the leadership of the A. F. of L.

liter-  
unsk  
from  
of st  
class  
comi  
in  
prea  
owne  
ers'  
icy,  
Edu  
at fir  
wing  
with  
A. I  
Socia  
polic  
then  
to d  
wage  
ter o  
the v  
whic  
Unio  
durin  
meri  
than  
lion  
T.U.  
check  
Hoo  
later  
unio  
of th  
Bu  
ing  
look  
unio  
itself  
to or

literally helped drive many of the unskilled and semi-skilled workers from the unions. Instead of a policy of struggle, it adopted a policy of class collaboration to the point of becoming the agents of the employers in organizing speed-up, and it preached labor-banking and stock ownership as a solution to the workers' problems. To combat this policy, Foster, and the Trade Union Educational League which he headed at first, helped organize a broad Left-wing and progressive movement within the A. F. of L. But when the A. F. of L. leaders, including the Social-Democrats, embarked upon a policy of wholesale expulsions and then did nothing during the crisis to defend the unemployed and the wage standards of the workers, Foster did not shrink from organizing the workers into independent unions which later joined to form the Trade Union Unity League. The T.U.U.L. during this period, despite its numerical weakness, led more strikes than the A. F. of L. with its two million members. By this struggle, the T.U.U.L. was able in many cases to check the wage-cutting drive under Hoover, and contribute much to the later building of the independent unions and, finally, the formation of the C.I.O.

But again Foster, never abandoning fundamental principles, did not look upon the formation of the new unions of the T.U.U.L. as an end in itself. Always the central object was to organize the workers and to unite

the labor movement. When the first opportunity arose, many of the T.U.U.L. unions rejoined the A. F. of L. and many of them became the very unions that formed the nucleus of the C.I.O. This also helps explain the fight today of Foster and our Party for the unification of the trade union movement. Of course, we never were, and are not now, advocates of a policy of unity at any price. We know, for example, that the two great union centers today, the C.I.O. and the A. F. of L., even though divided into two separate organizations, represent much greater working-class unity than did the old A. F. of L., with its few million members, which resisted the organization of the unorganized. We stand for unity on a minimum program that will assure the growth of a united organization dedicated to the defense of the workers' interests. We favor united action now, even before full unification of the A. F. of L. and the C.I.O. is achieved.

\* \* \*

The workers, now faced with the urgent necessity to organize their own political party, in alliance with the Negro people, the farmers, the professionals and others, can also learn much from the earlier experiences of the labor movement. This, too, emerges forcefully from Comrade Foster's book. While the situation as regards political action is not the same as in previous periods, the possibilities are much greater, and there are many lessons to be

learned, many pitfalls to be avoided.

There is hardly a problem facing the workers that will not be more easily tackled if the experience of the last half century of labor's struggles, brought together by Foster in this book, is mastered. This is true of the necessity for the trade union movement to undertake a serious defense of the rights of the Negro workers and the Negro people generally. It is true in the field of international labor solidarity, which is now symbolized in the great World Federation of Trade Unions. The book also has many lessons regarding the trade unions' responsibility to the women workers and the young workers, as well as the foreign-born, now again the subject of intimidation as after the First World War.

For the practical trade union organizer, the book contains a wealth of material on how to organize, on strike strategy and tactics, on the relations of labor to the community, on how to wage campaigns, on legislative work, on shop stewards, on making and enforcing contracts, etc. An outstanding contribution of this book is the material on the struggle to achieve genuine democracy in the trade unions. This question is approached in the most fundamental manner, by a Marxist and practical trade union organizer who knows the necessity for trade union discipline, by one who never confuses democracy with chaos and anarchy. The question of trade union democracy is not approached in the

abstract. It is linked with the policy of struggle, with the development of the initiative of the workers and their education in the meaning of struggle and responsibility. Comrade Foster's presentation of this problem is, of course, not an underestimation of leadership. On the contrary, the emphasis is on the highest quality of leadership.

\* \* \*

There is one chapter in this book which alone would make it of the greatest value to the labor movement today. It is the chapter dealing with "The Communist and the Trade Unions." Written in question and answer form this chapter takes up such questions as the following:

What part do the Communists play in the trade unions? What is meant by Communist trade union work?

Is it a fact, as is often charged, that the Communists in the trade unions always set out to capture these organizations?

Do Communists form factions (organized party groups) within the trade unions?

What is the attitude of the Communists toward unauthorized strikes and toward trade union discipline generally?

Is it true that Communists consider trade union agreements "mere scraps of paper" to be violated at will?

What is the Communist policy on the arbitration of labor disputes?

What about seniority in industry?

Do s  
ment  
practi  
WH  
appre  
WH  
towar  
and  
trade  
I o  
alway  
union  
Ca  
a ge  
ment  
WH  
dema  
into  
WH  
tentio  
wage  
crises  
Ho  
dema  
WH  
gard  
polic  
WH  
quest  
labor  
when  
them  
answ  
page  
Merc  
corre  
porta  
TH  
the l  
nist  
tiona



Do seniority clauses in union agreements constitute a good or bad practice?

What is the Communist policy on apprentices in industry?

What is the Communist attitude toward sick and death benefits and other fraternal features in the trade unions?

I often hear it said: "Communists always bring politics into the unions." What's the answer?

Can craft unions exist as part of a general progressive labor movement?

Why do Communists so insistently demand the admission of Negroes into the trade unions?

What is there to the common contention of the reactionaries that high wages are the cause of economic crises?

How do Communists raise the demand for the right to work?

What is the Communist stand regarding employers' share-the-work policies?

Will any one deny that all of these questions are as much issues in the labor movement today as they were when Comrade Foster answered them in 1939? These 15 questions and answers from but eight of the 375 pages of this urgently needed book. Merely from the urgency of these correct answers we can judge the importance of this volume.

They are especially important in the light of the present anti-Communist drive, instigated by the reactionaries and reflected within the

trade unions themselves. These questions and answers, as well as the entire book, will not only better enable us to expose the Red-baiters inside and outside the labor movement: they will also help make clear our policies to many honest workers and trade union leaders who have a wrong view as to what those policies are. More than this, they will actually bring clarity to many Communists and Left-wing elements who often make mistakes because they do not themselves know fully the position of our Party on various questions.

\* \* \*

Let us close this review by actual quotations of the answers to the first three questions mentioned above, in the order that they appear in Foster's book. We believe that, thus, if any doubt still remains, every Party member will be convinced that he must secure a copy of this book. And this, we believe, will also move every Party member to get this book into the hands of as many shopmates and trade union leaders as possible.

Q. What part do Communists play in the trade unions? What is meant by Communist trade union work?

A. Workers organize into trade unions primarily in order to win higher wages, shorter hours, and better working conditions. The Communist Party, as the political party of the working class, always supports the trade unions in their struggles. The Commu-

nist Party insists that its members join the unions of their respective industries or trades, that they be the most active fighters for the interests of the workers, that they give their untiring efforts to building and strengthening the unions, that they always protect the unity of the trade unions. The Communist Party educates and organizes the trade union workers into a broad democratic front with the farmers and other toilers in support of their common cause.

But the Communists also look beyond these daily struggles. We believe that a fundamental reorganization of society—socialism—is the only final solution of the workers' problems—unemployment, poverty, war. Not all members of the trade unions accept this socialist viewpoint of the Communist Party, which is based on a scientific analysis of capitalism and on the experience of the workers' struggles the world over. Because of their broad outlook, the Communists are able in every immediate struggle to champion most effectively the interests of the workers. Due to their Marxist-Leninist training, Communists are practical organizers of the workers, know how to estimate the forces of the enemy, and understand what tactics to apply in order to achieve the aims for which all workers are ready to fight at a given time.

We Communists naturally consider it our right to advocate our opinions and win to our viewpoint the workers in the unions. This viewpoint strengthens the fight of the workers today and prepares them for understanding the need for socialism—which can only be brought into existence when the majority of the workers become convinced

of its necessity through their own experience.

Q. Do Communists form factions (organized party groups) within the trade unions?

A. No. In the earlier years of the Communist Party the policy was sometimes followed of the Communist Party members in a given union meeting together to plan educational work in that organization. But this practice has been discontinued, as tending to create possible misunderstanding among the rank and file of the unions. The Communists, like all other members, function through the regular democratic procedures and committees of the unions. We are resolute opponents of factional control of unions, whether by a conservative bureaucratic clique or by some special political group. The Communists have full reliance that the union membership at large, if given an opportunity for a free discussion of the issues before it and the right to decisive, democratic action upon them, will arrive at sound policies. For this reason Communists are everywhere and always the most consistent and determined fighters for trade union democracy.

Q. Is it a fact, as is often charged, that Communists in the trade unions always set out to capture these organizations?

A. This is one of the many false accusations made against the Communist Party by enemies of a militant and powerful labor movement. The reality is that the Communists join with all other progressives in fighting against

the individual  
democratic  
which t  
icy, and  
thorough  
sponsive  
file. Co  
control  
among  
what d  
selves,  
accord  
the sam  
non-Co  
Com  
policies  
play a  
extent  
support  
merit

the unions being "captured" by any individuals or groups. We believe in democratic unions, organizations in which the membership determines policy, and we work for a broad leadership thoroughly representative of and responsive to the wishes of the rank and file. Communists fight against all clique control and dictatorial tendencies among union leaders, no matter from what direction it comes. As for ourselves, we ask no rights beyond those accorded all other workers. We accept the same responsibilities and duties that non-Communists do.

Communists expect to influence the policies of a labor organization and play a role in its leadership only to the extent that they win the respect and support of the workers. We strive to merit this support by our devoted ac-

tivities and educational work in the unions, not by acting as an organized group within them. Communists, whether rank and filers or elected officials of a union, have the duty and responsibility to build and improve the organization, work for the realization of its program, and to abide by the decision of the majority, arrived at democratically through the channels of the union. Communists who are elected into leadership of a union are responsible to the membership of that organization, and the Communist Party joins with all workers in calling to account any elected officials, Communist or otherwise, who fail to fulfill the responsibilities and duties entrusted to them by the membership of their trade unions.

# AMERICAN IMPERIALISM AND THE COLONIAL WORLD

By GEORGE PHILLIPS

THE STRUGGLE BETWEEN the colonial liberation movements and the imperialist powers has reached a new stage of development throughout the colonial world. The war effected profound changes both in the relative strength and positions of the imperialist powers and in the internal relationship of forces within the colonies and dependencies.

Germany, Italy, and Japan have been eliminated as colonial powers. The anti-fascist struggle, in which the peoples of the colonial and semi-colonial countries participated, laid the basis for the new advances of the liberation movements throughout the world. On the one hand, the anti-fascist resistance movements in the colonies and dependencies advanced the organization, collective strength, militancy, and political understanding of the national liberation movements. On the other hand, not only were the fascist countries defeated, but in the course of the war

the grip of the other imperialist powers on the colonies was considerably weakened.

In the early stages of the war, particularly in the Far East, the European colonial powers and the United States sustained a series of defeats. The myth of white supremacy and imperialist invincibility was shattered. The colonial peoples have not forgotten that the defeat of the Axis was achieved by a coalition that extended far beyond the imperialist powers. The victorious coalition included both the Soviet Union (which not only displayed its strength in Europe but struck decisive blows against the Japanese army) and the most militant forces of the colonial peoples themselves. Within a relatively short space of time the colonial peoples witnessed first the defeat of their traditional imperialist rulers and then the defeat of imperialist Japan which had temporarily succeeded in subjugating a rather large section of colonial Asia.

With the war's end the colonial liberation movements were stronger and more advanced in their anti-imperialist consciousness than before, while the imperialist position was weaker. That is the key to the conflicts and changes unfolding throughout the colonial world today.

The ascending national movements precluded the possibility of an automatic return to the old pre-war forms of imperialist rule. What we have been witnessing since V-J Day is a struggle by the liberation

mover  
vert  
the de  
by th  
other,  
tional  
impos

The  
freedo  
and s  
gles  
cratic  
South  
and M  
Asia,  
most  
is in  
ism.

gles a  
ject p  
velop  
count  
ments  
Some  
tories,  
tempo  
imper  
coloni  
to un  
a new  
and  
conce  
we ca  
ism i  
new  
powe

THE  
IN

At  
tions

movements, on the one hand, to convert the new opportunities created by the defeat of fascism into reality, and by the imperialist forces, on the other, to crush or weaken the national liberation movements and reimpose imperialist domination.

The postwar upsurge for national freedom has gripped all the colonial and semi-colonial countries. Struggles for independence and democratic rights are developing in the South-American countries, the Near and Middle East, and Africa. It is in Asia, however, that the struggle is most advanced. Virtually all of Asia is in revolt today against imperialism. Revolutionary freedom struggles are being waged by every subject people in Asia. The level of development of the various colonial countries and their liberation movements is, of course, highly uneven. Some have scored significant victories, while others have sustained temporary defeats at the hands of the imperialists. But everywhere the colonial liberation struggle has risen to unprecedented heights, presenting a new challenge to the reactionary and outworn colonial system. By concentrating our attention on Asia we can best see the crisis of imperialism in the colonial world and the new strategy of the imperialist powers in the postwar period.

#### THE NEW OPPORTUNITIES IN ASIA

At the end of the war the conditions were ripe for a great setback to

colonialism and a great expansion of the area of freedom in Asia. In two vital areas of Southeast Asia the fetters of colonialism were actually broken. On August 19, 1945 (on the eve of V-J Day), the Viet Minh Party in Indochina—a coalition of democratic nationalist forces—had overthrown the Japanese puppet government and established the Democratic Republic of Viet Nam with overwhelming popular support in the three Annamite provinces of Tonkin, Annam, and Cochinchina. Repeated French military efforts to overthrow the Viet Nam Republic have not succeeded.

The Republic of Indonesia (rooted in the islands of Java, Madura, and Sumatra, embracing the overwhelming majority of the population of Indonesia) is approaching its second anniversary and has effectively thwarted the attempted reimposition of Dutch rule by force of arms.

In China, in many respects the decisive Asian country, the conditions were ripe at the war's end for a democratic coalition government, including the Chinese Communists, which would lead a united China, for the first time, along the path of democratic development and national sovereignty.

In the Philippines, whose independence had been promised for July 4, 1946, in the Tydings-McDuffie Act, the powerful anti-Japanese resistance movement forged during the war gave birth to a postwar democratic political coalition, embracing

the organized peasant movement, labor, and the nationalist bourgeoisie, that promised a successful democratic revolution in this still semi-feudal U.S. dependency.

The defeat of Japanese imperialism released long-suppressed democratic forces and energies, most clearly expressed in the lightning growth of the Japanese labor movement, which has already exceeded the 5,000,000 mark. The political program adopted in August, 1946, by the Congress of Industrial Unions, the largest and most militant labor body in Japan, called upon Japanese labor "to play a role as a driving power against feudalism, militarism, and fascism by joining a democratic front, and to make an effort for the establishment of a democratic government supported by the people." A special plank on Japanese foreign policy in the C.I.U. declaration asserted:

We, as the Japanese working class, dedicate ourselves to our share of the task of preservation of world peace by fighting racism, as exemplified in the notion that the Japanese are a "master race" in Asia; by cooperating with neighboring nations on the principle of equality; by supporting revolutionary movements for national independence; and by joining the World Federation of Trade Unions which symbolizes the international solidarity of workers.

In India, the heart of the British Empire, the freedom upsurge is also unprecedented. 1946 witnessed the

greatest strike struggles in the history of India, nation wide demonstrations for the release of imprisoned India National Army men, a revolt of Indian navy and air force men demanding equality of treatment with their British counterparts, and movements for the end of autocratic government in the Princely states. The Indian Communist leader, G. Adhikari, in his pamphlet *Resurgent India* which reviews the developments of 1946, notes:

The naval rising and the great solidarity action staged by the advance-guard of the Indian working class in its support, were not an isolated incident. They were a flaming signal which announced to the world that a volcanic discontent and anti-imperialist urge was smouldering in the minds of the Indian people and their armed forces, ready to be united and harnessed for the final annihilation of the rotten structure of imperialist-feudal rule. . . .

Thus, the country-wide movement, which grew around the demand for the release of the I.N.A. and the naval rising of February, marks the beginning of a new period which is not just one of mounting discontent and unrest but one of deep crisis of imperialist rule in India—one when India's revolutionary fight for independence and democracy comes on the agenda.

During the war the first strong nationalist movement arose in Malaya in the form of the Malay People's Anti-Japanese Army. When the Japanese surrendered, it was so powerful and deeply-rooted in the people that it was able to take over

the ac  
citic  
return

Kor  
rule, I  
Demo  
tion o  
tive a  
way t  
aid of  
govern  
tered  
functi

which  
Korea  
which  
refuse

In  
move  
streng  
Burm  
agend

The  
and a  
ward

tion  
Unite

tire c  
termi  
decisi

The  
Chart  
the c  
Roos

States  
national  
to c  
leader  
in a  
Such  
adde

the administration of the principal cities of Malaya before the British returned.

Korea, long a victim of Japanese rule, had given birth to the Korean Democratic National Front, a coalition of democratic forces, representative and mature enough to lead the way to democratic Korea with the aid of the transitional allied military governments. When the Allies entered Korea they already found a functioning People's Government, which the Soviet authorities in North Korea recognized and assisted but which the U.S. forces in South Korea refused to recognize.

In Burma, likewise, the nationalist movement had achieved new strength and maturity, placing Burmese independence boldly on the agenda.

