

See. ✓

political affairs

DARTMOUTH COLLEGE
LIBRARY
NOV 22 1949

NOVEMBER 1949 • 25 CENTS

LEON RITTELMAN

[1] Reverse Wall Street's Verdict

WALTER WAREFIELD

[10] The Soviet Foreign Policy
Is a Peace Policy

MARVIN REISS

[25] Socialism Means Peace

EARL REISS

[40] The National Labor Conference
for Peace

CLYDE CRINN

[48] Browder's "Coalition"—With
Monopoly Capital

FRANK BUCKA

[58] Truman Plan for Backward Areas

FRANK SUTTON

[69] The Struggle for Peace, Liberty
and Bread in Greece

ALBERT BRAGO

[81] Productive and Non-Productive
Labor Under Capitalism

GEORGE BROWN

WALTER FOX

[93] Facts That Arm the Workers
(*Book Review*)

Recent INTERNATIONAL Books

ATOMIC ENERGY AND SOCIETY

By James S. Allen

An appraisal of the conflict between monopoly-military interests and the social use of atomic energy.

Paper \$0.50; cloth \$1.25

THE U.S.S.R. AND WORLD PEACE

By A. Y. Vyshinsky

Recent speeches of the Soviet Foreign Minister, selected and with a foreword by Jessica Smith

\$0.75

SOCIAL ROOTS OF THE ARTS

By Louis Harap

Explores the roots of the arts in the social forces of society, and their relation to production and technology.

\$2.25

POLITICAL ECONOMY

By John Eaton

A Marxist approach to the study of the science of political economy, from pre-capitalist economy to imperialism.

\$2.10

THE TWILIGHT OF WORLD CAPITALISM

By William Z. Foster

The foremost American Communist leader weighs the epochal changes that have transformed the world during his own lifetime.

Paper \$0.35; cloth \$1.00

NEW CENTURY PUBLISHERS

832 Broadway, New York 3, N. Y.

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.



A Magazine Devoted to the Theory and Practice of Marxism-Leninism

Editorial Board: V. J. JEROME, Editor, ABNER W. BERRY, ALEXANDER BITTELMAN,
JACK STACHEL, MAX WEISS

Reverse Wall Street's Verdict and Prevent the Outlawing of a Working-Class Political Party!

An Editorial Article by Alexander Bittelman

THE SHAMEFUL VERDICT of "guilty" against the 11 Communist leaders is not the verdict of the American people. It is the judgement and verdict of Wall Street. It is a demonstration of reactionary class "justice." It is the product of Wall Street's determination to cripple and outlaw the vanguard party of the American working class—the Communist Party—the best defender of the interests of the American people.

Wall Street's verdict against the leaders of the Communist Party exposes most glaringly the criminal conspiracy of the American monopolies against the democratic liberties and living standards of the American people and against the peace of the world. It is a conspiracy that we are facing now, but not a Communist conspiracy. It is a Wall Street conspiracy, a conspiracy of Ameri-

can imperialism and its hangers on, against the Bill of Rights, for making the masses of the people carry the main burden of the developing economic crisis, for a new world war, for a fascist regime in the United States.

This verdict does not stand by itself. It is the result of the same reactionary and warmongering drive of Big Business as the Taft-Hartley slave labor law and the "loyalty" tests and the Feinberg laws against the teachers. It comes from the same source as the fascist outbreak in Peekskill. It is of the same class nature as the attacks of the steel magnates and coal barons and automobile princes against the living standards of the American working class. This verdict is the direct result of the so-called "cold war." It is another Wall Street move to shackle

the American people, to check their peace movements, to prevent the growing resistance of the masses to Wall Street's offensive upon the living standards and democratic liberties of the American people.

But it is more than that. The verdict is an attempt to lay the basis for outlawing a working-class political party. It is a Wall Street conspiracy to outlaw the advocacy of Socialism and of the teachings of Marxism-Leninism. It is a dastardly reactionary and pro-fascist move calculated to bring about the outlawing of the Communist Party because this is the vanguard party of the American working class. The verdict is therefore another and most sinister move in the direction of fascism in the United States.

The responsibility for this disgraceful verdict against the Communist leaders rests with Wall Street's two political parties. It rests first of all with the Democratic Party and the Truman Administration which initiated the indictment and prosecution of the Communist leaders in accord with its general reactionary, imperialist and warmongering policies. It was also intended by the Truman Administration as a partisan political move in the 1948 national elections—a reactionary move to demoralize the developing people's democratic coalition and to hamper the Presidential campaign of the Progressive Party.