Thus the developments of the war, and above all the great strides forward taken by the colonial liberation movements as allies of the United Nations, weakened the entire colonial system and brought the termination of imperialist rule in decisive parts of Asia within grasp. The implementation of the Atlantic Charter and other U.N. declarations, the continuation of the progressive Roosevelt policies by the United States, would have enabled the national freedom movements in Asia to consolidate their positions of leadership and would have resulted in a democratic and stable Asia. Such an historic development, added to the birth of the new democ-

racies in Europe which attained economic sovereignty and liberation from the dictation of foreign capital as one of the guarantees for their popular democracy, would have accelerated the defeat of the entire imperialist system and the development of a democratic peace.

#### THE IMPERIALIST COUNTER-OFFENSIVE

But it is not in the nature of imperialism to abdicate or to yield passively to ascending democratic movements. With the end of the anti-axis war the most imperialist forces in the capitalist world launched a counter-offensive against the colonial liberation movements, in an effort to save the colonial system from collapse and to restore imperialist domination over the rich resources and vast populations of the subject nations.

As a long-range historical objective, of course, this counter-offensive is doomed to defeat. All the king's horses and all the king's men or, in the modern setting, all the dollars of Wall Street, cannot put the decaying colonial system together again. But its death agonies can be prolonged and the sufferings of the colonial peoples intensified.

The imperialist counter-offensive has assumed two forms. One is force, terror, and violence to crush the liberation and democratic movements either in the form of imperialist wars against the new democratic republics (Indonesia and Viet Nam)

or military and financial assistance to reactionary cliques to launch civil wars or repressive drives against the people (China and the Philippines). The other is constitutional reform.

U.S. imperialist intervention in China, is directly responsible for the civil war. A detailed analysis of U.S. intervention in China, by the Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy, revealed that the U.S. granted four billion dollars' worth of aid to Chiang Kai-shek from V-J Day to December, 1946, outside of 271 naval vessels, numerous air force bases, the U.S. naval installation at Tsingtao with over 100 naval vessels, large-scale transportation of war materials, and various forms of indirect aid. In scope, magnitude, and strategic significance, the U.S.-sponsored war directed at preventing China from becoming united, democratic, and free, is the decisive postwar military operation of the imperialist forces. But it is not the only area in which imperialism has resorted to armed warfare against the people since the defeat of the Axis.

In the Philippines large-scale military operations are being conducted against the organized peasant movement. The war against the Filipino peasantry, like the war in China, is U.S.-sponsored. The soldiers of the Philippine army are American-trained. They are employing U.S. arms and ammunition and are directed by the Roxas Administration, which is a puppet of the American interests that dominate both the eco-

nomic and political life of the Philippines.

The French war against the Republic of Viet Nam persists. The Dutch war against the Republic of Indonesia flares up periodically as the Dutch authorities continuously violate their truce and other agreements with the Indonesians. The period since V-J Day has been one of the bloodiest in India's history. As G. Adhikari has pointed out:

It has also been a year of imperialist counter-offensive against the freedom movement which has taken unusual forms, and has created ghastly internal conflicts to drown the freedom fight in a fratricidal blood-bath.

Similarly, in Malaya, Burma, and other colonial areas the imperialist counter-offensive expresses itself in the form of acute repression, persecution of leaders of the liberation movement and assaults against the most conscious movements for colonial freedom. And in Japan, which is virtually under the sole occupation of the United States, the MacArthur policy has curbed the democratic revolution and imposed heavy obstacles upon the Japanese labor movement and the democratic forces.

The significant fact, however, is that nowhere in the colonial or semi-colonial world has imperialist force been able to achieve a decisive imperialist victory. The vast aid to Chiang Kai-shek has not resolved the conflict in favor of imperialism.

On the contrary, the reactionary



Kuomintang clique that American imperialism is supporting has suffered military reverses. In the Philippines the Roxas Administration is pursuing the path of fascism and, though the rights of the national freedom forces have been severely restricted, the popular opposition is growing and extending to wider areas of the Islands.

Imperialism, with its flexible method and constant endeavor to adapt itself to the changing forms of the national struggle, is conscious that brute force alone cannot dam the tide of national liberation welling up in the colonies. Together with its armed warfare the imperialist powers have formulated new constitutional plans, reforms, and administrative changes as a concession to the strengthened national movements. These are the "carrots" that accompany the "club." These plans have been announced with great fanfare and pomp as "independence" plans, equivalent to the liberation of the colonies. In reality they are aimed at retaining the greatest measure of imperialist control that conditions will permit. Thus, in rather rapid succession, we have witnessed, since the end of the war, the proclamation of Philippine independence, *de facto* recognition of the sovereignty of the Indonesian Republic by the Netherlands, and British plans for the independence of India and Burma. In the light of the offensive against the colonial liberation movements the good intentions of the imperialist

powers are clearly suspect. But it is not enough merely to point to this obvious contradiction between imperialist promise and action. The various "independence" plans are a further revelation of the crisis of imperialism in the colonies, the inability to maintain imperialist control on the prewar basis, and the new strategy of imperialism which has stirred up so much confusion.

#### IMPERIALIST PROPAGANDA

Accompanying the "independence" plans is an intense wave of propaganda which attempts to camouflage both the imperialist crisis and the brutal methods of the colonial powers today with pretty talk about the sunset of empire, the disappearance of colonialism, and the voluntary support of national freedom for the colonies by the great colonial powers.

The style was set with the proclamation of an independent Philippine Republic on July 4, 1946. General MacArthur, one of the supreme imperialist propagandists of this epoch, set the tone personally with his grandiloquent declaration:

Let history record this event in the sweep of democracy through the earth as foretelling the end of mastery of peoples by power of force alone—the end of empire as the political chain which binds the unwilling weak to the unyielding strong.

When Henry Wallace criticized the Truman Doctrine as a departure

by the United States upon a course of "ruthless imperialism," a uniform line was adopted by the proponents of the Doctrine. From Hearst columnist George Rothwell Brown, to syndicated by-line stories in the Scripps-Howard press down to a *New York Post* editorial, an effort was made to laugh away Wallace's charge by pointing to the Philippines as the supposed irrefutable answer to any charge of American imperialism! The imperialist propagandists have seized upon the new British plan for a partitioned India as another occasion for a chorus of hurrahs and hallelujahs and are singing even more loudly than before about the vanishing act of colonialism! The *New York Times* proclaimed editorially on June 1, 1947:

The imperial rule of the Occidental is ending. It is ending partly because Western power has diminished, partly because imperialism is no longer a paying enterprise, and partly because the Western conscience has revolted against it.

Far be it from the *Times* to mention the revolt of the colonial peoples. It is so much better propaganda to speak of imperialism going out of business, of the revolt of the Western conscience, of the abandonment of imperialism by the imperialist powers. The colonial system is universally hated by the democratic forces in the colony-holding states, and the true motives of imperialism are best concealed by trying to

equate imperialism with anti-imperialism. This propaganda is calculated to disarm the foes of the colonial system and the anti-imperialist forces, to lull them into the false belief that there is no need to fight imperialism since the worst features of imperialism have been abandoned.

#### BROWDER'S "THEORY"

It remained for Earl Browder, however, to render the most unique service to the current imperialist propaganda campaign on the dissolution of the colonial system. In his new book, *War or Peace with Russia?*, Browder renders this service to imperialism in the name of Marxism and Leninism. He sets out to correct "the point of view of orthodox Marxists" on the colonial question. In his own words:

It is my opinion, reached after long study and much hesitation, that the United States of America is in process of establishing a long-term policy directed toward the dissolution of the colonial system. . . .

Because this issue goes deeper than current events, to the very structure of world power, I have had to answer the objections raised against my conclusion from the point of view of orthodox Marxism, *i.e.*, the already established presumption of most Marxian thought that colonialism is an invariable and unalterable characteristic of capitalism in its final stage of development. . . .

It is now becoming clear, however, that the policy of the U.S. is more and more definitely and energetically orientating toward the dissolution of the sys-

tem of colonial empire; the step of granting independence to the Philippines is now seen in the light, not of a special case, but of the first step in a comprehensive world policy. The United States is, tentatively and with many hesitations, but nonetheless definitely, setting itself a new imperial pattern from which colonialism is excluded.

He does not in any way analyze the realities of the present situation in the Philippines and can offer no evidence to substantiate any consistent anti-colonial policy by the United States. Instead he cites two pious anti-colonial declarations from the *New York Herald Tribune* and the *United States News*, on the basis of which he concludes:

When such expressions come, as a matter of course, from typical spokesmen of Republican conservatism and big business, it may be assumed that the basis of support in all classes for the anticolonial policy initiated by Roosevelt is far broader and has deeper roots than was the case of most New Deal policies. It seems already to be established as a bipartisan national policy supported equally by capital and labor, and almost immune from serious challenge.

To build this false theory on the basis of U.S. policy in the Philippines is political chicanery of the crudest variety. Even certain capitalist newspapers, as shown below, admit openly that America has granted only puppet independence to the Philippines. Wall Street is utilizing the

feudal landlords and the Filipino *compradore* bourgeoisie as a club against the Filipino national liberation movement. Legislation adopted by the U.S. Congress in 1946 and the commercial and military treaties between the United States and the puppet Philippine government leave essential control of the Philippine economy in the hands of American corporations and control of the military bases in the Islands in the hands of the U.S. army, contrary to the Philippine policy outlined by President Roosevelt.

A columnist of the conservative *Christian Science Monitor* (Feb. 24, 1947) exposed the fact that the Philippine Trade Act "throws the Philippine public domain wide open to American exploitation" and pointed out that ". . . there is no squaring it with the Atlantic Charter, or with any sound principles for a better world . . . it impairs, and in time may destroy, the independence of the Philippines; and to such a degree that their membership in the United Nations might be open to challenge as palpably invalid." This is characteristic of the more responsible and sober evaluation of U.S.-Philippine policy.

Long before Browder completed his book the evidence was available in the United States that the independence of the Philippines was grossly curtailed by the Philippine Trade Act and other official U.S. measures. A detailed analysis of American policy in the Philippines

which appeared in *Far Eastern Survey*, organ of the American Institute of Pacific Relations, as far back as June 5, 1946, concluded:

On July 4 America will officially withdraw its sovereignty from the Philippines. But the birth of the Philippine Republic has been surrounded with so many qualifications and amendments that it no longer proclaims the dawn of a new Asia. America today is pioneering with new forms which leave the old, pre-war colonial content substantially unchanged.

Browder, however, ignored the facts and set out, not to criticize U.S. imperialist policy in the Philippines, but to reform "orthodox Marxism" in conformity with the ambitions of American imperialism, to give Marxist sanction to his erroneous conclusion that "the U.S. finally granted independence to the Philippines *after having found colonies unprofitable*" (Browder's italics).

So unprofitable that U.S. investments and the number of U.S. corporations in the Philippines today is greater than ever before and the Philippine Constitution, originally approved by Presidential Roosevelt, has been amended upon Wall Street insistence, to give U.S. capital the "constitutional" authority to control the resources of the Philippines, which are richer than Japan's.

#### WHAT LENIN REALLY SAID

With colossal effrontery Browder quotes Lenin in an effort to buttress his theory. He quotes from a polemic

by Lenin entitled "A Caricature of Marxism and 'Imperialist Economism'" (*Collected Works*, Volume XIX). But it is precisely this polemic of Lenin's which fully exposes the crass reformism of Browder's own position. A few quotations from this polemic, which Browder failed to cite, expose Browder and reveal that the "orthodox Marxist" analysis of imperialism fully took into account the imperialist maneuvers reflected in the present series of "independence" plans. Thus Lenin pointed out:

If it is quite practicable for "wealth" in general to rule over any democratic republic by means of bribery and the Stock Exchange, how can P. Kievsky assert, without falling into an amusing "logical contradiction," that it is impossible for the enormous wealth of trusts and banks which manipulate billions to "exercise" the rule of finance capital over a 'foreign, *i.e.*, politically independent, republic?

To show that the birth of new states was fully feasible under imperialism Lenin pointed to the example of the separation of Norway from Sweden. Lenin said:

Norway achieved the allegedly impossible right to self-determination in 1905, in the era of the most unbridled imperialism. . . . The independence of Norway "achieved" in 1905 was only political independence. She did not intend to, nor could she, alter her economic dependence.

Lenin went further and spoke of conditions under which finance capi-

tal itself would find it most advantageous to set up or recognize the political independence of subject nations that would still remain victims of imperialist domination. Thus Lenin said, as far back as 1916:

Under such circumstances, it is not only "feasible," from the point of view of finance capital, but *sometimes* is even to the direct *advantage* of the trusts, of *their* imperialist politics and of *their* imperialist war, to grant to *certain* small nations the largest possible amount of democratic freedom, and even complete political independence so as to relieve "their" military operations of all risk. . . .

In this essay, written before the end of the imperialist war of 1914-18, Lenin pointed out, on the basis of the fundamentals of imperialism:

If with a given outcome of the present war, the formation of new states in Europe: Poland, Finland, etc., is quite "feasible" without in the least disturbing the conditions of development of imperialism or its power—but, on the contrary, may even *strengthen* the influence, the connections and the pressure of finance capital—then, with a different outcome the formation of a new Hungarian, Czech or other state is equally "feasible." . . . .

In *Imperialism* itself Lenin was very careful to point out:

The division of the world into two main groups—of colony-owning countries on the one hand and colonies on the other—is not the only typical feature of this period; there is also a variety of forms of dependent coun-

tries; countries which, officially, are politically independent, but which are, in fact, enmeshed in the net of financial and diplomatic dependence.

The forms of imperialist domination change constantly, but true anti-colonialism, the actual emancipation of the colonies, is something quite different from changes in the form of relations between the imperialist powers and the nations in the colonial world. The "orthodox Marxist" view on this question, as stated by Stalin, is:

That the national and colonial questions are inseparable from the question of emancipation from the power of capital. . . .

That imperialism (the highest form of capitalism) cannot exist without the political and economic enslavement of non-sovereign nations and colonies.\*

The proclamation of Philippine Independence, and the "independence" plans for India and Burma do not emancipate these countries from political and economic enslavement by the big imperialist powers. Some spokesmen of finance capital are much franker than Browder in admitting this. Thus the mouthpiece of British capital, the *London Economist* had the following to say about the Attlee Government's "independence" offer to Burma, in its Feb. 1, 1947 issue:

The magic word today in all countries such as Burma is "independence"; the Burmese will feel humiliated if they

\* Joseph Stalin, *Marxism and the National Question*, International Publishers, p. 115.

seem to have less sovereignty than India or Siam. But, if independence is conceded, there is plenty of room for arrangements on economic matters, and if friendly relations can be maintained, there is no reason for severing the special connections established by colonial rule.

### BRITISH PLANS FOR INDIA

Two Marxist commentaries on the British plans for India illuminate still further the objectives of the British imperialists. R. Palme Dutt, the British Marxist authority on colonial questions, observes in the new edition of his classic, *India Today*, which he has brought up to date and which was published recently in Bombay:

Thus it may be said that throughout this modern period every step of constitutional "reform" in India has been carried out under Conservative inspiration and guidance not for any abstract love of reform, but in the desperate hope to erect a dyke against the floodtide of the national movement for liberation. And it may be added that even the Labor Government's constitutional proposals of 1946 only carried forward the general lines of the plan of 1942 devised under an Amery as Secretary of State and a Tory-dominated Cabinet.

By these successive dykes, by this prolonged series of transitional stages and temporary compromise solutions, the leaders of British imperialism have hoped to win their rearguard action. They have striven to carry through the process of adaptation by which they still seek to prolong the maintenance of their powerful economic and financial inter-

ests of exploitation in India and their strategic domination of India, step by step passing over to Indian hands the task of keeping the people in order and maintaining the base of cooperation with British imperialism.\*

The Indian Marxist, G. Adhikari, analyzed the new relationship of forces in India as follows:

In the face of the rising mass revolt, the main social and political base of British power which has usually rested on the Princes and feudal elements—*i.e.*, on the big landlord class created by it for its support, was no longer enough. It was clear to the British imperialists that they could not save their tottering Empire unless they could draw in the rising bourgeoisie, which stood behind the leadership of the two main popular parties, namely the Congress and the League, to cooperate with itself and its princely allies against the Indian masses.

The small Indian capitalist class had made huge profits by fulfilling the colossal war orders of British imperialists, though at the expense of the masses who had been impoverished during the war. The capitalists were seeking new outlets and expansion for their newly-accumulated wealth and were straining at the stranglehold of British monopoly capital which prevented independent Indian industrial development. They supported the leadership of the Congress and the League (especially the former) in their demand for immediate transfer of power and independence, and even the Congress threat of struggle if the same were not granted.

\* R. Palme Dutt, *India Today*, Bombay, 1947 edition, p. 491.

But the Indian capitalists were afraid of the new rising temper of the masses. Besides, their accumulated wealth was in the hands of the British imperialists in the form of sterling balances and they had to rely upon the imperialists to get it back in the form of capital goods for their expansion and profit-making. British imperialists knew that they could save their imperialist domination over India by using this weakness of the Indian capitalist class.

Their strategy is to offer the bait of peaceful transfer of power and joint (junior?) partnership in the British economic monopoly in India to Indian vested interests and to draw the bourgeois leadership of the Congress and the League into a scheme of constitutional settlement based on the formal "independence" of India.\*

The new maneuvers of the imperialist powers in the colonies do not substantiate the myth of "decolonization." What we are witnessing is the drawing of the bourgeoisie—in some of the major colonial countries, who are more fearful of the mass liberation movements in their own countries than of foreign imperialism—into new state apparatuses aimed at repressing the anti-imperialist colonial freedom movements which are fighting everywhere for agrarian reform and democracy in their respective countries. The old forms of colonialism can no longer work, and new forms are being devised, with the assistance of both the feudal landlords and important sections of the bourgeoisie in the colonial countries.

\* *Resurgent India*, p. 6.

#### ANGLO-AMERICAN RIVALRY

But Browder's role as an apologist for American imperialism is particularly revealed in his discussion of Anglo-American rivalry as it affects the colonial system. Here he converts a half-truth into a gross distortion of contemporary history. The surface unanimity of the Anglo-American alliance conceals a growing intensification of Anglo-American rivalry. It is true that American capitalism has long been irked by the protected position of British capital within the British colonial system. American capital has long been waging a war against the British "preferential system" which operates against the free expansion of American capital within the British Empire. Expansionist American finance capital is interested in breaking down the "preferential" system and those aspects of the British colonial system that in any way hinder the operations of American capital within the British Empire. (This struggle is keenly expounded by James S. Allen in his *World Monopoly and Peace*, Chapter VIII: "The Expansionist Freedoms.") Many spokesmen and organs of American finance capital have time and again made sweeping denunciations of the colonial system and colonialism, having in mind those features of the colonial system which limit the expansion of U.S. capital, and not the features of colonialism that keep the colonial peoples enslaved to foreign capital.

What Browder leaves out of the picture is the most important new feature of the postwar world: the aggressive drive of American finance capital to achieve world domination. He fails completely to dwell upon the actual significance of American imperialist expansionism, of which the Truman Administration is the aggressive proponent today.

On March 31, 1947, *Life* magazine gave mass circulation to a condensation of James Burnham's recent book, *The Struggle for the World*, which voices the program of expansionist American monopoly capital in the following unmistakable words:

There is already an American empire, greatly expanded during these past five years. From the point of view of political reality the empire extends to wherever the imperial power is decisive, not for everything, or nearly everything, but for the crucial issues upon which political survival depends. The American Empire in effect reaches out to the West to include the many islands of the Atlantic and the Pacific, implicitly dominated by U.S. military and naval installations. For that matter those parts of Africa and Europe where U.S. armed force is supreme are also, for now at least, in the empire. All of the Americas already lie within it. Canada, too, in terms of political reality, must be included within the American empire. Maps of U.S. war resources have for many years included those of Canada.

An imperial policy is not, therefore, something new for the U.S. It has been and continues to be forced upon the

U.S. by the dynamic effects of power relationships. The relative strength of the U.S. is too great to permit passivity. The U.S. cannot help building an empire.

The blueprint for world domination by U.S. imperialism as outlined by Burnham calls for full political union between the U.S., Great Britain, and the British Dominions. "Such a union," Burnham goes on to explain, "would mean that Britain, her Dominions and the U.S. would become partners in the imperial federation. In the first stages Britain would be necessarily the junior partner."

#### U.S. IMPERIALISM'S AIMS TODAY

The new American expansionism, the most aggressive and ambitious in the history of the United States, is the most dominant expression of the postwar change in imperialist power relationships. Germany, Japan, and Italy have been laid low. France and the Netherlands have been seriously weakened as colonial powers. And Great Britain, as a colonial power, has suffered serious reverses as a result of the war. Britain has lost its naval supremacy to the United States, has suffered in its foreign trade, having been reduced to a debtor nation, and cannot maintain its burden of imperialist and colonial commitments without financial aid from the United States. On the basis of these changes American imperialism, the dominant imperialist power



in the world, now aims at world domination. This intensifies the Anglo-American rivalry and the rivalry between the United States and the other capitalist countries, which assume greater and greater significance in the evolution of U.S. foreign policy.

The old prewar colonial system, based upon the partition of the colonial world between a number of imperialist powers, cannot adequately serve the ambitions of a single—the greatest—imperialist power, the U.S., to dominate the world. U.S. expansionism comes into conflict with impediments and obstacles to its ambitions inherent in the British, French, and Dutch colonial systems. Thus U.S. imperialist policy objectively comes into conflict with the old colonial system. But while American imperialism seeks to break down all the barriers in the colonial system which in any way limit U.S. penetration of the colonial countries, it simultaneously aims to preserve and utilize all those features of the colonial system which protect imperialist interests and hamper the liberation of the colonial peoples from the domination of foreign capital and foreign powers. In the light of the new strength of the colonial liberation movements this is not an easy task and we are today witnessing streamlined imperialist techniques.

The birth of new states, like the Philippines, while in no sense representing genuine independence,

should also be seen as a concession to the national liberation movements. Sections of the *compradore* bourgeoisie and the feudal landlords administer the country as agents of U.S. imperialism. This policy helps disarm the foes of traditional colonialism.

American imperialism, which emerged after the world had already been partitioned by the existing capitalist powers, has long been a master at dominating small nations without assuming official sovereignty: witness Cuba, Panama and other Latin-American states. Direct colonial rule, as Lenin pointed out, is not the only form of imperialist domination. With the export of finance capital as the basic feature of imperialism and motive force of world domination, American capitalism is both intensifying methods of the past and developing new forms and techniques. This is clearly evident in the standardization of arms as a means of ensuring military hegemony of the capitalist world, "mixed" companies such as are developing in Mexico where American capital "cooperates" with Mexican capital, the new Sino-American trade treaty which grants U.S. capital rights of exploitation never before attained in China.

The much-trumpeted proclamation of Philippine "independence" undoubtedly expressed a new form of American imperialist policy, dictated by a changed world situation. But it is not an abandonment of im-

perialism, or of colonialism, which in essence means the enslavement of subject nations, whatever the form. Browder admits that America is imperialist. But the context and manner in which he discerns a non-existent anti-colonialism in U.S. policy and accepts the proclamation of Philippine independence at face value, without pointing out that the Philippines remains an economic and military colony of the United States, constitutes a whitewash of U.S. imperialism.

If American policy were anti-colonial, it had an ideal opportunity to show its colors in Indonesia. The Dutch fought desperately to save their colonial system in the rich Indies. What side did the Truman Administration help? The U.S. trained Dutch forces that went into combat against the Indonesian Republic; allowed U.S. military supplies to be used against the Indonesian people, on condition that they would not bear U.S. insignia; and gave a loan to the Netherlands East Indies government, the Dutch colonial administration in Indonesia. To this day it aids the Dutch blockade of the Republic and has hampered the development of normal economic relations between the Indonesian Republic and the United States. The socialist Premier of the Indonesian Republic, Soetan Sjahrir, from bitter experience, evaluates U.S. policy on the colonial question quite differently than Browder. In

his famous pamphlet *Our Struggle*, Sjahrir wrote:

As long as there is an Anglo-American capitalism and imperialism, we cannot achieve 100 per cent independence, however much we try. Because of this, the fate of the people of Indonesia is bound up with international conditions and developments, and more than any other country, we need a changed basis of society, which means the eradication of world capitalist imperialism. And until the basis of society is changed, and an end is put to capitalist imperialism, the struggle of our people cannot be fully satisfied and the independence which we can achieve, even freed fully from the Dutch, will still be nominal independence similar to that of other small countries under the influence of big capitalist countries.

Has U.S. policy in China militated for or against the dissolution of the colonial system? In the opinion of the Chinese Communist Party American imperialism is today more dangerous than Japanese imperialism as a threat to national freedom. A statement issued by the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party on the 9th Anniversary of the Marco Polo Bridge incident observed:

The same U.S. reactionary clique, working hand in hand with the reactionary clique in China, is trying to take the place of Japan and convert her (China) into a colony of U.S. imperialism. . . . Since American imperialism is today more powerful than Japanese imperialism, its aggressive methods appear outwardly more "legal" and "civi-

lized  
abilit  
fascis  
ship  
ples.  
tion  
nese  
plott  
into  
conc  
impe

N  
ship  
gles  
tary  
the  
the  
the  
tem.  
of th  
publ  
duri  
tion  
whic  
colo

Ev  
notic  
tions

lized." The danger is increased by its ability to make capital out of the anti-fascist war and the traditional friendship of the Chinese and American peoples. The existence of the Chinese nation is therefore threatened by both Chinese and foreign reactionaries, who are plotting together to transform China into a dependency or colony, a colossal concentration camp and a base for new imperialistic wars of aggression.\*

Non-Communists in the leadership of the colonial liberation struggles similarly do not see any voluntary disappearance of colonialism on the basis of the policies pursued by the imperialist powers and do not see the U.S. dissolving the colonial system. On the contrary, the delegates of the Indonesian and Viet Nam Republics issued a joint declaration during the recent Inter-Asian Relations Conference in New Delhi which had the following to say about colonialism:

Every careful observer should have noticed that there are enough indications to show that colonialism will con-

tinue in a new and more dangerous form, unless the resurgent masses can combine against it. . . . The new colonial tactics thus threaten the very independence of all Asiatic countries and endanger the peace and prosperity of the peoples of the whole world.

Browder's thesis of "de-colonization," his spurious theory that U.S. finance capital supports the dissolution of the colonial system, is injurious to the cause of the struggling colonial liberation movements. What is most urgently needed today is the most active support from labor and the democratic forces to the historic national liberation movements fighting for their freedom. Since the United States policy today, in violation of the national interests and democratic traditions of the American people, is the chief obstacle to the freedom of the colonial peoples, the American labor movement and all the supporters of the Roosevelt policy have the greatest responsibility to find every means of combatting U.S. imperialist expansionism and allying themselves with the national freedom forces and movements.

\* *World News and Views*, August 3, 1946.

# WHAT'S HAPPENING IN THE SOUTH

By NAT ROSS

RECENT EVENTS IN THE SOUTH have focused nationwide attention on the problems of that area and their vital impact on political developments in the United States. There is a growing recognition that fascist reaction is emboldened throughout the country as long as no drastic federal action against the lynch terror is undertaken and no punishment is meted out to the lynchers. At the same time, new and heroic forces and powerful movements are developing within the South in opposition to the lynch system. This article endeavors to examine the causes of some of these developments and the perspectives of struggle in the South.

## THE LYNCH OFFENSIVE

The widespread lynch terror against the Negro people in the South, which abated during the war, was unloosed after V-J Day, and has been intensified recently by a new barbaric orgy following the acquittal of 28 self-confessed lynchers in the Greenville, South Carolina, trial in

May. Only a fragment of the extent of the unceasing lynch terror reaches the American people. A veritable Iron Curtain hides from the people the extent and nature of the terror, enslavement, and oppression of millions of Negroes, especially in the rural Black Belt of the Deep South where, generally, "legal" rule is similar to that of Hitler and his storm-troopers at their worst.

The postwar lynch terror is aimed at smashing the growing political consciousness and united action of the Negro people in the South and especially the militant role of the Negro veterans in the Negro liberation movement. The reactionaries want to break up the growing Southern labor movement and its present organizing drives, as well as the progressive developments among sections of the white professionals and urban middle class, which are moving toward united action with the Negro people, although often quite hesitantly and conditionally. At the same time, reaction is taking advantage of the fact that despite the white masses of the South, progressive developments among them lag far behind the advancing Negro people's movement in the spirit of unity, militancy, and political consciousness.

*What is new in the postwar wave of lynching is that reaction is using the South as the "place d'armes" and the Negro people as "Dachau," for testing out and preparing the ad-*

ance of fascism throughout the United States.

The lynch forces in the South are being encouraged by an unholy combination of Bourbon landowners, reactionary Southern industrialists and powerful Wall Street corporations. The role of the latter (the absentee owners and rulers of the South) and their long hand in the terror and oppression of the Negro people, needs special emphasis. It is an undenied fact that a number of Wall Street corporations operating in Georgia (banks, railroads, electric power), were the main financial backers of the Klansman, the late Eugene Talmadge, in his campaign for governor last summer. These monopolists, together with Black Belt landowners, supported Herman Talmadge's attempted fascist seizure of the governorship last winter. There is mounting evidence that, in addition to Talmadge and Bilbo, numerous other notorious poll-tax Democrats and Ku Kluxers are closely associated not only with Southern plantation owners, but with dominant Wall Street monopolies.

The objectives of American monopoly capital and its subservient plantation allies are expressed in the policy of the present Congressional bloc of the Republican majority and the poll-tax Democrats in their anti-labor, anti-New Deal, and general pro-fascist offensive. The Republican High Command is a bitter enemy of the Negro people, as well as of

the white masses of the South. The Republicans are hell-bent on deepening the unequal status of the South compared to the rest of the country. They are opposed to the economic development of the South, to the abolition of the freight rate differentials and the whole gamut of financial and other discriminatory practices enforced by Wall Street against the South. Despite certain demagogic gestures looking toward the Negro vote in pivotal states in 1948, the basic policy of the Republican High Command is to strengthen the share-cropping plantation system which serves as the foundation for the enslavement of the oppressed Negro majority in the Black Belt and for the backwardness of the South. In these ways, as well as by their support to the imperialist Truman Doctrine, and the anti-Soviet and anti-Communist hysteria engendered by it, they are deliberately encouraging the Southern lynchers and preparing the ground and the atmosphere for fascist advance throughout the U.S.

Along with these new factors in the postwar politics of lynching, there are some new factors in the postwar *economics* of the lynch system. The economic assault launched by Big Business right after V-J Day against the living standards of the Negro people and the masses of Southern white toilers, continues. In addition to mass lay-offs from the war plants, the failure to reconvert most of these

plants to peacetime production and the drastic cut in the level of wage rates achieved during the war period, reaction is attempting to drive hundreds of thousands of Negro veterans and former war workers back to the semi-slave conditions of the cotton and tobacco plantations of the Black Belt.

The reactionaries want to rob Negro veterans of their unemployment compensation and their Terminal Leave pay. They want to deprive the Negroes of their wartime acquired industrial and technical skills and to compel them to work as plantation wage hands at starvation wages. The plantation owners openly talk of *bringing wages on the plantations back to the prewar dollar-a-day*. The average monthly wage of \$47 for agricultural workers in the South during 1946 is a sharp drop from the wartime peak and is two-thirds the average wage of agricultural workers in the rest of the U.S. The terribly low income of Negro farm workers and share-croppers in the cotton and tobacco Black Belt areas forms the springboard for the struggle of monopoly capital against real wage increases and adequate wage standards throughout the country, as well as for their bitter opposition to an adequate federal minimum wage law.

The terror against the Negroes in the Black Belt and their oppression, is further intensified by the catastrophic perspective for American cot-

ton, which has been suffering from a recurrent chronic crisis for the past two decades. Despite the maintenance of the present inflated cotton prices, a straw in the wind was the overnight drop of 10 cents a pound for cotton last winter. If we recall the drop in cotton prices after World War I, from 38.5 cents in April, 1920, to 9.5 cents one year later, we can visualize the disastrous drop in prices that lies ahead, since impending developments are far more critical for cotton and the American economy generally than they were following World War I. This was one of the factors to which Henry Wallace referred last year when he stated that unless extraordinary measures were undertaken there would be seven million unemployed in the South in the next five to ten year period.

Hand in hand with the planters' campaign is the drive to widen the wage differential in manufacturing, between the North and the South, which had been bridged slightly during the war. 28 per cent of the working force in manufacturing and mining in the South received less than 65 cents an hour, and the proportion below 65 cents was much greater in the "typical" southern industries—tobacco, textiles, lumber, furniture, paper, and pulp.

The drive to lower wages in the rural Black Belt and in the cities of the South, and to beat back union demands for wage increases, is indissolubly connected with the wave

of lynch terror, especially against those who refuse to work for starvation wages. The lynch terror, which is aimed at the further enslavement of the Negro people and the drive against wage standards and organized labor, is intended to break up the movement toward Negro-white solidarity and independent political action. The lynch campaign is aimed at strengthening the imperialist offensive at home and abroad enunciated in the Truman Doctrine. *In a word, the lynch drive, unless stopped by an aroused people throughout the country, is the pace-setter for the advance of fascist reaction in the United States.* And any American who now fails to fight lynching actually facilitates the advance of fascism in our country.

#### LABOR FIGHTS BACK

There is no doubt that the fury of the lynchers expresses their fear of the rising people's movement in the South. One of the high points of this movement was the six weeks' strike of 7,000 tobacco workers, mainly Negroes, at the R. J. Reynolds plants in Winston-Salem, N. C. An examination of this historic struggle reveals most clearly the advances and positive achievements of the organized labor and Negro liberation movements in the South today, as well as some serious weaknesses.

The strike was led by Local 22 of the Food, Tobacco, Agricultural and Allied Workers, C.I.O.—one of

the largest locals in the South, with a membership of about 8,000. In the four years of its existence, Local 22 has been able to organize almost all the Negro workers (6,000), but only about 1,000 of the 4,000 white workers at Reynolds. This organization has been achieved despite the bitterest opposition from the company which has successfully resisted a number of attempts to unionize the Camel workers in the past three decades.

The Local, in which the Negro workers, mainly women, have been both its backbone and spearhead, has achieved a number of important economic gains for the white and Negro workers as a result of its militant policies in the past four years. In addition, the Local has been instrumental in bringing about a general renaissance and political unity of the Negro people in that area unprecedented since Reconstruction, as well as a general democratic advance in the Winston-Salem area. The union was able to break down, in part, the semi-slave and oppressive conditions in the Reynolds plant and to overcome to some extent "the company town" atmosphere created by the dictatorial domination of the city by the Reynolds family.