This shameful verdict is equally the

responsibility of the Republican Party—the party of Dewey, Dulles, Taft and Vandenberg—the party which has been whipping up and stimulating the reactionary offensive of the Truman Administration and especially its attacks on the Communists and all other progressive forces of the American people. It is also the responsibility of the Truman "liberals," of the reactionary trade-union leaders and of the Social-Democratic leaders whose splitting policies and Red-baiting are definitely helping all along the line the pro-fascist offensive of Truman and Dewey.

WALL STREET'S REASONS FOR THE VERDICT

There were special reasons for Wall Street's determination to secure a "guilty" verdict against the Communist leaders at this particular time. The monopolies are very uneasy about the general political situation at home and abroad. Wall Street fears the further rise and development of broad mass movements against the offensive of the monopolies in all fields. It therefore wants additional police and other government measures to intimidate the masses, to curtail further their civil rights and democratic liberties, to check their struggles and to deprive them of the vanguard leadership of the Communists. This is why Wall Street wanted the "guilty" verdict. This is how it will try to

use it. *B
America
fascist ar
of the
man-De*

On th
dustries,
now un
miners a
as the
the New
ing Com
are fight
the atte
drive do
They ar
defeat W
the mass
the econ
are matt
one of V
moveme
"guilty"
nist lead
Wall Str
labor's s
Street w
vanguard
working
*it in the
Street co*
On th
sees the
people's
of playin
role in t
The dis
with the
Truman
growing

use it. *But it is in the power of the American people to defeat this pro-fascist and warmongering conspiracy of the monopolies and their Truman-Dewey-Taft-Dulles servants.*

On the economic field, in the industries, these mass movements are now unfolding. The striking coal miners and steel workers, the same as the Hawaii longshoremen and the New Jersey Singer Manufacturing Company workers before them, are fighting major battles against the attempt of the monopolies to drive down labor's living standards. They are fighting major battles to defeat Wall Street's attempt to make the masses carry the main burden of the economic crisis. Similar battles are maturing in all industries. And one of Wall Street's answers to these movements of the people is the "guilty" verdict against the Communist leaders. This pro-fascist verdict Wall Street will try to use to crush labor's struggles. This verdict Wall Street will try to use to outlaw the vanguard party of the American working class. *But the people have it in their power to defeat this Wall Street conspiracy.*

On the political field Wall Street sees the imminent rise of a powerful people's democratic coalition capable of playing a major, if not decisive, role in the national elections of 1950. The disappointments of the masses with the fraudulent promises of the Truman Administration and their growing bitter resentment against

both parties of Wall Street—these profound developments among the broadest masses of the American people are bound to begin to take on organized political shape in the not too distant future. The current economic struggles demonstrate clearly the fighting mood of the masses, while promoting further their political understanding. Ever broader masses of our people are beginning to sense the fascist menace behind the current reactionary and Red-baiting drive.

To check these progressive political developments, to intimidate and demoralize this growing people's democratic coalition, to prevent it from playing a major role in the 1950 national elections, and to deprive the masses of the vanguard leadership of the Communists—for all these reactionary and warmongering purposes Wall Street wanted and secured a "guilty" verdict against the Communist leaders. *But it is within the power of the American people to defeat this newest Wall Street conspiracy.*

On the peace front, in the field of struggle for peace, Wall Street's warmongering drive for world domination has suffered recently a number of major and far-reaching defeats. The world relation of forces between the camp of war, imperialism and reaction headed by Wall Street and the camp of peace, democracy and Socialism headed by the Soviet Union is constantly chang-

ing in favor of the peace camp. Economically, the camp of peace, democracy and Socialism is growing stronger, while the camp of imperialism and war is growing weaker. This is so because in the Soviet Union and in the people's democracies of Europe the Socialist and transitional Socialist economies are making tremendous advances, while the capitalist economies in the United States and the other capitalist countries are in a state of developing economic crisis (in the U.S.) or impending crisis—a condition which became more aggravated by the currency devaluations that Wall Street forced upon England and the other Marshallized countries. In the Soviet Union, on the eve of the 32nd anniversary of the great October Socialist Revolution, industrial production in the third quarter of 1949 was 17 percent above the same period in 1948, while in the United States industrial production in July, 1949 was 17 percent *below* the high point of November, 1948.

Inevitably, the material well-being and security of the masses in the Soviet Union and in the people's democracies are on the upgrade, while in the United States and in the other capitalist countries they are on the downgrade.