In the 1946 elections, Local 22 played an important part in the defeat of the ex-Liberty Leaguer and reactionary textile baron, Chatham, and in the re-election of the somewhat liberal Rep. Folger to Congress.

It assisted in the registration of thousands of Negroes as well as white workers who had never voted before.

In the recent Spring city elections, Local 22 initiated the movement that led to the formation of a United Labor Committee of A. F. of L., C.I.O., and Railroad unions. It also called together the representatives of all sections of the Negro population (N.A.A.C.P., Ministers Association, and civic groups) and established the political unity of the Negro community and its alliance with united labor in the city elections. This loose coalition threatened the political domination of the Reynolds family for the first time. While its candidate for Mayor was defeated, the coalition succeeded in electing two Aldermen, Denny and a Negro Minister, Reverend Kenneth R. Williams, who received votes from both white and Negro citizens. *Rev. Kenneth R. Williams, who is a World War II veteran, is the first Negro elected to public office in the South since the end of the last century, when the last political victories of Reconstruction were wiped out. The militant and politically conscious leaders of Local 22 based their election activity on a municipal program in the interests of the Negro people, the white workers, professionals, and middle classes, i.e., of the entire community in opposition to the handful of monopolist exploiters.*

In numerous other ways, Local 22

has supported the struggles of the white and Negro workers of North Carolina and has played a major role in the C.I.O. organizing drive in the State. It was responsible for the organization into the F.T.A. of 10,000 Negro leaf-house and tobacco workers in the Black Belt plantation area of eastern North Carolina.

One of the most important results of the wartime industrial growth in the South was the increased role of the organized working class. This was expressed in labor's role in the changing relation of forces in the South. In Winston-Salem it took the specific form of the leading role of the Negro working class in the leadership of the oppressed Negro people.

An analysis of the struggles of the Reynolds workers offers highly instructive lessons. Local 22 was spearheading the drive to achieve united action of the Negro people in Winston-Salem and the rural Black Belt of North Carolina. Side by side with the general political stirrings in the state, the groundwork was being prepared for building of a broad coalition of labor, the Negro people and the democratic middle class of North Carolina, that would challenge the Reynolds', Dukes and Cannons, and the Wall Street-Bourbon economic and political dictatorship over North Carolina.

Motivated by fear of the political perspectives for the further develop-



ment of the labor and Negro liberation movement in the Winston-Salem area, and determined to crush the union as part of the general offensive of reaction, the Reynolds Company provoked the strike on May 1. The company, which had made a net profit after taxes in 1946 of \$28 million, insisted on abrogating the contract and the union security clause, while offering only a 5½¢ hourly increase. The company counted heavily on support from the anti-labor drive in Congress.

Locally, its trump card was Red-baiting and Negro-baiting. *The company was aware of the crucial weakness of the union, namely, that the majority of the white workers had not joined the organization.* It used every open and subtle form of Negro-baiting to make the strike a race and not a class issue. It gave various favors to white scabs and undertook other subterfuges and provocations. An unprecedented Red-scare, cries of Communist domination, the direct intervention of the House Un-American Committee and the weapon of evictions and hunger were all utilized to break the strike, the union, and the advance of the Negro liberation movement. But the company failed.

6,000 Negroes and close to 1,000 whites struck on May 1. (About 3,000 whites and a handful of Negroes remained in the plant and were joined in the course of the strike by a few hundred other white

scabs.) The 7,000 strikers maintained 73 marching, singing picket lines on a 24-hour basis around the Reynolds industrial empire for six weeks. The strike had the support of the entire Negro population. Despite terrific provocations and pressure, the Inter-denominational Alliance of Ministers of Winston-Salem (Negro) unitedly supported the strike. The strike had wide community support, as shown by the fact that 200 white business people signed a statement supporting the strike and the demand for a 15¢ hourly increase.

These factors and the militancy and political consciousness of the Negro strikers in particular, and the splendid leadership of the Negro and white officials of Local 22 finally, after six weeks, broke the Camel's back. Despite all the desperate efforts to break the strike, the company was forced to retreat. Had it not been for the fact that a majority of the white workers refused to join the strike, all the workers could have won completely all their demands and one of the greatest strike victories in the South. As it was, the strike was settled as a definite even if partial victory, with a number of important gains, all of which the company had refused to yield for six weeks, namely, an average 8¢ to 12¢ hourly wage increase, a contract, union security, and seniority maintenance.

The lessons of this major struggle both in its achievements and short-

comings, open up new perspectives for the labor movement and the organizing drive, for the Negro liberation movement and the democratic coalition in the South.

#### OTHER MASS MOVEMENTS

As in Winston-Salem, so in many areas of the South the Negro people have developed a united and militant action unprecedented in recent decades. One of the main features of this upsurge among the Negro people in all walks of life expresses itself in political activity, especially in the urban centers of the South. This is seen in the fact that an estimated 700,000 Negroes voted in the Southern states last year in spite of obstacles and threats against their lives, dramatized in the Talmadge, Bilbo, and Rankin campaigns. It is also seen in the fact that in a number of Southern states (Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Florida, Texas, etc.), Negroes ran for public office and built mass political action movements involving every type of Negro organization. In a number of cases these candidates received the vigorous backing of trade unions and progressive white citizens. Fear of this rising political consciousness of the Negro people and their support for progress, has led reactionaries to make a renewed campaign for new voting restrictions, which is symbolized by the establishment of the so-called white primary in a number of the old slave states of the

deep South.

Not only is there a deep ferment among the oppressed Negro people, and the labor movement of the South, but considerable changes are taking place among various strata of the white professionals and middle class. Outstanding in this development is the movement and struggles of the students (mainly veterans) that have permeated most southern universities. This is seen in the demonstration and parade of Georgia students against Talmadge's fascist coup and their solidarity with Negro students (organized by the Southern Negro Youth Congress) in the fight against Talmadge, the Ku Klux Klan, and Columbians; and in the demonstration and parade of Alabama students in support of Governor Folsom against a reactionary attack. This is seen in the demonstration of South Carolina students against the acquittal of the self-confessed lynchers in the Greenville trial; in the struggle for Negro rights by the students of Tulane, the University of Oklahoma, and the University of Texas; in the tremendous pro-Wallace sentiment among the Southern students, and in literally scores of movements for academic rights, housing for veterans, and other economic needs of the students.

Important political and economic struggles have taken place among white teachers in North Carolina, Georgia, Louisiana, Texas, etc. There is considerable stirring among white

vet  
Thi  
lasi  
sho  
to t  
and  
num  
nifi  
erab  
chur  
Sou  
by  
In  
whi  
wor  
caus  
wor  
ribl  
by  
Not  
whe  
Sou  
the  
not  
It i  
the  
in t  
peop  
fluid  
in  
will  
lies  
A F  
PI  
T  
crat  
ent  
in t  
bas

veterans in many parts of the South. This was dramatized by the events last summer in Athens, Tenn., which showed dissatisfaction and opposition to the reactionary political machines and a progressive orientation on a number of questions. Another significant manifestation is the considerable democratic sentiment among church congregations throughout the South, and the positive role played by women in these developments.

Increasing numbers among the white and urban middle class and working class recognize that a root cause of their own inadequate and worsening conditions lies in the terrible oppression of the Negro people by the Wall Street-Bourbon forces. Notwithstanding this, the overwhelming majority of the white Southerners, including a section of the Southern labor movement, do not yet understand this central fact. It is precisely this that holds back the limitless possibilities for progress in the South. But the South and its people are in a state of tremendous fluidity, and this central weakness in the people's movement can and will be changed in the period that lies ahead.

#### A FIGHTING PEOPLE'S PROGRAM

The reactionary poll-tax Democrats have a stronger position at present in the national Democratic Party, in the national Administration and basically in Congress, than at any

time since 1933. Yet, as the foregoing analysis has shown, there exists in the South today a broad popular basis of resistance to the dictatorial control of the poll-taxers. The common denominator for this opposition is the widespread and popular sentiment against the masters of the poll-tax Democrats—the Wall Street-Bourbon combination. While labor and the oppressed Negro people must form the core of the struggle against the Wall Street-Bourbon oppression of the South, the democratic people's front has the broadest potential base. It can include a considerable section of the liberal bourgeoisie in the South and their political spokesmen, such as Pepper, Folsom, Arnall, etc., who are in opposition to the Wall Street-Bourbon strangulation of the South.

This broad democratic movement can base itself on the progressive Roosevelt heritage in the South and the present widespread support of Henry Wallace's opposition to the Truman Doctrine and his program for overcoming the unequal economic status of the South. The rallying of these progressive forces within the Democratic Party, as well as outside, can also help to defeat a number of the poll-tax Democrats in 1948, and weaken their tie-up with Truman in the 1948 Democratic convention and elections. It can also serve to facilitate progressive and independent political action in the South looking toward a new people's

party against the dictatorial domination of the poll-tax Democrats and their lynch-henchmen. Such a perspective was at least implied by the Southern Conference for Human Welfare in its recent declaration that "the human needs and political aspirations of the Southern people will not be frustrated by reactionary programs of either traditional party," and that "the greatest political need of the Southern people is to give urgent consideration, through their churches, unions and associations of every kind, to the best way of reversing the present tragic trend in domestic and foreign affairs."

The democratic movement can be rallied and united around a fighting people's economic and legislative program. Such a program could be realized only by a *united, popular crusade and powerful mass struggles in the South* to save the people from mass unemployment and lynch terror, from ruin and catastrophe. Such a program could be adjusted locally to the primary needs of the toilers in a given plantation, factory, or community, with a recognition of the different levels of development in various areas. At the same time, specific points of the program would attract one or another sector of the people's coalition, and sometimes only in a conditional sense.

As we said in an article in *Political Affairs* in March, 1946 ("What the South Faces Today"); the people's economic and political program

needs to center around the fight for jobs, for full equality and freedom for the oppressed Negro people, for drastic agrarian reform, for overcoming the unequal economic and political status of the South and for building a democratic, forward-looking South in a progressive America. Such a program needs to include, in part, the following points:

1. Jobs for all at decent wages. Government responsibility for full employment. Government operation of all remaining shut-down war plants, which private industry refuses to operate, for the production of peacetime goods.

2. An end to Wall Street's economic and financial discrimination against the South. Adequate and liberal government credit to aid small and medium business to develop industry and the natural resources of the South. Breakup of Wall Street's financial stranglehold on the South.

3. Land to those who farm it. An end to the plantation set-up in the Black Belt and to the system of national oppression of the Negro people, *which is the foundation of the South's misery and backwardness*. Written contracts between landlords and tenants. Inclusion of Negroes in the county farm boards and all authoritative bodies. An end to the Jim-Crow color caste system, to peonage and usury. Expansion of the Farm Security Administration and the development of a large-scale land-purchasing and resettlement

prog  
be  
4.  
ing  
Neg  
yout  
panc  
cour  
indu  
5.  
to p  
effec  
Deat  
men  
bill  
lives  
6.  
hour  
ante  
tabli  
redu  
7.  
eral  
eran  
a pe  
discr  
Main  
year  
8.  
state  
wico  
inclu  
cont  
ban  
trific  
tals,  
9.  
crati  
dom  
indu

program to help the tillers of the soil become farm owners.

4. Adequate wage increases. Raising of the standard of living of the Negro people, farmers, veterans, youth, and other toilers, thereby expanding the home market and encouraging small and medium local industry.

5. Drastic immediate federal action to prevent lynching. Passage of an effective federal anti-lynching bill. Death penalty to lynchers. Enactment of an over-all federal civil rights bill to protect the rights and very lives of the Negro people.

6. Enactment of a federal 75¢-an-hour minimum wage law. A guaranteed annual wage in industry. Establish the 30-hour week without reduction in earnings.

7. Adequate and progressive federal legislation on social security, veterans, health, housing, education, and a people's tax program without any discrimination against the South. Maintenance of rent controls. A 3-year moratorium on evictions.

8. The launching by the federal, state and local governments of a widespread public works program, including power, river-valley, flood-control and irrigation projects; urban and rural housing, rural electrification, highways, schools, hospitals, etc.

9. Public ownership under democratic control of the Wall Street-dominated utilities, power and oil industries, mines, railroads, and of

the munitions industry.

10. For full economic, political, and social equality for the Negro people, equal job rights, equal pay, upgrading of Negroes and against arbitrary mass lay-offs.

11. Passage of effective state and federal F.E.P.C. and anti-poll tax legislation. For the enforcement of all federal and other laws in defense of the civil rights of the Negro people, against all restrictions on the franchise (white primaries, etc.) and for the unqualified right of Negroes to vote and hold public office.

12. The outlawing and prohibition of the K.K.K., Columbians, and all other fascist organizations. Abolition of the Un-American Committee. The defeat of all state and federal anti-labor and anti-Communist bills. The defense of the legal existence of the Communist Party.

13. Support a full farm production program, including a program for the modernization and diversification of Southern agriculture in cotton and tobacco, in livestock and dairying, fruits and vegetables, and new industrial crops. For cheap long-range government credit for purchase of tools, seed, fertilizer, and livestock. For the development of credit associations and farmers' cooperatives (marketing and consumers) and for the cooperative use of tractor and farm machinery.

14. An end to the Truman Doctrine and the reactionary bi-partisan foreign policy with its program of

imperialism and militarism which endangers peace and breeds international insecurity, crises, and civil wars. Support to a peace policy based on the genuine interests of the South and our country as a whole, on the Roosevelt policy of Soviet-American friendship and collaboration in an effective United Nations.

15. Support to the campaigns to organize the workers and professionals, the sharecroppers and farmers, the oppressed Negro people, the veterans and other sections of the population, and to their struggles for their needs and the people's program for the welfare of the South.

#### TASKS OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY IN THE SOUTH

Since its reconstitution two years ago, the Communist Party organizations in the South have made considerable political and organizational progress. This was achieved by applying the correct Marxist line established by the National Convention in July, 1945 and by developing a fighting spirit and local initiative. By increasing its membership four-fold in one year, by its independent mass work in defense of labor and the Negro people, by its public relations activity (advertisements, radio talks, appearances at state legislatures, trade unions, churches, and colleges) the Communist Party of North Carolina has set an example for our Party, especially in the South. Equally great responsibilities and

great opportunities that confront Communists in the South today call for a critical examination and substantial improvement of the basic propaganda and organizational work of the Party Districts in the South in the struggle for the vital needs of the masses and for the people's economic and legislative program for the South.

It is of paramount importance for all Communists to deepen their understanding of our Marxist position on the Negro question, the educational use of the slogan of self-determination, and its significance as a general guide to our day-to-day struggles for Negro rights. This is all the more urgent since the major weakness of the mass movement in the South today is the separation and lagging far behind, of the majority of the white masses, including a section of organized labor, from the forward-moving Negro people's movement. This is seen, on the one hand, in the absence as yet of an effective mass struggle against the wave of lynch terror; and, on the other hand, in certain aspects of the historic struggles in Winston-Salem.

The Communists have the supreme task of explaining to the Southern labor movement and the white masses generally the real truth that is hidden by the Jim-Crow propaganda, and hence their responsibility in the struggle against the lynch terror. While combating every trace of white chauvinism in their own

ranks  
skillfu  
and li  
masses  
lot un  
fight  
and fo  
portun  
strugg  
mer a  
the om  
can ac  
join i  
Crow  
and in  
There  
in the  
This  
even r  
and B  
by the  
the K  
creasin  
tivities  
Demo  
South.  
confid  
al wo  
course  
princip  
approa  
will su

ranks they must explain boldly and skillfully, using the most immediate and living examples, that the white masses cannot improve their own lot *unless and until* they join in the fight against Jim-Crow oppression and for Negro rights. At every opportunity and in the course of every struggle, the Communists must hammer away at the underlying fact that *the only way* the toiling white masses can advance *their own interests* is to join in the fight against the Jim-Crow system which lynches Negroes and impoverishes the white masses. *There is no other way to progress in the South.*

This is no easy task. It is made even more difficult by the imperialist and Bourbon offensive in the South, by the activities of the lynchers and the Ku Klux Klan, and by the increasingly menacing and splitting activities of the reactionary Social-Democrats and Trotskyites in the South. But we Communists have confidence that by correct educational work and by leadership in the course of struggle, by combining principle with flexible tactics in our approach to the white masses—we will succeed. In this way we will be

able to transform the bosses' lies about the Negro question, which serve as barriers to progress, into the truth about the Negro question, and unite Negro and white in the struggle for democracy.

Along with this work, it is necessary to re-emphasize that Southern Communists must help develop a real organizing crusade and become dynamic organizers of the masses on all fronts of struggle. This applies in the first place to labor's organizing drive, but also to organizing work among the farmers and sharecroppers, veterans, the oppressed Negro people, etc.

We must constantly bear in mind that the South needs, more than anything else, *a fighting mass Communist Party*. Only if we build such a Party in close contact with the masses, can we defend the every-day needs of the people and advance the cause of democracy and Socialism. Only such a Party can help build a broad democratic coalition for progressive political action which is able to carry on effective struggle against the unholy Wall Street-Bourbon oppressors of the Negro people and the white masses of the entire South.

# CURRENT ECONOMIC TRENDS

By LABOR RESEARCH  
ASSOCIATION

EVERYONE from bankers Jesse Jones and Winthrop Aldrich to the liberal *Reader's Scope* magazine, is now busily engaged in talking the country out of a depression.

Or rather they are all joining in the general chant that it's a "recession readjustment," not a depression, with which we now have to deal.

In their search for a pleasing formula, business spokesmen all seem to agree, at least for public consumption, that a depression would be a terrible thing. But does that make a recession O.K.? The question arises: how far can an economic decline proceed and still be just a fairly pleasant "shakeout" recession, but no depression? If we have 10 million unemployed, or "only" seven million, as some of the most conservative sources now predict, will we feel any better if we call it a recession, not a depression?

It is best for people who are interested in what is actually happening to steer clear of these exercises in semantics and to look at the basic

economic relationships as they shape up as this is written at the beginning of June.

## INDUSTRIAL PRODUCTION

Look first at industrial production which has already reached its turning point. The Federal Reserve Board index, on a 1935-39 base equal to 100, reached its peak in March at 190. In April it fell to around 186 (revised) which is also below the January and February levels although well above the pre-war level of 162 (annual average) in 1941. It continued its decline in May.

Here are the annual averages and the latest quarterly and monthly figures:

*Index of Industrial Production*  
(Federal Reserve Board; 1935-39=100)

1939.....109	1944.....235
1940.....125	1945.....203
1941.....162	1946.....170
1942.....199	1947: (1st quar.)...189
1943.....239	March.....190
	April.....186 <sup>r</sup>

r= revised

Although the industrial production index is headed downward, it has been rather slow at making the turn. With such a massive boom, comprising so many factors, the "plateau" at the top has been extended over a number of months and the decline is not likely to be precipitous; but it will certainly continue over a longer period than most economists are now predicting.

The recent Dun & Bradstreet sur-

vey  
for  
tion  
of th  
Cou  
the  
busin  
from  
end  
woul  
vicin  
far i  
its P  
150

Gr  
Go  
Pri  
C  
R  
M  
M  
C  
L  
M  
S

Ho  
mates  
reason  
the cl  
making  
which  
dollar  
chase  
a Qu  
b Th  
private  
of 1947  
new age  
goods ar  
not yet



vey of Big Business opinion taken for the Taft Committee, in connection with its belated consideration of the report of the President's timid Council of Economic Advisers under the Employment Act of 1946, found business itself expecting a drop of from 5 per cent to 15 per cent by the end of this year. The 15 per cent drop would carry the F.R.B. index to the vicinity of 160. Regardless of how far it goes in the next six months, its possible continuance to the 140-150 area sometime next year would

certainly be a lot more than a mere "recession."

### GROSS NATIONAL PRODUCT

A more "over-all" way of looking at the economy is by means of the figures on the "gross national product." The quarterly figures for this total economic indicator have been issued by the U.S. Department of Commerce for a number of years. Here are the estimates for the two most recent quarters, the last of 1946 and the first of 1947:

### GROSS NATIONAL PRODUCT<sup>a</sup>

(U.S. Department of Commerce; in billions of current dollars)

	1946 4th Quarter	1947 1st Quarter
Gross national product or expenditures .....	204.7	209.0
Government expenditures for goods and services....	30.8	31.5
Private gross capital formation .....	37.9	39.0
Construction .....	8.8	8.9 <sup>b</sup>
Producers' durable goods .....	15.6	15.5 <sup>b</sup>
Net change in inventories .....	9.7	5.6 <sup>b</sup>
Net export of goods and services .....	3.8	9.0 <sup>b</sup>
Consumers' expenditures for goods and services ....	136.0	138.5
Durable goods .....	16.7	.....
Non-durable goods .....	81.8	.....
Services .....	37.5	.....

However inexact these rough estimates may be, they represent with reasonable accuracy the direction of the change in the various categories making up gross national product, which is a measurement in current dollars of all goods and services purchased by the three main subdivi-

<sup>a</sup> Quarterly figures at annual rates.

<sup>b</sup> The detailed figures for the components of private gross capital formation for the 1st quarter of 1947 are advance estimates by a private business agency. Figures for breakdown of consumer goods and services for the 1st quarter of 1947 are not yet available.

sions of the economy—private business, government, and individual consumers.

The total figure, as estimated for the first quarter of 1947, stands at the all-time high. That it is actually higher than during the war is due mainly to the postwar inflation of prices. It does not indicate any increase in economic activity. For, as noted above, the index of industrial production is down to 186 compared

with a wartime peak average far above this in the war years 1943 through 1945.

In the limited periods compared in the table on gross national product between the fourth quarter of last year and the first quarter of 1947, the rise was the result of the increase in prices and the temporary big gain in net exports.

Looking at the various components of gross national product we find that the one called "private gross capital formation," the most dynamic one under what the economists loosely call the "enterprise system," now stands at a level never before reached in the history of American capitalism.

But let us look at the factors that make up this private gross capital formation and the expectations for continuance of this high rate of performance.

#### BUILDING CONSTRUCTION

First, consider construction in the first quarter of this year which accounts for a little under \$9 billion of the total. The facts on construction are anything but cheerful. Total contracts for new construction turned down about June of last year and have been declining since. Home construction in many communities is practically at a standstill.

The dollar volume of contracts awarded in April for residential building declined about 10 per cent, and for non-residential, about 4 per cent, according to the authoritative

F. W. Dodge Corp. reports. Actually the lag was much greater, since the decline is contra-seasonal and building costs have soared to fantastic levels.

During the first four months of this year only about 200,000 permanent privately-financed housing units were started, against 205,000 in the like period of last year. Permits for new urban building in the first quarter were 35 per cent below a year ago. Those covering non-residential construction were down 54 per cent. As the *Wall Street Journal* admits, "These are drastic declines." Not more than 700,000 new houses are expected to be started this year despite the misleading talk about a "million new homes" in 1947.

There has, of course, been a considerable amount of optimism generated in connection with the building industry. There has been, for example, much discussion of a drop in home prices, which have more than doubled since before the war.

The facts in this situation, however, as outlined by Washington agencies, indicate that building material prices on the whole are about a third higher than they were last October. By May they were over 40 per cent higher than a year ago. Although there has been some "softening" in the prices of Southern pine lumber, for example, it has been accompanied by rises in other building items such as bath tubs, oak flooring, and sinks. The most optimistic predict declines of possibly 10-15 per

cent  
now.

On  
tion is  
dustry  
support  
props a  
is that  
need  
them. T  
for hou  
the pu  
the de  
buildin

CAPIT.

The  
up priv  
"produc  
represent  
ate busi  
ment.  
regard  
tal form

The  
tendenc  
off."

reached  
stimulat  
reconve

A dro  
the card  
ample,  
it will  
sion of  
tip-off f  
lines. E  
a small  
ter of r  
to expe  
billion i

cent in average prices by a year from now.

On the whole the building situation is so unsatisfactory that the industry is definitely counted out as a support for the economy when other props are withdrawn. The stark fact is that while millions of Americans need homes, they cannot afford them. The so-called deferred demand for housing is meaningless without the purchasing power to transform the demand into orders for new building.

#### CAPITAL GOODS

The next item that goes to make up private gross capital formation is "producers' durable goods." This represents the expenditures by private business on machinery and equipment. Along with construction it is regarded as the hard core of capital formation.

The figures already show some tendency for this category to "level off." The record-breaking totals reached in this field were obviously stimulated by the requirements of reconversion.

A drop in this category is now in the cards. The steel industry, for example, has made it quite clear that it will go in for no further expansion of its facilities; and this is the tip-off for what to expect in related lines. Even though there might be a small increase in the second quarter of 1947 it is certainly reasonable to expect a decline of possibly \$3 billion in the annual rate of expendi-

tures for producers' durable goods within the next year.

#### INVENTORIES

Another component of private gross capital formation is what is called "net change in inventories." This has been on the positive side throughout 1946. Inventories have been piling up to fill the "pipelines" of industry and trade. As the figures show, however, this could not last. The break came in the first quarter of 1947 when the rate of inventory accumulation fell about \$4 billion.

In our last review of current economic trends in the April issue of *Political Affairs*, we concluded that the 1946 rate of inventory accumulation would not continue much longer. We also indicated what is now generally recognized, that inventory accumulation had been a very important support of business volume in the last two years.

In a recent report on the inventory situation, S. Morris Livingston of the Department of Commerce noted that the inventories of wholesalers during the first quarter of the current year continued to rise even where there was no longer a strong upward trend in sales. This showed that unsold goods had started to back up on the wholesaler. (*Survey of Current Business*, May, 1947.) Inventories of wholesalers continued to rise in April in the face of the declining sales.

The Commerce Department econ-

omist concludes cautiously that "the expansionary force" of inventory accumulation in business as a whole "is likely to be of diminishing importance." This is another way of saying that inventory as a contributing factor in boosting production is going down. In other words it could be expected in due time, in the course of the depression next year, to approach zero, and ultimately to be a negative factor in the total business picture.

### EXPORTS

These big holes left by the withdrawal of inventory accumulation, the decline in construction and in expenditures for new plant and equipment, some think, might be filled by exports. They cite the need for goods abroad and the vast market that might be filled with our goods overseas.

Exports have, it is true, been a real "sustaining factor" in the economy especially in the first part of the current year. The U.S. "export surplus" as the table shows, rose to an annual rate of around \$9 billion in the first quarter of this year, and later estimates indicate that it has been actually running at around \$12 billion.

This spectacular export boom means, as the National City Bank puts it in its June *Letter*, that "foreign countries are incurring a deficit of \$1 billion a month in their international transactions with the United States."

But this situation cannot long continue without the foreign countries running out of dollars, gold, or credits to make up such a tremendous deficit. This is where the advocates of vast "foreign-aid" come on the scene with their programs of political grants and loans to nations that can fill the conditions laid down by Wall Street. The much-discussed multi-billion foreign "aid" program is advanced as one way of heading off Communism abroad in line with the provocative "Truman Doctrine" and at the same time, as *Business Week* puts it (June 7), of helping avert "a violent cut in U.S. exports" and a "serious recession." Others call it world economic "pump-priming."

The plans for wide-scale foreign "aid" may possibly be considered in a later session of Congress, but even if they were adopted in full they would be too late to have any effect on the general economic trend this year and a part of next.

We should note also the sobering fact that whatever is given to these reactionary governments abroad will have to be paid through heavier taxes on the American consumers. This will have influences on domestic purchasing power and the home market that would go far to counter-balance any stimulating effects to be expected from the trade resulting from the foreign "aid" program.

### CONSUMER EXPENDITURES

Finally, we come to that largest of all components in gross national

pro-  
goods  
of th  
twen  
the fi  
is onl  
prices  
declin  
cal vo  
The  
is gen  
sult o  
to fill  
in wa  
great  
diture  
able g  
ning  
vance  
The  
justed  
elimin  
drop  
year t  
or abo  
of ret  
of th  
high  
below  
So  
cerned  
whole  
about  
dollar  
sharp  
in thi  
that v  
about  
ity of  
same  
One

product—consumer expenditures for goods and services. Here the figures of the table show a slight rise between the last quarter of 1946 and the first quarter of this year. But this is only the result of an *increase in prices*. Actually, there was a slight decline measured in terms of physical volume.

The high rate of expenditures, it is generally agreed, has been the result of an abnormal buying spree to fill certain needs that accumulated in wartime. As noted before, the great expansion in consumer expenditures fell in the field of non-durable goods. But these are now beginning to slump as prices have advanced.

The index of total retail sales, adjusted for seasonal variation and eliminating price changes, shows a drop from 170.1 in March of last year to 157.0 in March of this year, or about 8 per cent. And the value of retail trade for the first quarter of this year, after correction for high prices, was about 6 per cent below the like period of last year.

So far as food consumption is concerned we find that food sales of wholesalers have slumped to only about 10 per cent above last year in dollar totals. And in view of the sharp increases in the price of food in this period this would indicate that wholesalers are actually selling about 35 per cent less physical quantity of food this year than at the same time last year.

One of the outstanding trends of

the postwar period has been the decline in real wages. (See our *Labor Fact Book* 8.) The result has been that when the non-durable goods markets began to decline and durable goods began coming on the market in increasing amounts the purchasing power has not been there to absorb them.

To be sure, there is apparently a steady market for automobiles and certain other durable goods for some months to come among the top percentage of the population that has some savings. But the normal run of buyers have, as the economists say, "been priced out of the market." We hear even of furniture stores and others cancelling orders for washing machines.

When such signs begin to multiply we know that there is no great unsaturated effective market for this type of goods.

And the extension of consumer credit, which has now reached \$10 billion outstanding, is only a sign of vanishing ready cash. It only postpones the time when payments for these items must be made. It creates no new purchasing power.

Besides, even corporation economists, who figure markets carefully, admit that there are millions of Americans today who are in no position to meet the installments under consumer credit plans. In other words, they are not able to buy on these terms the durable consumer goods that are now being turned out in a torrent. The fact is that so much

of the income of these people must be laid out for food, clothing, rent, and the bare necessities of life that the more durable items are entirely beyond their reach.

### PRICES

As this is written, some wholesale prices are rising, others are "weakening," as businessmen put it; a few are not moving in either direction. Although the trend is not decisive the general over-all movement is downward, from the peak of a little under 150 on the Bureau of Labor Statistics index which was reached in March. However, no "precipitate or disorderly decline," as the National City Bank puts it, is expected in the immediate period ahead.

Comparisons with the price levels of prewar and wartime are given below:

#### Wholesale Commodity Prices (U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics; 1926=100)

1939 .....	77	1944 .....	104
1940 .....	79	1945 .....	106
1941 .....	87	1946 .....	121
1942 .....	99	1947:	
1943 .....	103	1st quar. ....	145
		2nd quar. ....	147 <sup>p</sup>

<sup>p</sup> = preliminary

A more definite trend downward is predicted for the last half of the year. But even if the index fell to the level of 1946 it would still be 57 per cent above the prewar level.

Commodities expected to show the most decline are textiles, espe-

cially cotton goods and hosiery, hides, skins, leather, shoes, fats, some metals, some building materials, drugs, paints, and a few other items.

So far as retail prices are concerned they are not reflecting very noticeably the trend in wholesale prices. In fact they might go higher if rents are included, for Congress has yet to finish its wrecking job on rent controls.

The present expectation is that food prices will not decline appreciably during the next twelve months and the big foreign demand, combined with the price-fixing grip of the monopolists, especially in meat and dairy products, will tend to hold them up for some time ahead.

The trend in the conservative cost of living (consumer price) index of the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, since before the war runs as follows:

#### Consumer Price Index

U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics;  
1935-1939=100

1939 .....	99.4	1945 .....	128.4
1940 .....	100.2	1946 .....	139.2
1941 .....	105.2	1947:	
1942 .....	116.5	Jan. ....	153.3
1943 .....	123.6	Feb. ....	153.2
1944 .....	125.5	Mar. ....	156.3
		Apr. ....	156.1

Between last June, when price control cracked up in Congress, and March, 1947, the consumer price index rose over 17 per cent, the food component alone rising 30.2 per cent. Food, incidentally, now ac-

counts for about 43 per cent of the consumer price index compared with only 34 per cent when the war started in 1939.

One way of illustrating the significance of the rise in the cost of living is through the inverse value of purchasing power of the dollar. This is graphically shown by the fact that \$18.75 invested in an "E" defense bond in 1941 may now be cashed for \$21. But this amount of money will buy only as much as \$12.15 in 1941 dollars.

As for the voluntary price cuts over which President Truman and Senator Taft have been exchanging political swings, we can agree with the *Magazine of Wall Street* (June 7, 1947) that they so far consist mostly of "mark-downs of sub-standard and over-priced merchandise items."

The Department of Commerce admits as much, when, after noting that the call for voluntary price cuts had been negligible, says: "To be broadly effective, reductions will need to go beyond the retailers—to manufacturers and distributors as well as to producers of farm and food products. . . ."

In any event, whatever declines occur in retail prices will be slim and holds out little hope for higher standards of living to the worker whose wages are declining and for whom the specter of unemployment is becoming more real. (See report on

lay-offs in our June *Economic Notes*.)

Although there was an over-all increase in jobs in May, most of the increase was admittedly seasonal—in construction, lumbering, and in the trade and service field. Factory employment, however, continued to decline, the drop in May being close to 160,000, according to the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. Of these, about 64,000 represented jobs in the durable goods industries, the remainder being in textiles and other nondurable goods industries.

When lay-offs begin to increase, when production declines further, and when sales fall off in the "healthy adjustments" that the corporations now look forward to, a program of government expenditures will doubtless be considered by the President's Council of Economic Advisors. This would be expected to take up some of the slack.

Such a program, however, if it involved expansion of public housing, public works, increase in pensions and social security, and lower taxes on low incomes, would, of course, be sharply resisted by the reactionaries in and out of Congress. Under the present alignment in Washington, such a program would be unlikely to make any progress unless the strongest pressure is brought to bear through the independent political action of labor and its allies.

## FROM THE COMMUNIST PRESS OF OTHER LANDS

### ON THE GRADUAL TRANSITION FROM SOCIALISM TO COMMUNISM\*

By A. P. LYAPIN

AFTER THE VICTORIOUS ENDING of the Great Patriotic War, the Soviet Union entered into a new era of its historic development, the era of peaceful economic and cultural development and construction.

The new Five-Year Plan Law, adopted by the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R., deals with the reconstruction and development of the people's economy of the U.S.S.R. and opens before our land new perspectives for the greatest rise of productive forces, of the material and cultural standards of the people, of the economic and military might of the Soviet State.

The fulfillment of the new Five-Year Plan will constitute an important step forward in completing the

building of Socialist society and in the gradual transition from Socialism to Communism.