Politically, too, the camp of peace is growing stronger, while the war camp is growing weaker. China, the new China, is now in the camp of peace, democracy and Socialism, and

the other great national liberation movements are moving in the same direction. Further: the world now knows definitely and with finality that the atom bomb upon which Wall Street and its allies have been basing their entire diplomacy and foreign policies is no longer a Wall Street monopoly. This naturally registers a definite and major change in the relation of forces in favor of the peace camp, but it also creates more favorable conditions for *outlawing the atom bomb*, and for the struggle to adopt all the other peace proposals of the Soviet Union. The current months have registered a tremendous growth and consolidation of the people's peace movements all over the world manifested in the Paris World Peace Congress and in similar movements in all countries, including the United States. Finally, the emergence of the German Democratic Republic adds a new and significant force in the fight for peace.

These historic advances of the peace forces are causing Wall Street great anxiety. The warmongering and pro-fascist American monopolies are now seeking *more desperately than before*, to intimidate and demoralize the peace movements of the American people, to isolate these movements from the peace forces of the world, to deprive the masses of the vanguard leadership of the Communists. For this purpose Wall Street wanted and secured a "guilty

verdict
ers. *Bu*
America
Street
ary and
Wall
pretend
by the a
Tito ga
Now, th
Tito clic
to the
headed
ing clea
special
clique b
and dem
cratic m
people,
out und
United
The mo
business
Hungar
which s
to heart
sive, by
peace, b
concentr
upon r
precisely
clearly c
on the
calls for
of, and
and Wa
United
that the
of the
war and

verdict against the Communist leaders. *But it is in the power of the American people to prevent Wall Street from realizing these reactionary and warmongering purposes.*

Wall Street and its hangers-on pretend to feel greatly strengthened by the accession to their camp of the Tito gang of fascists and traitors. Now, there can be no doubt that the Tito clique has sold itself completely to the camp of war and fascism headed by Wall Street. It is becoming clearer every day that one of the special jobs assigned to the Tito clique by Wall Street is to penetrate and demoralize the peace and democratic movements of the American people, a job which is to be carried out under the command also of the United States intelligence services. The mechanics of this treacherous business were plainly revealed in the Hungarian trials, the lessons of which should be studied and taken to heart by every American progressive, by every American fighter for peace, because the Tito agents are concentrating in the United States upon misleading and entangling precisely these forces. This situation clearly calls for the greatest vigilance on the part of all progressives. It calls for the most intense exposure of, and struggle against, Titoism and Wall Street's Tito agents in the United States. But it is equally clear that the open and complete passage of the Tito gang into the camp of war and fascism, while presenting a

serious task of struggle for the American progressives, changes little in the major and profound shifts in the world relation of forces favorable to the camp of peace, democracy and Socialism.

Wall Street sought and secured a "guilty" verdict against the Communist leaders at this time in order to open the way for more intense reactionary attacks upon the growing national liberation struggles of the Negro people. The "guilty" verdict thus secured against Comrades Winston and Ben Davis among the Eleven symbolizes reaction's attack upon the tried champion and vanguard of the Negro people's struggles. These struggles of the Negro people are becoming a first rate political factor in the United States. These struggles constitute a major component of the developing people's democratic coalition for peace, equal rights and economic security. To check these struggles, to intimidate the Negro masses and to deprive them of the vanguard leadership of the Communists, Wall Street obtained the "guilty" verdict. *But the American people can, must and will check and defeat this Wall Street conspiracy.* They will check and defeat the conspiracy to intensify the oppression and persecution of the masses of Mexicans and Puerto Ricans in the United States, the discrimination and persecution of the masses of the national groups, the growing anti-Semitism and at-

tacks upon the masses of the American Jews.

Finally, Wall Street wanted and secured a "guilty" verdict against the Communist leaders at this time because it fears the Communist policies of the united and people's front in a situation of growing mass struggles against the monopolies; because it fears the conquering ideological power among the masses of the teaching of Marxism-Leninism under whose banner the world is being liberated from national oppression, class exploitation, imperialism and war; because it fears the advocacy of Socialism; because it fears the vanguard role of the Communist Party.

Wall Street will try to use the verdict to cripple the Communist Party, to jail its leaders, to hamper the work of its organizations. Wall Street will try to use the verdict to make impossible the open and legal existence of the Communist Party. Wall Street will seek to use the verdict in order to bring about *the outlawing* of the Communist Party—the outlawing of a working-class political party, the outlawing of the advocacy of Socialism and of Marxism-Leninism.