\* \* \*

The full establishment of Communism in our country is the aim of the Bolshevik Party and the Soviet people. While this aim has not yet been achieved, it can and must be achieved in the future. Comrade Stalin established the possibility of building Communism in our country even under the conditions of capitalist encirclement, and pointed out concrete ways of gradual transition from Socialism to Communism. Comrade Stalin's theory on the possibility of establishing Communism in the U.S.S.R. is an important contribution to Marxist-Leninist social science.

Comrade Stalin teaches us that the question of the victory of Socialism and Communism in our country has two distinct sides, one dealing with internal, the other with external, relations.

From the point of view of internal relations, the Soviet Union has every condition and opportunity for the establishment of full Communist society. During the past Stalin Five-

\* A lecture delivered under the auspices of the All-Union Lecture Bureau, Ministry of Highest Education, U.S.S.R., Moscow, 1946. Translated by Victor.

Year  
lished  
indust  
cialism  
ricultu  
ing cla  
Sociali  
establi  
ism th  
path t  
munis  
But  
questio  
nism h  
nal, i  
U.S.S.  
der co  
ment,  
danger  
side an  
capital  
of 194  
cist in  
war e  
Hitler-  
pan, th  
bounda  
rialist  
interna  
grew  
connect  
ever be  
new a  
peacefu  
country  
time it  
as long  
the pos  
ber att  
elimina  
Whil



Year Plans, the Soviet Union established an advanced large machine industry, the material base of Socialism. The collectivization of agriculture was completed, the exploiting classes were liquidated, and the Socialist society's foundations were established. The victory of Socialism thus opened to our country the path to the highest phase of Communism.

But besides internal relations, the question of the victory of Communism has another side, that of external, international relations. The U.S.S.R., building Communism under conditions of capitalist encirclement, is not guaranteed against the danger of military attacks from outside and against attempts to restore capitalism. Proof of this is the war of 1941-45, which the German-fascist invaders forced upon us. This war ended in complete defeat of Hitler-Germany and imperialist Japan, the two countries closest to our boundaries and the strongest imperialist robbers. During this war, the international prestige of the U.S.S.R. grew stronger, and its international connections became broader than ever before. All these factors create new and favorable conditions for peaceful Socialist construction in our country after the war. At the same time it should be remembered that as long as the capitalist world exists, the possibility of new wars and robber attacks upon the U.S.S.R. is not eliminated.

While continuing to develop peace-

ful Socialist construction, we must maintain maximum vigilance, not for a moment forgetting the intrigues of international reaction hatching plans for a new war. Hence, even during the process of further Socialist construction and the gradual transition to Communism, we must in every way strengthen our Socialist state, raise the military-economic might of our land, and constantly strengthen the armed forces of the U.S.S.R.

The question of establishing Communism in our country has a worldwide, historic significance. For ages the best representatives of mankind dreamed of the future Communist society. Marx and Engels founded the scientific theory of Communism. Lenin and Stalin, living in a new set of historic conditions, in a struggle for building Socialism in our country, developed this theory and put it into practice. For the first time in history the U.S.S.R. is putting the ideas of scientific Communism into practice. In fact, the U.S.S.R. has already fundamentally realized the first phase of Communism, and the gradual transition to its second, or highest phase, is now a matter of practical task. The successes already achieved in the building of Communist society furnish spiritual armament for the Soviet people, move them forward, strengthen their belief in their own forces, and mobilize them for new Communist victories and achievements.

\* \* \*

The works of Marx, Engels, Lenin

and Stalin furnish a scientific characterization of Communist society. Marxism-Leninism teaches that, in the process of its development, Communist society goes through two basic phases. The first is Socialism, the second and highest is Communism. These are not two different social-economic formations, but only two stages of development of one and the same Communist society.

The principles common to both Socialism and Communism are that, in both, the means of production are no longer in the hands of private owners, but are social, common property; the country's national economy is conducted according to a single plan; exploitation of man by man is done away with; and competition, anarchy of production, crises, and unemployment are absent.

These principles, common to both Socialism and Communism, make it impossible to draw any distinction between them except as different stages or phases of the development of Communist society. In characterizing Socialism as the first phase of Communism, Lenin wrote:

In so far as the means of production become *common* property, the word "Communism" is also applicable here, providing we do not forget that it is *not* complete Communism. (*Selected Works*, Vol. VII, p. 90.)

Socialism and Communism, as two phases of Communist society, differ from each other in certain characteristics and peculiarities.

Under Socialism the productive forces have not as yet reached a stage of development which would ensure an abundance of all articles of consumption. Labor has not yet become man's most important life necessity; society still has to exercise the most stringent control over labor, over the production and consumption of commodities. The distribution of articles of consumption is regulated by the principle: "From each according to his capacity, to each according to his labor."

Social, or common property, still exists in two forms—state and collective-farm cooperative, which finds its practical expression in class differences between workers and peasants; hangovers of capitalism still exist in the economy and consciousness of the people. The contradiction and differences between town and country, between mental and physical labor, are not yet fully liquidated; there still remain remnants of the old social division of labor.

Under the highest phase of Communism, the productive forces reach such a high stage of development that they bring a full abundance of all products and articles of consumption. Labor becomes man's prime life necessity. Distribution of articles of consumption takes place according to the principle: "From each according to his capacity, to each according to his needs." There is only one form of common or social property, Communist ownership of all means of production. There is a

complete liquidation of all remnants of class distinctions and hangovers of capitalism in the consciousness of the people. There is a complete elimination of any contradictions between town and country and between mental and physical labor, a liquidation of any remnants of the old social division of labor, etc.

The transition from the first phase of Communism to its highest phase assumes the character of gradual transition, and thus represents an entire historic phase of development. We know, of course, that the change from capitalism to Socialism constitutes the change from one system of production to another, a radically different system. Hence, this transition cannot be realized in any other way than through revolution.

But the process of transition from Socialism to Communism is entirely different. The change from Socialism to Communism is not a change from one social-economic formation based on individual ownership, to another one, based upon common ownership of means of production. Under Socialism, the exploitation of man by man and the exploiting classes are liquidated. Under present conditions in the U.S.S.R., where Socialist society is fundamentally already established, where the Socialist system rules fully over the whole national economy, the further development of Socialism, as well as the transition to Communism, proceed on their own basis. The second, highest phase of Communist society

will naturally grow up and develop out of Socialism, its first phase. Hence, the transition from Socialism to Communism will materialize in the form of a gradual development.

The gradual transition from Socialism to Communism does not however mean that this development will proceed at a slowed-down tempo. On the contrary, the period of transition from Socialism to Communism will be characterized by rapid development of the productive forces, rapid growth of national wealth, and an unheard-of advance of the level of the material and cultural living standards of the people.

The gradual transition from Socialism to Communism does not exclude the possibility of irregular, zig-zag stages in the process of development of Socialist society. For example, the transition to Communist principles of distribution cannot take place simultaneously with all articles of consumption. Of necessity, such a change must be gradual, in accord with the growth of the productive forces and the achievement of an abundance of commodities. But the very transition from a Socialist principle of distribution, according to labor, to a Communist principle, according to needs, constitutes a leap into a new set of conditions.

The same rule is applicable to technological progress as well. During the transition from Socialism to Communism, technological development will demonstrate itself in great technical changes in the different

branches of national economy. The use of the most important scientific and technical discoveries will denote a new stage in the development of man's productive forces, man's conquest of nature.

Of course, it would be erroneous to assume that social development during the period of gradual transition to Communism would proceed without struggle, simply and smoothly, of its own accord. In his report to the XVII Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, Comrade Stalin ridiculed those who thought that now "we can lay down our arms and retire—to sleep and to wait for the advent of classless society." Transition to Communism means the enormous, unheard-of development of the productive forces. This alone demands the raising of the level of activity of the Soviet people, the concentration of their efforts in the building of the new form of society. At the same time the building of Communism presupposes strenuous struggle against routine and prejudice, against any and all hangovers of capitalist society. Comrade Stalin pointed out that classless society cannot come of its own accord, that it must be conquered and built up by the efforts of all toilers in the struggle against the enemies of Socialism.

It would also be wrong to visualize the social developments of this period as a picture, where the building of Socialist society would first be completed, and only then would be-

gin the transition to Communism. These two are a single process, and not two consecutive processes. The process of gradual transition to Communism will come together with the further development and strengthening of the Socialist system of production, together with the completion of the upbuilding of Socialist society.

In order to achieve the transition to Communism, it is imperative to strengthen and develop in every way all the foundations, all the principles, of Socialism, of Socialist productive relations. The transition to a single Communist form of ownership will be realized through the strengthening and further development of all forms of Socialist ownership. The transition to Communist distribution, "according to need," will be achieved through the strengthening and development of Socialist distribution, "according to labor," through the strengthening of the monetary system, the all-round development of Soviet trade, etc.

\* \* \*

The transition from the first phase of Communism to its second, highest phase, calls for ceaseless growth and development of the productive forces, the production of an abundance of articles of consumption.

The advantages of the Socialist system of economy furnished the possibility of transforming the U.S.S.R. within the briefest historic period from a backward country into an advanced industrial and col-

lec  
first  
velop  
do  
sary  
cons  
for  
acco  
of se  
quar  
they  
In  
men  
grow  
will  
abun  
socie  
grad  
of di  
to th  
cordi  
throu  
in all  
my,  
dustr  
On  
sites  
phase  
lies i  
econ  
catch  
capita  
sense  
produ  
tion.  
surpa  
temp  
and  
U.S.S  
the ca  
the t

lective-farm State. But during this first stage of Communism the development of the productive forces do not as yet reach the level necessary to guarantee an abundance of consumers' goods. Therefore, articles for consumption are distributed, not according to the needs of members of society, but in proportion to the quantity and quality of the work they perform for this society.

In the process of further development, as a result of the gigantic growth of the productive forces, it will be possible to guarantee an abundance of consumers' goods; and society will find it possible to pass gradually from the Socialist principle of distribution, "according to labor," to the Communist principle, "according to needs." The road lies through a ceaseless upward advance in all branches of our national economy, through the growth of our industries, agriculture, and transport.

One of the most important requisites for the transition from the first phase of Communism to the second lies in the realization of the main economic task of the U.S.S.R.—to catch up with and surpass the major capitalist countries in an economic sense, *i.e.*, in the volume of industrial production per capita of the population. The Soviet Union has already surpassed all capitalist countries in tempo of development of economy and technique of production. The U.S.S.R. has already surpassed all the capitalist countries of Europe in the total volume of industrial pro-

duction. The U.S.S.R. is still behind England and the U.S.A. in the per capita volume of industrial production.

The per capita volume of industrial production constitutes the basic criterion of a country's economic might. Therefore, the task of achieving such a level of production as to enable the country to surpass the per capita norms of consumption existing in major capitalist countries, becomes the basic economic task of the U.S.S.R., the decisive condition for the transition from Socialism to Communism.

Comrade Stalin posed this problem before the XVIII Congress of the Party:

Only if we outstrip the principal capitalist countries economically can we reckon upon our country being fully saturated with consumers' goods, on having an abundance of products, and on being able to make the transition from the first phase of Communism to its second phase. (*Leninism*, International Publishers, 1942, p. 448.)

The war against Hitler-Germany interrupted the realization of this basic economic task of the U.S.S.R. and inflicted enormous damage on our national economy. The new Five-Year Plan calls for full reconstruction of the damaged areas, reconstruction of the prewar level in industry and agriculture, as well as a considerable raising of these levels. The new Five-Year Plan calls for a considerable step forward in the solu-

tion of the basic economic task of the U.S.S.R.

In his historic election campaign speech to the voters of the Stalin election district in Moscow, on February 9, 1946, Comrade Stalin outlined a grandiose program for a new and mighty upsurge of the national economy of the U.S.S.R. which would enable our country to raise its industrial level about 300% over that of 1940. Comrade Stalin set the following tasks: to raise the annual production of cast iron up to 50 million tons; steel, up to 60 million tons; coal, to 500 million tons; crude oil, to 60 million tons. "Only under such conditions," said he, "can we consider that our homeland will be guaranteed against all possible accidents. That will probably require three more Five-Year Plans, I should think, if not more. But it can be done, and we must do it."

The new Five-Year Plan for the reconstruction and development of the national economy of the U.S.S.R. is a part of the grandiose program for the economic and cultural upsurge of our land. The new Five-Year Plan foresees further growth of all branches of our national economy; special attention is also given to technical progress and the raising of the material and cultural level of the life of the toilers. In 1950 our industrial production will be nearly 150% that of 1940. Toward the end of the five-year period, production of heavy metals will be 35%, coal 51%, electric power 70%, machine con-

struction 200%, and agricultural production 27% greater than in 1940. On the basis of the ceaseless growth of labor productivity, our national earnings and consuming power will be considerably higher.

In order to fulfill the basic economic task of the U.S.S.R., special attention will be paid to further growth of our industry, further development of construction of new enterprises, and further technological progress in all branches of our national economy. The new Five-Year Plan calls for enormous capital construction. Within these five years, about 5,000 reconstructed and newly built enterprises will be brought into operation. 157.5 billion rubles have been appropriated for capital construction during these five years. Thus, capital construction becomes a most important condition for rapid growth of industrial production.

Toward the end of the new Five-Year Plan, the per capita industrial production of the U.S.S.R. will surpass France's prewar level, and will come closer to that of England. But it will take a longer period to catch up with and surpass the industrial per capita production of the U.S.A.

In order to solve our basic economic task, it will be necessary to raise still higher our labor productivity, improve the organization of labor, and raise the skill and qualifications of our working and engineering cadres. "The higher our productivity of labor, the more our technique of production becomes per-

fecto  
comp  
task,"  
XVII  
Lab  
durin  
Five-  
techn  
nation  
power  
tion.  
Social  
hanov  
Union  
not or  
also in  
in in  
branch  
This  
while  
ing en  
for ac  
for th  
and in  
Soci  
newes  
ment,  
strugg  
tivity.  
ment.  
"opens  
can be  
of pro  
essenti  
cialism  
p. 369  
The  
a 36%  
tivity i  
prewar  
Year I

fects, the more rapidly can we accomplish this cardinal economic task," said Comrade Stalin at the XVIII Congress of the Party.

Labor productivity rose 2½ times during the first and second Stalin Five-Year plans as a result of the technological reconstruction of our national economy, the growth of power equipment and mechanization of labor, the development of Socialist competition and the Stakhanovite movement. The Soviet Union has made tremendous gains, not only in the tempo of growth, but also in the level of labor productivity in industry, as well as in other branches of our national economy. This growth of labor productivity, while increasing the output of existing enterprises, also serves as a source for accumulation of Socialist wealth, for the construction of new plants and industrial undertakings.

Socialist competition and its newest form, the Stakhanovite movement, play an enormous role in the struggle for higher labor productivity. The Stakhanovite movement, Comrade Stalin points out, "opens to us the path by which alone can be achieved those high indices of productivity of labor which are essential for the transition from Socialism to Communism." (*Leninism*, p. 369.)

The Five-Year Plan provides for a 36% growth of industrial productivity in 1950, as compared with the prewar level. During the new Five-Year Plan, 70% of the new total

growth of industrial production is to be provided by advance of labor productivity. This struggle to raise the productivity of labor, this development of Socialist emulation, constitutes a struggle for a new upsurge of productive forces.

This new and higher level of labor productivity presupposes a new and higher level of development of productive forces in means of production, as well as in human force, the basic productive force.

The transition from Socialism to Communism calls for the establishment of new and higher technique. It is well known that in so far as technique of production, the full equipment of new technological means for industrial production, is concerned, the U.S.S.R. holds the first place in the world. The Soviet land, taking advantage of the world's latest technological achievements, introduces them widely into all branches of its national economy. Contrary to the capitalist countries, where technological development is in contradiction with the social-political system, in the U.S.S.R. the advantages of a planned Socialist economy enable new technological means to develop unimpeded at a greatly accelerated tempo.

The process of transition from Socialism to Communism will bring the introduction of a qualitatively new technique, unthinkable and unachievable under capitalism. This new technique, the technique of Communism, will guarantee favor-

able conditions for an unheard-of growth of productive forces, changes in the usual type of labor, and complete elimination of any contradiction between physical and mental labor.

Hence, we can understand the enormous significance which technological progress and development of science assume during the period of transition from Socialism to Communism. Soviet scientists, studying and taking advantage of the latest discoveries of world science and technology, must at the same time push science and technique forward, and lead our country into the vanguard of world technological progress. Comrade Stalin set a task for Soviet scientists—within the shortest time, not only to catch up with, but to surpass any of the achievements of foreign science.

The new Five-Year Plan provides for further technical progress in all branches of our national economy. The Five-Year Plan provides for broad mechanization and electrification of production. On the whole, throughout the industry of the U.S.S.R., the technical equipment of the workers will, during the Five-Year Plan, be increased 150% as against 1940. Large technological changes will take place in the machine, metallurgical, coal, and chemical industries and other branches of the national economy. At the same time the Five-Year Plan provides for a series of tasks connected with

the development of new branches of technique and production.

The transition to the second, and higher, phase of Communism presupposes the all-around development of man, society's most important productive force. Comrade Stalin teaches that man, bringing into motion the means of production and possessing productive labor experience, constitutes society's basic, most important, productive force. Communism denotes a new stage in the development of this productive force.

Even Engels pointed out that mere possession of means of production is not enough to raise industrial and agricultural production to a height suitable for Communism. It is also necessary to develop the capabilities of man, using these means of production.

General management of production by the forces of the whole society, and the subsequent new development of production will call for and will create new human beings. (Marx and Engels, *Collected Works*, Russian edition, Vol. V, p. 478.)