This is one of Wall Street's central objectives at the present time. Following in Hitler's footsteps, the American monopolies seek to cripple and destroy the most consistent fighter for peace and democracy, *the vanguard* in the historic fight of the

American people to check and defeat Wall Street's drive to war and fascism. The vanguard party is showing the way for the American working class to become the leader of this fight. From victory in this struggle for peace and democracy the working class will become capable of leading the direct struggle for Socialism in the United States. Following further in Hitler's footsteps, Wall Street seeks the outlawing of the Communist Party *as the opening wedge* in a fresh and most intense attack upon the Bill of Rights, in an accelerated drive to fascism and war. *But the American people have it in their power to defeat Wall Street's attempts to use the verdict to bring about the outlawing of the Communist Party. They have it in their power to save the Bill of Rights, to preserve and extend their democratic liberties, to preserve the right of the Communist Party to an open and legal existence.*

From the foregoing it follows inevitably that the fight to reverse the "guilty" verdict, to free the Communist leaders and to defend the right of the Communist Party to an open and legal existence has become the major battle ground for the fight to preserve the Bill of Rights, for the fight to safeguard labor's gains and rights, for the fight to preserve and extend the democratic liberties of the American people. Now, more than ever before, one cannot fight effectively for civil rights and democratic liberties without fighting for

the right
out fight
ing of a
without
of the C
and leg

From
that the
Commun
legal ex
from th
masses
fensive
Bill of
of the C
part of
for pen
repeal
against
oaths an
poyment
aid to
small bu
economy
Bill of
of the C
and leg
part of
rights fe
anti-Ser
for the r
and min
has der
with fin
progress
necessar
This i
for the
against
and dem

the rights of the Communists, without fighting to prevent the outlawing of a working-class political party, without fighting to defend the right of the Communist Party to an open and legal existence.

From the foregoing it also follows that the defense of the right of the Communist Party to an open and legal existence cannot be separated from the every-day struggles of the masses against Wall Street's offensive in all fields. The fight for the Bill of Rights, *including the rights of the Communists*, is an inseparable part of the fight for higher wages, for pensions and insurance, for the repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act, against the pro-fascist "loyalty" oaths and tests, for adequate unemployment relief and insurance, for aid to the working farmers and small businessmen in the developing economic crisis. The fight for the Bill of Rights, *including the right of the Communist Party to an open and legal existence*, is an inseparable part of the fight for peace, for equal rights for the Negro people, against anti-Semitism and for equal rights for the masses of the national groups and minorities. The "guilty" verdict has demonstrated once more and with finality that this is so, and the progressive forces must make all necessary conclusions from it.

This is the content of the struggle for the united and people's front against war and fascism, for peace and democracy, as it unfolds itself at

the present time. This is the mandate: the organization of the broadest united-front struggles, day by day, around the following slogans:

Demand the immediate release of the 11 Communist leaders on reasonable bail!

Reverse the pro-fascist verdict against the Communist leaders and secure their freedom!

Prevent the outlawing of a working-class political party. Prevent the outlawing of the advocacy of Socialism and the teaching of Marxism-Leninism!

Defend the Bill of Rights, preserve and extend the democratic liberties of the American people, by defending the right of the Communist party to an open and legal existence!

For the broadest unity of all democratic and anti-fascist forces in defense of the Bill of Rights and of the rights of the Communist Party—in the struggle for peace, democracy, equal rights and economic security!

Make the defense of the rights of the Communists—the defense of the Bill of Rights—a living part of the every-day struggles of the masses of the American people against the pro-fascist and warmaking offensive of the Wall Street monopolies!

The struggle for the united-front policies of our Party is the key to all our activities. We must find and establish firm contacts with the broadest masses, build up alliances with all progressive forces of the American

people, with all those willing and able to fight reaction even on the most elementary issues. This united-front policy, free from all opportunist distortions, is also the key to the building up of broad mass movements in defense of the Bill of Rights, in defense of the rights of the Communist Party.

FOR A UNITED FRONT OF STRUGGLE!

Let us remember that there is a widening distance between what Wall Street wants to do and what it is actually capable of accomplishing—a constantly widening distance between reaction's desire and ability. This is so in domestic affairs as well as in foreign affairs. Wall Street's conspiracy against the American people and Wall Street's conspiracy against the Communist Party can, must and will be defeated.

This confidence is based upon the fact that the masses of the American people are beginning to move against Wall Street's offensive, getting ready to proceed from the economic to the political field and to the building of the people's democratic coalition. This confidence is based upon the constantly changing relation of forces in favor of the camp of peace, democracy and Socialism. This confidence is based finally upon the fighting capacities of the Communist Party, of its sympathizers and allies.

Our leaders have put up a magnificent and heroic fight in the courtroom against Wall Street's indictment and prosecution. They fought for our Party, of course, skillfully and effectively. But in doing so they fought for the American people—for its present and future. They fought for the freedom and security and liberty of the American working class and its allies. They fought for peace and democracy and equal rights and economic security. They fought for the world liberating principles and teachings of Marxism-Leninism, demolishing the "force and violence" frame-up of the government and exposing the real force and violence conspiracies of Wall Street's drive to war and fascism.

We are proud of our leaders, of our heroes. Their fight is inspiring and will continue to inspire ever broader masses of the American people to fight for peace and democracy, and to become ready for the fight for Socialism. Their fight will enable our Party to gain wider and closer ties with the masses, to gain a deeper understanding and greater mastery of the principles of Marxism-Leninism, to become the recognized mass vanguard party of the American working class, to continue to fight as the vanguard party under all conditions and circumstances.

Our leaders have demonstrated in their court fight the monstrous nature of the criminal slander that our Party is some sort of a secret so-

ciety a
abroad
demol
against
ously
als," b
and G
the Soc
to hid
trayed
Wall S
cism. C
that w
party,
Americ
can pa
ism-Le
Our
their c
ment,
the tri
is dire
Street's
the pr
the de
ican pe
the mo
war an
tions i
for a p
cialist
No
and sl
its lea
our lea
historic
Americ
the w
for the

ciety and conspiracy directed "from abroad." They have exposed and demolished this Hitlerite charge against our Party—a charge assiduously spread by the Truman "liberals," by the Murrays and Reuthers and Greens and Dubinskys and by the Social-Democratic leaders in order to hide the fact that they have betrayed the masses and are serving Wall Street's drive to war and fascism. Our leaders have demonstrated that we are a working-class political party, the vanguard party of the American working class, the American party of Socialism and of Marxism-Leninism.

Our leaders have demonstrated, in their court fight, in the Foster document, and in Dennis' summation in the trial, that the Party's main line is directed toward defeating Wall Street's drive to war and fascism; to the preservation and extension of the democratic liberties of the American people; to curbing the power of the monopolies—the main spring of war and fascism; to creating conditions in the United States favorable for a peaceful transition to the Socialist revolution.

No amount of Browderite attack and slander against our Party and its leaders can obscure the fact that our leaders have carried through a historic battle for the liberties of the American people, for the peace of the world, for Marxism-Leninism, for the Communist Party. Only trai-

tors can make such attacks upon our leaders and their defense as Browder made in the midst of the trial. Only agents of Wall Street can do it—agents of the State Department which is building up Titoite "Communists" to try to penetrate and demoralize the progressive movements of the American people.

Honest progressives will turn away from such attacks with disgust and contempt. The masses of the American people generally will now come to realize, more widely than heretofore, how important the Communist Party is for the progress of the American people. Even those still influenced by the Truman "liberals" and the reactionary trade-union bureaucrats and Social-Democratic leaders will begin to rally to the fight now unfolding for the Bill of Rights and for the rights of the Communist Party. Therefore—

Forward to the united front of struggle for the Bill of Rights, for the right of the Communist Party to an open and legal existence, for the preservation and extension of the democratic liberties of the American people!

Forward to the united front of struggle for peace, democracy, equal rights and economic security!

Forward to the struggle for Marxism-Leninism, for proletarian internationalism, for the vanguard role of the Communist Party!

The Soviet Foreign Policy Is a Peace Policy

by Jack Bakerfield

(On the occasion of the 32nd Anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution.)

THE AMERICAN PRESS and radio have outdone themselves in exclaiming how horrible and unnatural it is for a diplomat to say "No!" (especially to Washington and Wall Street). The sure-fire radio joke good for a dutiful laugh at all times (at least from the studio audience) is to identified Molotov and Gromyko with the word "No!"

But this is nothing for any thinking person to be worried about. Let us remember that the October Socialist Revolution in 1917 began with a mighty "No!" to war, "No!" to starvation, "No!" to capitalism and landlordism; that our own country began with a "No!" to "taxation without representation" and saved itself from degeneration by its "No!" to slavery. It was the Russian "No!" to war in 1917 that made possible the later "Yes!" to the equality of the nations in the U.S.S.R., "Yes!" to the Five-Year-Plans, "Yes!" to Socialism and "Yes!" to the heroic and victorious war against Hitler for the benefit of our own country as well as theirs.

Thus it is necessary to look beyond the cheap jibes of the press and the hysterical attacks of the warmongers and see what is the real

essence of Soviet foreign policy—whether the Soviet "Yes!" and "No!" really constitute a danger to the American people, or whether they are in the interests of all peoples.