Socialism will not only speed up the development of the means of production, but will give the workers an opportunity for all-around development and use of their capabilities. In the U.S.S.R., man has changed radically, tremendously enriched his industrial experience, and raised his level of culture and consciousness. Soviet rule has performed a complete revolution in the consciousness of the peasantry, trans-

fering  
tive  
munis  
in cul  
In H  
Congr  
out: "  
peasan  
cated,  
time."  
prepara  
tured p  
we m  
mighty  
technic  
collecti  
growth  
qualific  
cialist i  
the spir  
The r  
enormou  
ment. T  
Year Pl  
forward  
technolo  
and coll  
The c  
society and  
m call  
rather  
ownership  
relations.  
nunist  
ery wa  
cialist  
ndatic  
source of  
light.  
Under



fering it to the path of social, collective labor. The transition to Communism poses new enormous tasks in cultural development.

In his report to the XVIII Party Congress, Comrade Stalin pointed out: "We want all our workers and peasants to be cultured and educated, and we shall achieve this in time." Communism calls for fully prepared, fully developed and cultured people. In order to achieve it, we must achieve a further and mighty upsurge of the cultural-technical level of the workers and collective farmers; we must have a growth of industrial training and qualification for all workers in Socialist industry, their education in the spirit of Communism.

The new Five-Year Plan outlines enormous tasks in cultural advancement. The fulfillment of the Five-Year Plan will denote a further step forward in raising the cultural and technological level of the workers and collective farmers.

\* \* \*

The completion of Socialist society and the transition to Communism call for the strengthening and further development of Socialist ownership and Socialist industrial relations. In order to establish a Communist society, it is necessary in every way to protect and strengthen Socialist ownership—the economic foundation of our Soviet system, the source of our country's wealth and might.

Under Socialism there exist two

forms of Socialist ownership—State and collective-farm cooperative. They reflect the specific characteristic of the workers' and peasants' development toward Communism. While these forms of social ownership are similar in type, there are distinctions between them which are reflected in the different levels of socialization of means of production, in the character and organization of social labor, administration, and distribution of income in the state and collective-farm enterprises.

Under Communism the sole form of social ownership of the means of production will be Communist ownership. The transition to this sole form of social ownership of the means of production will be performed on the basis of the strengthening and development of the two forms of Socialist ownership now existing in the U.S.S.R., while strengthening the leading role of State ownership as the higher form of socialist ownership. The collective-farm-cooperative form of ownership will be developed by strengthening the collective-farm social economy.

This all-around development and strengthening of the collective-farm social economy constitutes the way by which the present agricultural artels will grow into communes. Comrade Stalin said:

The future agricultural commune will arise when the fields and farms of the artel are replete with grain, with cattle, with poultry, with vegetables, and all other produce; when the artels

have mechanized laundries, modern dining rooms, mechanized bakeries, etc.; when the collective farmer sees that it is more to his advantage to receive his meat and milk from the collective farm's meat and dairy department than to keep his own cow and small livestock; when the woman collective farmer sees that it is more to her advantage to take her meals in the dining room, to get her bread from the public bakery; and to get her linen washed in the public laundry, than to do all these things herself. The future commune will arise on the basis of a more developed technique and of a more developed artel, on the basis of an abundance of products. . . . (*Leninism*, p. 343.)

The process of transforming the present artel into a commune will take place gradually, in accord with the growth of the productive forces, in accord with the degree of conviction of the collective farmers of the necessity of transforming the present artel into a commune. Under present conditions the agricultural collective is the only correct form of the collective-farm movement, because it correctly combines the personal and social interests of the collective farmers, adapting their personal to their social interests. Hence, it is necessary to develop in every way the collective-farm social economy. The transition from the present artel to the commune is impossible in any other way but through full strengthening of the present artel, through full use of all of its inherent possibilities and opportunities.

The transition to Communism is

inextricably linked with the liquidation of the old social division of labor and remnants of class distinctions. Already now we can see a gradual elimination of the dividing lines between the worker and peasant classes, as well as between these classes and the intelligentsia. But under Socialism there still remain remnants of class distinctions between workers and peasants.

All classes and remnants of class distinctions will fully disappear. Lenin pointed out the way the disappearance of these class distinctions would take place. "In order to achieve complete liquidation of classes," wrote Lenin, "it is necessary not only to overthrow exploiters, landowners, and capitalists, not only to abolish their system of ownership. It is also necessary to abolish any private ownership of means of production; it is necessary to destroy the difference between city and village as well as the difference between people engaged in physical and mental labor." (*Collected Works*, Russian edition, Vol. XXIV, p. 337.)

The transition to the highest phase of Communism demands the overcoming of any hangovers of capitalism in the economy and the consciousness of man. Hangovers of capitalism in the consciousness of man are expressed in the form of a non-Socialist attitude toward labor and social ownership; in setting personal interests above those of society; in a petty-bourgeois "levelling (equalization); in a tendency to give

the  
trying  
from  
liquid  
It is n  
ceasele  
of the  
itude  
proper  
munis  
dation  
In  
highest  
suppos  
like th  
the pr  
... is o  
of soci  
deman  
lected  
The  
of the  
signifi  
gradual  
to Com  
In or  
and pro  
great d  
atic wor  
of capit  
ness; it  
systemat  
anti-Len  
propaga  
ing the c  
of the S  
Comm  
aneously  
directly  
Commun  
the Corr

the state as little as possible, while trying to snatch everything possible from it, etc. These hangovers cannot liquidate themselves automatically. It is necessary to fight against them, ceaselessly to develop in the citizenry of the U.S.S.R. a truly Socialist attitude toward labor, toward Socialist property. The transition to Communism calls for the complete liquidation of these hangovers.

In 1917 Lenin wrote that the highest phase of Communism "presupposed a productivity of labor unlike the present and a person *unlike the present* man in the street who . . . is capable of damaging the stores of social wealth 'just for fun,' and of demanding the impossible." (Selected Works, Vol. VIII, p. 89.)

The task of Communist education of the toilers is one of enormous significance during the period of gradual transition from Socialism to Communism.

In order to eliminate old customs and prejudices, we must put in a great deal of persistent and systematic work to overcome the hangovers of capitalism in human consciousness; it is necessary to continue the systematic and sharp criticism of anti-Leninist ideologies, the tireless propaganda of Leninism, thus raising the cultural and ideological level of the Soviet people.

Communism is not built spontaneously, but consciously; it is built directly by the masses led by the Communist Party. The growth of the Communist consciousness of the

masses becomes a most important factor in the development of Socialist society into a Communist society. Communist education, therefore, is the most important means in the struggle for overcoming the hangovers of capitalism in human consciousness and the development of a Communist attitude toward labor, toward social ownership. It helps strengthen an attitude of Socialist mutual aid among the toilers, and fraternal cooperation between the peoples of the U.S.S.R.; it helps develop within our people a feeling of Soviet patriotism and readiness to fight to the very end for the victory of Communism in our land.

With the further approach toward Communism, there will be a ceaseless growth of mass participation in state and social activities, a further rise of mass initiative and action, a broader development of the people's creative forces, talents, and capabilities.

Under the conditions of Socialism, labor has not yet fully become man's prime necessity. The level of productive forces within Socialist society is such that labor is commensurate only with consumption.

In the highest phase of Communism, when the productive forces will have reached the full height of development and the old divisions of labor will have disappeared, labor will become man's prime life necessity. People will become used to social duties performed without compulsion; unpaid work for the

common benefit will become, as stated by Lenin, a common event.

The process of distribution of the social products will be one of the basic differences between Socialism and Communism. Socialism's guiding principle is: "From each according to his capacity, to each according to his labor."

The principle of Socialism is that in a Socialist society each works according to his ability, and receives articles of consumption, not according to his needs, but according to the work he performs for society. (Stalin, *Leninism*, p. 368.)

In Communist society, when the productive forces will reach their highest level, we will practice the principle: "From each according to his capacity; to each according to his needs."

The principle of Communism is that in a Communist society each works according to his ability, and receives articles of consumption, not according to the work he performs, but according to his needs as a culturally developed individual. (*Ibid.*)

Under Socialist equality, Comrade Stalin pointed out, Marxism-Leninism sees not a levelling of personal standards and requirements, but a general liberation of all toilers from exploitation, the abolition of all private ownership of means of production, an equal duty for all to labor according to capacity, and an equal right to receive according to labor.

The Marxist-Leninist understanding of equality in Communist so-

ciety presupposes an equal duty for everybody to work according to capability, and receive according to need. But even under full Communism peoples' needs will not be equal.

Marxism proceeds from the assumption that people's tastes and requirements are not, and cannot be, identical, equal, in quality or in quantity, either in the period of Socialism, or in the period of Communism. (*Ibid.*, p. 344.)

The Socialist principle of distribution plays a most important role in the further development of Socialist society, and in the gradual transition to Communism. This principle constitutes the most important base of Socialist production, and is a mighty motivating force within Socialist society. It guarantees the correct combination of the personal and social interests of the toilers, establishes every worker's material interest in the results of his labor, stimulates the growth of the worker's qualifications, speeds up the development of society's productive forces, and strengthens Socialist economy.

Hence, it is necessary to realize consistently and to the very end the Socialist principle of distribution according to the quantity and quality of labor performed; it is necessary to uproot completely any thought of "equalization" in the pay for labor. The better and more fully this principle is practiced, the more successfully will the development of Socialist economy move toward that of Communism.

In order to provide a greater

stimulus for workers, the new Five-Year Plan provides for a series of most important measures for the improvement of pay for labor—the broadest use of progressive piece-work pay, the increase of premiums in the earnings of workers and employees for the fulfillment and over-fulfillment of production tasks, an emphasis on the rule of the “work day” in the distribution of collective-farm earnings, the broadest use of additional pay for better crops and higher productivity in animal husbandry. All these measures are meant to strengthen further the Socialist principle of distribution according to labor, as the most important condition for the transition from Socialism to Communism.

The Socialist principle of distribution according to labor means that labor becomes the measure of relations between society and its individual members. But it is impossible to calculate this labor directly on the basis of labor time because, during the first phase of Communism, there still exists the difference between the labor of a collective farmer and that of an industrial worker, between physical and mental labor, between skilled and unskilled labor. The calculation of labor under Socialist conditions is possible only in a monetary form, only on the basis of commodity costs. The Soviet State deliberately makes use of a modified form of this law of costs in order to strengthen and develop Socialist production.

Under Communism, where the

productive forces will reach their highest development and the Communist principle of distribution will be applied, there will be no need to estimate individual consumption on the basis of quantity and quality of labor expended. Together with it will come the abolition of monetary payment for labor. “From each according to his capacity, to each according to his needs,” presupposes a change from the commodity-monetary estimate of labor and labor products to labor-time, the natural estimate of labor. On the other hand, Communist distribution excludes commodity exchange, and the transformation of products into commodities; it excludes the necessity of value forms.

But until then, as long as we have not reached the highest phase of Communism, costs, money, commerce, and wages are still necessary as most important instruments of a planned, Socialist economy. Soviet commerce and the Soviet monetary system must become so strong as to enable it to change over to the direct exchange of products.

In 1934, during the XVII Party Congress, Comrade Stalin, criticising all “Leftist” theories dealing with abolition of money and Soviet trade, said:

These people, who are as far removed from Marxism as the sky is from the earth, evidently do not realize that we shall use money for a long time to come, right up to the time when the first stage of Communism, *i.e.*, the

Socialist stage of development, has been completed. They do not realize that money is the instrument of bourgeois economy which the Soviet government has taken over and adapted to the interests of Socialism for the purpose of expanding Soviet trade to the utmost, and of thus creating the conditions necessary for the direct exchange of products. They do not realize that the direct exchange of products can replace, and be the result of, only a perfectly organized system of Soviet trade, of which we have not a trace as yet, and are not likely to have for some time. (*Ibid.*, pp. 336-7.)

The law of the new Five-Year Plan demands the strengthening of monetary circulation and credit relations in national economy; it demands raising the importance of profits and economic accounting in the national economy as an additional stimulant for the growth of production. This must be done by means of lowering the cost of production to raise the profitability of all branches of our industries.

\* \* \*

The transition from Socialism to Communism means the elimination of the contradictions between town and country, between physical and mental labor. This has already been practically achieved as a result of the Socialist transformation of our society, as a result of the realization of the Socialist industrialization of the country and collectivization of our agricultural economy. But under Socialism there still exist some rem-

nants of the old division of labor, of the old differences between town and country. The contradictions between town and country will be finally liquidated only in the highest phase of Communist society.

The victory of the collective farm system in the countryside was the most important requisite for the liquidation of the contradictions between town and country. In his speech to a conference of Marxist students of the agrarian question, Comrade Stalin pointed out that "the question of the relations between town and countryside is now put on a new basis, that the contrast between town and country will be washed away at an accelerated tempo." It is therefore understood that the further strengthening and development of the Socialist collective farm economy will serve as one of the basic conditions for the liquidation of the contradiction between town and country.

This process of liquidation of the contradiction between town and country presupposes all-around mechanization, electrification of the agricultural productive processes, the transformation of agricultural labor into a variety of industrial labor.

The new Five-Year Plan provides for further arming our agriculture with the latest technique. During these five years the collective-farm countryside will receive no less than 325,000 new tractors and hundreds of thousands of other agricultural machines. This will bring mechan-

nization of plowing to 90%, of harvesting to 55%. This enormous growth of machine equipment will establish the requisites for transforming agricultural labor into a variation of industrial labor.

The all-around development of transportation and communication, as well as proper distribution of productive forces throughout the country, are another important requisite for the liquidation of the contradictions between town and country.

The transition period between Socialism and Communism is connected with overcoming the contradiction between mental and physical labor.

In our country, workers' and peasants' labor is free from exploitation. A new, advanced technique has been created. New cadres have arisen as masters of this technique. The right to education has become a reality. Nevertheless, under Socialism, there still remain remnants of the old division of labor, the contradiction between mental and physical labor has not yet been fully liquidated. This contradiction will be finally overcome only under Communism.

In order to liquidate any contradiction between mental and physical labor, it is necessary to raise the cultural and educational level of workers in Socialist production, of the whole working class and peasantry. In his speech to the First All-Union Conference of Stakhanovites, Comrade Stalin pointed out that the elimination of the contradictions be-

tween mental and physical labor can be achieved only by raising the cultural level of all workers up to that of technical-engineering workers. Only such a technical-cultural upsurge, said Comrade Stalin, can undermine the basic contradictions between mental and physical labor, can provide for high labor productivity and for the abundance of consumers' goods necessary for the transition from Socialism to Communism.

The Stakhanovite movement has a special significance in the raising of the cultural-technical level of the workers because, as pointed out by Comrade Stalin, the Stakhanovite movement contains the germs of such a cultural-technical advancement of the masses which facilitates the liquidation of differences between mental and physical labor, and guarantees high labor productivity and the transition from Socialism to Communism.

The growth and perfection of production technique is one of the most important conditions for the liquidation of the contradictions between mental and physical labor. The liquidation of the old division of labor is achieved through all-around mechanization and automatization of productive processes, through electrification and the strengthening of the technical equipment of labor.

The Soviet State constitutes the chief decisive instrument for the Socialist transformation of our society. Its further strengthening, there-

fore, becomes the most important requisite for the transition from Socialism to Communism.

During the initial phase of its development—from the October Revolution to the liquidation of the exploiting classes—the Soviet State fulfilled the function of suppressing the resistance of the exploiting classes within the country, of the defense against attacks from without, of reconstruction of our economy and preparation of favorable conditions for the liquidation of exploiter elements.

In the second phase of development of the Soviet State—from liquidation of the capitalist elements in town and country to the full victory of Socialist economy and the adoption of the new constitution—its basic task was to organize Socialist economy all over the country, to achieve the cultural revolution, to organize a modern army for the country's defense.

Now the main task of our state inside the country consists of peaceful economic organization and cultural education. As for our army, punitive organs, and intelligence service, their edge is not turned to the inside of the country but to the outside, against external enemies. (Stalin, *Leninism*, p. 474.)

The Soviet State, now owning the basic means of production, today takes up the gigantic economic-organizational and cultural-economic tasks embracing all sides of our country's life. The Soviet State leads

in the country's defense, establishes plans for the development of the national economy, secures the execution of these plans, organizes systematic control and accounting of production, distribution of products, etc.

The Soviet State is necessary under Socialism. It will be necessary under Communism as well, as long as the capitalist encirclement continues to exist.

Comrade Stalin worked out and developed the Marxist-Leninist theory of the State under conditions of victorious Socialism and during the transition to Communism. Comrade Stalin scientifically proved the necessity of further strengthening the Soviet State, and pointed out ways for its development, as well as its role under conditions of capitalist encirclement.

. . . We are going ahead, toward Communism. Will our state remain in the period of Communism also?

Yes, it will, unless the capitalist encirclement is liquidated, and unless the danger of foreign military attack has disappeared. Naturally, of course, the forms of our state will again change in conformity with the changes in the situation at home and abroad.

No, it will not remain and will atrophy, if the capitalist encirclement is liquidated and a Socialist encirclement takes its place. (*Ibid.*)

As long as we remain within a system of bourgeois states, our country will have to maintain mighty armed forces, an up-to-date army, navy, aviation. The armed forces of

the So  
guard t  
viet pe  
U.S.S.R.