FOREIGN POLICY AND RULING-CLASS OBJECTIVES

Foreign policy is not a question of the temperament of a diplomat. It is a question of the essential interests of states and governments in their international relations. And therefore it is a question, first and foremost, of *which class* dominates the government in a given country. The idea that "politics stops at the water's edge" is sheer fiction, as all our American history shows, and is spread only in an attempt to make people feel that there is something unethical and unpatriotic in opposing the *foreign* policy of the ruling class, even if the people are fighting on domestic policies. The present "bi-partisanship" on foreign policy has the purpose of spreading the same idea and giving the impression that the present U.S. foreign policy is supported by "the whole people." In reality this "bi-partisanship" is

similar to the situation when, during prohibition days, two rival groups of gangsters in Chicago might agree that they should jointly take over the "territory" in St. Louis. Their "foreign policy" was bipartisan.

Aggressive wars, and the foreign policies that prepare these wars, do not develop out of psychological questions, such as "lack of understanding," "combative instincts," and all the other phrases that are used by liberals and others to hide the stark reality of the facts. These wars are fought for something. They develop for certain specific things that the given ruling class expects to get as a result of winning the war.

Now what does the ruling class of a capitalist country want, in contrast to what the people want? The people want peace, a higher standard of living and social progress. These desires do not conflict with those of the people of any other country. But the capitalists face the fact that their system is declining, that it is threatened by a continually shrinking market for its products. Despite their power, their decaying system, in the grip of its ever-deepening general crisis, is confronted with a new economic crisis of great magnitude. They begin to rely on the huge expenditures for armaments and war to maintain and increase their profits and attempt to avert, or find a way out of, the developing crisis. And, needless to say, armament

production paid for by the people's taxes is enormously profitable.

The monopoly capitalists seek to increase their own profits and wealth, not only by increasing the exploitation of their own people, but by exploiting the peoples of other countries. This is to be seen today, not only in the Marshall Plan and the grandiose schemes of American imperialism in Truman's "bold, new program," but in the instance of even such a small power as the Dutch in its ferocious war against Indonesia, and even the half-crippled French imperialism in its hanging on to the fight against Viet-Nam.

These are the standing objectives of the capitalist class to which its foreign policy is dedicated. And for this purpose, the imperialist powers maneuver politically and carry on economic warfare against one another, struggling over the spoils—a struggle which from time to time bursts out into open warfare, such as the Spanish-American War and the First World War. And this same imperialist struggle went on in, around and throughout the people's anti-fascist war against the Hitler Axis in World War II.

BEHIND THE GRANDIOSE DEMAGOGY

Naturally, even in the early days of imperialism, the people could hardly be expected to give enthusiastic support to such war objectives, and so imperialism's unjust wars had always to be given the higher-sound-

ing "national" objectives of "national honor," avenging "an insult to the flag," etc., etc. But once these wars had grown beyond the scope where they were carried on by small professional armies hired to do "the country's" fighting (such as Kipling's British army in India) and had turned into the horrible mechanical meatgrinder of the trenches in World War I, these vague abstractions no longer sufficed. In order to get millions of young men to go out and die, it was necessary to develop demagogy of a more "ethical" type, more closely connected, apparently, with the interests of the people themselves.

Thus, in World War I, for Germany it was "a place in the sun," with all that that implied; it was German "kultur" and "efficiency" and the magnification of the myth of German "superiority." For the Allies it was "the sanctity of treaties," "poor little Belgium," "against German militarism," the "freedom of the seas," and, finally—the American government's contribution—"the war to end war." Then, naturally, as the clinching argument, every country was fighting "in self-defense."

After World War I, in the face of the world-wide popular revulsion to imperialist warring, the demagogy of finance capital was compelled to assume the guise of pursuit of peace. Under the peace façade of the League of Nations, the big imperialist powers had begun their preparations for the second world slaughter.

In furthering this criminal design, the imperialists had to combine their hypocritical "peace" motif with diatribes against the Soviet Union, whose voice in the League of Nations boldly challenged them before the world on the issue of peace. Such was the nature of imperialist demagogy throughout the 'twenties and 'thirties.

Following the advent of Nazism, the Axis powers, in their expansionist drive to redivide the world, "refined" the art of "anti-Comintern" demagogy, while the Western imperialists cloaked their policy of financing, arming and abetting Hitler's "Drang Nach Osten" with the pretext of preserving peace by "appeasing" the Nazi beast. Thus, on his return from the Munich betrayal of peace, Chamberlain vowed that he had won "peace in our time."

The anti-Soviet strategy of the Western imperialists dismally failed to achieve its objectives—not till after bringing colossal tragedy to the peoples of the whole world. The Western imperialist powers, whose vital interests required the forging of an anti-Axis alliance with the U.S.S.R. after the Nazi attack on the Soviet Union, continued, however, to resort to demagogy. While this demagogy was not of the blatant kind of those who strove to avert the defeat of Hitler and to destroy the grand alliance with the Soviet Union, it was nonetheless a continuous undercurrent during the war, expressive of the Western imperialist policy which

sought
ally
upon
for v
viet

No
lays
more
it ne
tives
fetc

W
of A
our
into
war?

the p
the s
of L
Cent
tract
pride
in on

his p
that
of the
bition

of do
lions
lives
domi
tage

milit
ness
order
either

deper
come
all c
allow
whate

sought to bleed white the great Soviet ally with the design of "taking over" upon the conclusion of their hoped-for war of attrition between the Soviet Union and Germany.

Now, as American imperialism lays its plans for a World War III, more than ever before does it find it necessary to cover its real objectives with the most brazen and far-fetched demagogy ever known.

What are the real objectives today of American foreign policy which our ruling class is anxious to make into the objectives of a third world war? They can be summed up in the phrase coined by Henry Luce, the somewhat megalomaniac Lord of *Life* and *Time*: "The American Century." This is not just some abstract, legitimate matter of national pride in our country for being "tops" in one way or another. Luce coupled his phrase with the jingoistic scream that "America can become the terror of the world"—a highly laudable ambition! Essentially, it is a plain matter of dollars and cents, or rather of billions and millions of dollars (and lives). It is a grandiose scheme to dominate the world, to use to advantage America's present industrial and military superiority and the weakness of other imperialist powers in order to force every one of them into either junior partnership or utter dependency, while Wall Street becomes the sole, primary exploiter of all colonial and "backward" areas, allowing its puppets and vassals whatever participation it deems fit.

But such a program, of course, could not be achieved without crushing the great counter-force in the world for peace and progress—the force of Socialism, which guarantees the independence of peoples, and opposes and finally abolishes all human exploitation. Therefore, American imperialist foreign policy has set itself as its primary aim in its drive for a third world war, the crushing of Socialism and the historic movements toward Socialism—at home, in the colonies, and semi-colonies, in the Western European countries, in the Eastern European People's Democracies and, chief of all, in the U.S.S.R.

The demagogy for this policy of world domination consists of the "principle" of the Truman Doctrine: that "Communism is a threat to the freedom of peoples," that any advance of Communism anywhere in the world represents "Soviet expansionism," and that "Communism must be contained" for the alleged preservation of "Western democracy." This demagogy served as the cover under which Wall Street itself intervened and developed the civil war in Greece, and established there a monarcho-fascist puppet government under an American receivership while also using the American people's taxes to build up the fascist military power of Turkey, which sided with Hitler throughout the last war.

The fantastic theory that any increased support that the people of any country give to their Communist

movement represents "Soviet expansionism" was used to cover up American imperialism's own most brazen interference in the affairs of other countries, ordering the French and Italian governments—in defiance of all their traditional parliamentary methods—to exclude the Communist ministers from their respective Cabinets; as well as the open management of the Italian election campaign from Washington in real Tammany Hall style (large-scale slush fund and all).

The Marshall Plan, which was designed to vassalize the Western European countries by imposing Wall Street's stiff economic and political terms in return for a handout of consumers' goods and luxury items piling up in American warehouses, was put forward as "a great humanitarian scheme to clothe the naked and feed the hungry." As was predicted by the anti-imperialist camp headed by the Soviet Union and as has been amply confirmed even by imperialist spokesmen, the Marshall Plan has become a boomerang deepening the developing economic crisis in Western Europe, spurring the discontent of the masses there, and sharply reducing U.S. foreign trade by intensifying the "dollar crisis" abroad.

And now our foreign policy has crowned its efforts with the North Atlantic Pact which operates under the demagogy that it is not we, with our far-flung network of military bases up to the borders of the

U.S.S.R., our enormous military establishment, and our atom-bomb, who threaten aggressive war—but it is the U.S.S.R. that threatens us!

But the high-sounding fanfare of Messrs. Acheson, Bevin and Schumann cannot conceal the aggressive designs of U.S. imperialism, which have been further exposed by the appropriation of additional billions for the arming of European reaction in order to convert Europe into a base of aggressive operations against the Soviet Union and the People's Democracies.