It is n  
Lenin's  
peaceful  
must gu  
armed f  
try. (O  
Armed  
May 1,

The  
Party is  
the Sov  
for Com  
the toil  
strengt  
the Soci  
social a  
labor. E  
of the  
the Bol  
of our  
ward C  
organiz  
building

The I  
of the  
with t  
revoluti  
successf  
ented I

construc  
of the I  
multi-na  
workers  
of the  
our cou  
socialist  
arm sy



the Soviet Union will vigilantly guard the creative labors of the Soviet people and the interests of the U.S.S.R.

It is necessary to remember the great Lenin's admonition, that in passing to peaceful labor we must remain vigilant, must guard as the apple of our eye the armed forces and defenses of our country. (Order by the Minister of the Armed Forces of the U.S.S.R., *Pravda*, May 1, 1946.)

The great Lenin-Stalin Bolshevik Party is the leader and organizer of the Soviet people in their struggle for Communism, is the vanguard of the toilers in their struggle for the strengthening and development of the Socialist system, the kernel of all social and political organizations of labor. Basing itself upon knowledge of the laws of social development, the Bolshevik Party maps the route of our country's advancement toward Communism, mobilizes and organizes the masses for the full building up of Communist society.

The Party, armed with knowledge of the laws of social development, with the Marx-Engels-Lenin-Stalin revolutionary theory, did and does successfully solve all problems presented by the progress of Socialist construction. Under the leadership of the Lenin-Stalin Party, the whole multi-national Soviet people—the workers, peasants, and intelligentsia of the U.S.S.R.—have transformed our country, established our mighty Socialist industry and the collective farm system, built our Socialist so-

ciety. During the years of the Great Patriotic War the Party roused the entire people in a struggle for our country's freedom and independence, for a world-important historic victory over the German fascists and Japanese imperialists.

The new phase of development which our country entered after the Second World War, the new tasks posed before our country, call for further growth and strengthening of the Party organizations, call for raising the ideological-theoretical level of the Party cadres.

The Party must develop a broad program of Communist education of the workers to overcome the hangovers of capitalism in the consciousness of our people. The very success of our movement from Socialism toward Communism depends upon the quality of the organizational and political-educational work of the Party organizations, depends upon their ability to mobilize the masses for the overcoming of obstacles and difficulties.

Socialism is practically completed in our country. There is no doubt that the task of completing the structure of classless Socialist society and the gradual transition from Socialism to Communism will be successfully handled.

Under the leadership of the Party of Bolsheviks, led by the great Stalin, the Soviet people advance to a new flourishing of our Soviet land, to the full victory of Communism in our country.

## BOOK REVIEWS

### FACTS THAT EXPOSE FICTION

By JOEL REMES

A GUIDE TO THE SOVIET UNION, by William Mandel, The Dial Press, New York. \$5.00.

It is reported that 500,000 copies of *Communism in Action*, the House of Representatives' own guide to the Soviet Union, have already been distributed. Its preparation and publication was pressed for by Representative Dirksen (Ill.), who was eager for a work on this subject which, in his own words, should:

... be couched in understandable language. It should not be wearisome with too much historical detail. It should concern itself with Communism in action. It should be well documented. . . . It should be fair and impartial.

It will not surprise our readers that in this "documented study" the traitors Kravchenko and Barmine are quoted on page after page; that White, Lyons, Chamberlain, etc., are cited as unimpeachable authorities; and that those who deal honestly with the Soviet Union are, in the main, called on for evidence only to have it distorted for anti-Soviet purposes.

But this "unbiased" account of the Soviet Union is only one of the propaganda poisons now being poured into the minds of the American people in a massive attempt to corrupt their understanding, to instill in them hatred and loathing for the Soviet Union. All this is necessary for the powers that be so that the Truman Doctrine shall become a dogma that the American people will as little question as they do George Washington's patriotism.

### A TRUE GUIDE

All the more necessary then is it that a book like *A Guide to the Soviet Union* should receive the widest distribution and closest study, for it is precisely the opposite of the sort of book about the U.S.S.R. that Rep. Dirksen is really eager to see published. It is understandable. It is well documented. It is convincing. It has the objectivity of truth.

The Soviet Union is a whole new world in itself, and this bright new world is both surveyed and analyzed for us by Mr. Mandel.

The 500 pages of this work are divided into six books in which are described and discussed the sixteen constituent republics of the U.S.S.R.; the history of the Soviet Union since 1917; its contemporary foreign policy; its cultural progress, its education, theater, literature, art, press, scientific organizations, and health services; its economic system, the nature of the Five

Year Plans, management-labor relations, trade unions, wages, social security, agriculture; and finally, the way the government works, the structure and function of the Communist Party and the nature of Soviet democracy.

Every page reveals that Mr. Mandel has brought wide experience and mastery of the source material to bear in the writing of this book. Page after page presents facts and ideas that reveal clearly how the Soviet people work, live, and rule themselves, *i.e.*, how socialism works in practice.

For example, the capitalist press screams that the U.S.S.R. is a "totalitarian" state. The facts Mr. Mandel presents refute this lie in a hundred-and-one different ways. It is refuted, for instance, in the fact, not widely known here, that "1,300,000 persons are members of Soviets, from the lowest to the highest, about one adult in 70. Large numbers actually take part in their deliberations." This grass-roots nature of Soviet democracy is made clear in a letter, quoted by Mr. Mandel, from a rural county describing the functioning of a village Soviet:

... There are usually some 20 to 25 outsiders attending the meetings of the Soviet, and when particularly urgent questions are discussed, as many as 60 collective farmers, teachers and medical workers come to the meeting. The people come to their Soviet with questions, take part in drafting the decisions adopted and help put the decisions into effect. (Pp. 462-463.)

The composition of the new Supreme Soviet, elected in 1946, also indicates the close ties of the people and their government.

... more than a fifth of the members are engaged in manual pursuits. By social origin (*not* present occupation), 511 are workers, 479 office-workers, professionals and intellectuals, and 349 peasants. Of 1,339 members, 277 are women. One-third of the members have a college education. This includes the 18 outstanding Soviet scientists. 523 members have less than high school education. (P. 462.)

But democracy in the Soviet Union is not something formal and abstract. It pervades every phase of social relations. This is disclosed, for one, in the relation between writer and reader in the U.S.S.R. Mr. Mandel cites the instance of the novelist, Arkady Perentsev, who, during the war:

... wrote a novel based on the lives of the refugee coal-diggers who had saved the country's life by opening new mines in the Urals. He went down into the shafts to get his material. When the first part of the book was finished, the writers' union and the miners' union organized a conference of coal miners to hear him read it. Their comments were precise and to the point, and resulted in a better book. That conference was typical. (P. 283.)

In so acting, Soviet writers demonstrate the lesson they have learned from Lenin who said:

Art belongs to the people. It must have its deepest roots in the broad masses of workers. It must be understood and loved by them. It must be rooted in and grow with their feelings, thoughts and desires. It must

arouse and develop the artist in them. (P. 215.)

Of special interest at this moment, when the outcome of the Taft-Hartley Slave Labor Bill is hanging in the balance, is the section on the Soviet trade unions. In the U.S.S.R., 27,000,000 workers are members of trade unions. There is no legislation in the Soviet Union aimed to cripple trade unions and destroy their effective functioning in the interests of the workers. As a matter of fact:

There are certain fields where the unions' word is law, in the literal sense of the word. The unions draft the annual appropriation bill for social insurance and the schedule of taxes to be paid by employing organizations for that purpose. They also draft the safety laws and enforce them by a system of fines which their inspectors levy on management and labor alike, by court action if necessary. However, if management is recalcitrant the trade union has the power to compel compliance, including the power to close up the plant until the required measures are adopted. (P. 386.)

How deeply the Soviet workers feel that these are their own unions, and that the unions really represent their interests, is demonstrated by the following:

Participation in union activities is greater than in any other country. In the fall of 1942, though people were working 11 hours a day and living under miserable conditions, nationwide elections to local union office brought 78 per cent of the membership to meetings. At last re-

ports, more than 5,000,000 union members were serving on committees. (P. 385.)

#### A USEFUL LESSON

But it is not enough to emphasize that *A Guide to the Soviet Union* is a valuable compendium of facts, a storehouse of information, a wealth of detail and generalization about the U.S.S.R. To review it merely in that fashion might guarantee that neither the book nor this review would be read. Perhaps we can best stress its usefulness if we point out that Communists will find it especially valuable. Why? Because even for too many of us the Soviet Union is still a country with vast unexplored regions. We ourselves know all too little about how its people live and work, their education, cultural interests, their economy, trade unions, rates of pay, ways of settling shop grievances, methods of farm production, etc.

The truth of this can be attested by anyone who has taught Party school and classes, who has listened to public speakers, who has himself stumbled while hunting for the simple fact that would answer the honest question of the worker or the argument of the enemy.

It should also be pointed out that except with regard to the Soviet Union, our role in foreign affairs, we have been paying far too little attention in our press and publications to the social, economic, and cultural problems of the Soviet Union. This is true despite the fact that the U.S.S.R. has been wrestling with a host of complex problems growing out of reconversion, reconstruction and the transition to Communism—problems which are being systematical-

misce  
action  
Pol  
had  
in the  
aspect  
et at  
story,  
Daily  
ries at  
ever,  
day-to  
and  
which  
own  
was p  
Morri  
Mosco  
public  
ticles  
cies, e  
As  
we ha  
pampl  
Union  
of a bo  
Soviet  
LABO  
Labe  
lished  
New  
The  
in the  
Labor  
questio  
for a v  
nt's be  
The  
have b

misrepresented in the capitalist and reactionary labor press of this country.

*Political Affairs*, for example, has had only two articles, both reprints, in the last two years or more, on these aspects of the Soviet Union. The *Worker* at rare intervals publishes a feature story, again too often a reprint. The *Daily Worker* from time to time carries an article on its cultural page. However, it practically never deals with the day-to-day happenings on the social and economic fields in the U.S.S.R., which even the bourgeois press, in its own fashion, covers quite regularly. It was perhaps only the happy accident of Morris Childs' coverage of the recent Moscow Conference that has led to the publication of a series of original articles on Soviet trade unions, wage policies, etc.

As far as pamphlets are concerned, we have not available a single popular pamphlet published by us on the Soviet Union, let alone an up-to-date version of a book like the Dean of Canterbury's *Soviet Power*.

If then we Communists, generally speaking, know so little concretely about the internal workings of this first socialist country, how can we in turn effectively transmit to the American people a full measure of understanding that by its very nature the U.S.S.R. is a friend, not a foe; the most advanced democracy, not a "totalitarian" state?

It is perhaps unfair to Mr. Mandel to use his book to point a lesson for ourselves. But if we grasp the lesson, we will try to ensure that *A Guide to the Soviet Union* is read by as many people as possible, including ourselves. For this book is a guide, not to some abstraction, but to the most tremendous phenomenon in world history, a country in which the working class has learned to have faith in its own strength, in its capacity to get along without the "entrepreneurial ability" of the capitalists. It is a guide to a land with which our country must maintain the closest and most friendly relations if world peace is to be safeguarded and man's freedom advanced.

## AN INDISPENSABLE LABOR HANDBOOK

By JOSEPH ROLAND

LABOR FACT BOOK 8, prepared by Labor Research Association. Published by International Publishers. New York, 1947. 208 pp., \$2.00.

The new *Labor Fact Book 8*, latest in the biennial series prepared by the Labor Research Association, is without question one of the most useful books for a worker's library or a trade unionist's bookshelf.

The purpose of these books, which have been published for the past six-

teen years, is mainly to record and comment on labor, trade union, and political developments in the previous two years. The new *Labor Fact Book 8* also gives us much background material on many subjects. When L.R.A. presents a new statistical series it is likely to give us comparisons with earlier years even far beyond the scope of the period during which these handbooks have appeared.

For example, in discussing the con-

cept of the workers' "relative position" in U.S. manufacturing industries, L.R.A. takes us as far back as the year 1899 and shows the trend since that date. The original figures assembled on this subject, for example, show that the relative position of the factory worker (his real wages in relation to his output), despite all the proud boasts of the National Association of Manufacturers, has fallen over 30 per cent in that period.

### ECONOMIC TRENDS

The new *Labor Fact Book* opens with a compact review of economic trends during the last two years. It includes not only the standard figures on over-all industrial production, but also the "national gross product" figures. In discussing the crucial item of expenditures on producers' durable equipment (capital goods) the book shows that already in 1946 this item formed a lower percentage of gross capital formation than before the war. This trend, which has been confirmed in the figures since published for the first quarter of 1947, throws a great deal of light on the fundamental instability of the capitalist postwar boom. For this boom was still in progress as the book was being prepared, but has since begun to peter out.\*

The reliability and carefulness of L.R.A. is illustrated in the fact that the estimate for profits, after taxes, in 1946 given in the book is only \$11.8 billion. In the last few weeks the U.S. Department of Commerce itself has admitted that the estimate for last year runs somewhat higher, or around \$12.5 billion for all corporate net profit.

\* See L. R. A.'s quarterly economic review in this issue of *Political Affairs*.

A new feature in the *Labor Fact Book* this year, or one that has not appeared at least for some time, is a compilation of the outstanding facts about the concentration of wealth and income in the U.S. and the tendency toward mergers and bigger monopolies. The material on the wartime trend toward economic concentration is especially significant, drawn like the data in all other sections of the *Fact Book* from government reports and other authentic sources. Everyone supporting measures to curb the monopolies and trusts will find this section of great practical value.

Other features worth careful study in the second chapter of the book are the discussion of the President's budget and the report on the class bias in the proposals for revision of postwar taxes made by the Republican-Democratic, Big Business coalition. This summarizes some of the most telling material in the field and is complementary to the constructive contributions on taxation that have appeared recently in the pages of *Political Affairs*.

Perhaps the best material in the book from the point of view of the trade union propagandist and agitator, is that on the labor and social conditions of the people of the United States, the distribution of their income and savings, and the actual wages earned, hours worked, and the cost of their family budgets. The busy trade unionist will be a thousand times grateful to L.R.A. for making it available in this convenient and effective form.

### THE NEGRO PEOPLE

A separate chapter has been allotted to a discussion of the problems of the Negro people in the United States.

This section brings up to date the information about the discriminations against Negroes in the trade union movement and the steps forward that have been made since the full list of unions, with their estimated number of trade union members, was published in the previous volume. The chapter also has particularly effective material on the housing of Negroes, the conditions in the schools, the salaries of teachers, the health of the Negro people, and full details on the record of violence against the Negro people.

This chapter deals also at some length with F.E.P.C., poll-tax legislation, the white primary in the South, and, finally, the appeal of the leading Negro organizations to the United Nations. For, as Dr. W. E. B. DuBois is quoted as saying in one of these appeals, the treatment of the Negroes in this country "is not merely an internal question of the United States. It is a basic problem of humanity; of democracy; of discrimination because of race and color; and as such it demands your attention and action. No nation is so great that the world can afford without protest to let it continue to be deliberately unjust, cruel, and unfair toward its own citizens."

#### TRADE UNIONS

The chapter on trade union developments is among the most rewarding in the book, for it condenses the main facts about the policies and actions of the A. F. of L., C.I.O., and Railroad Brotherhoods. It also covers the question of union practices and democracy, the place of women and white-collar workers in unions, and the importance of trade union unity and union group insurance. There is also a meaty section

on the labor press that is unlike anything we have seen in any other publication.

The full background of the anti-labor campaign in Congress is sketched in the following chapter dealing with "labor relations" and strikes. Not only are the federal anti-labor bills summarized, but the progress made by the reactionaries in getting anti-closed shop and related legislation through the various state legislatures.

One of the most revealing sections of the whole book is presented in this chapter. It is a list of the anti-labor organizations, like the National Association of Manufacturers and the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, that helped to cook up the mess of state labor-crippling laws as well as the Taft-Hartley Slave Labor Bill.

Details on these organizations, ranging from the high-powered and heavily-financed N.A.M., to regional groups of fascists such as the Christian American Association in Texas, are given in this section. The phoney small business outfits also are described so that they can be distinguished from the bona fide bodies that are not tied to the coattails of the N.A.M.

The basic strike statistics needed to answer the slanders of the employer press are presented as well as facts about the leading strikes carried on in an effort to maintain purchasing power after the end of the war.

No less meaningful are the facts presented in the chapter on "Political Action" which covers all the main moves of labor and the progressive forces since 1945. The issues in the primaries and election of 1946 are discussed, and the votes of the various parties are analyzed.

The chapter on "Farmers and Farm Workers" completes the picture of struggle in the United States against the forces of reaction. A particularly useful part is the data on farm income and the many examples of farmer-labor unity that L.R.A. has gathered over the last couple of years.

Finally comes a short report on Soviet labor which is a condensation of the pamphlet issued by the C.I.O. delegation that visited Soviet mines, mills, and factories in the fall of 1945.

#### AN INDISPENSABLE HANDBOOK

The *Labor Fact Book* is the most convenient, well-indexed compilation

of material of its kind available in English. The facts in this handbook, if properly used, can make for a much firmer labor unity than exists at present. It is recommended to the treasury and file of American trade unions who are leading in the struggle for labor unity. It can also be useful to the urban middle classes and wide-awake farmers who need facts as a guide and inspiration to their participation in the labor-progressive coalition against reaction.

*Labor Fact Book 8*, like its predecessors in the fact field, should certainly be a best seller in progressive book shops and union literature departments.



available in  
handbook  
or a manual  
exists  
to the ma  
union  
struggle in  
to the  
wide-awa  
guide  
tion in  
against  
  
e its  
should  
progress  
erature