Now let us untangle these demagogic slanders that attempt to picture Soviet foreign policy as "the aggressive drive of a slave power toward war for world conquest." Even as with Hitler, the warmonger charges his opponent with his own intent and character. The answer will not be found in the method of argument, or in the generalities of the "Left" liberals that "both sides are to blame," but only in a close and intellectually honest examination of the facts and realities that form the *content* of the situation.

SOCIALISM: BASIS OF THE CONSISTENT SOVIET PEACE POLICY

If we return to our original point that foreign policy is a question of the essential interests of one government in relation to others, and therefore most particularly of the class dominating that government, then the first thing to note is that the

Soviet
ing cla
ants,
lective
capital

What
Soviet
the int
out th
increas

every r
road o
country
Socialis

munism
be acco
war? C

war of
the So
set bac
while a

duction
their p
destruct
the Hit
necessa

earth p
In th
class of

ple, wh
tries, v
ing to
by sup
What

an agg
ing cla
that ha
is no i

Socialis
crises f
way ou

Soviet Union is ruled by the working class—in alliance with the peasants, who are for the most part collective farmers. There is no class of capitalists or landlords.

What are the basic interests of the Soviet people? They are, no less than the interests of the people throughout the world: to live in peace, to increase their standard of life in every respect and to advance on the road of social progress, which, for a country that has already achieved Socialism, means to progress to Communism. Could any of these interests be accomplished through aggressive war? Of course not! Even the just war of defense against Hitler cost the Soviet people millions of lives, set back their standard of living while all efforts went into the production of armaments and set back their progress through the wholesale destruction of farms and factories by the Hitlerite hordes, as well as by the necessary, self-sacrificing scorched earth policy.

In the Soviet Union there is no class of capitalists exploiting the people, while investing in foreign countries, with cartel connections, seeking to increase its profits and wealth by super-exploiting colonial peoples. What would a working class fight an aggressive war *for*?—any working class, least of all a working class that has established Socialism? There is no inherent contradiction in the Socialist system that drives it into crises from which war might be a way out, as with capitalism, which is

characterized by anarchy of production. The whole world saw how, during the last world-wide economic crisis from 1929 on, the Soviet Union proved absolutely immune. And let us not forget that when capitalists prepare for a war, they know that 99 percent of the casualties will be borne by the people. This is by no means undesirable to them, but to a Socialist state it is a fundamental consideration.

For these basic reasons it is correct to say that by its very nature, the Soviet Union *cannot* engage in an aggressive war.

And this is not "only" theory, but is borne out by fact. Since the Soviet government was established, its armed forces have been engaged as follows: from 1918 to 1921, in clearing its own country of the armed interventionists of 14 foreign powers, including American; in the late 'thirties, in repelling two provocative mass attacks by the Japanese militarists. In 1938, at the time of Munich, it stood ready to carry out its treaty obligations in defense of Czechoslovakia, while imperialist France betrayed its sacred word and joined imperialist England in selling the Czechoslovaks into the Nazi concentration camps.

In 1939, even after the Munich betrayal, the U.S.S.R. continued its efforts to effect a military agreement with Britain and France to check the Axis. But it was clear from the outset that the Western powers had sent, for participation in such vital nego-

tiations, second-rate officials who admittedly had no power to conclude an agreement with the U.S.S.R. The deliberate protraction of the talks by William Strang and Co. and the refusal to make mutual the Soviet offer to join in the defense of any Western power attacked by Germany, made it plain as day that the Western imperialists were merely paying lip-service to the people's demand for realizing a pact with the U.S.S.R. and were attempting to provide a cover for the hoped-for Nazi "Drang Nach Osten." This cynical duplicity of the Western powers was again emphasized when the ultra-reactionary government of Polish colonels and agents of the imperialist Western powers refused to allow passage through Polish territory of Red Army troops in order to head off the Germans. The U.S.S.R. therefore had recourse only to the acceptance of Germany's offer, in August of 1939, for the negotiation of a pact of non-aggression.

Ensuing events have made it clear that the Soviet-German non-aggression pact, and the Red Army occupation of territories which had been seized from the Soviet Union, kept the Nazis from Soviet borders and gained invaluable time. In 1941, the value of this action to all the United Nations was demonstrated when the Soviet Army became the backbone of the war and the main force that crushed the Nazi war machine.

No other country, certainly not our own with its aggressive war against Mexico in 1847, the Spanish-

American War in 1898 and its participation in World War I, can show a similar record of non-aggression. And let us not forget that for the imperialist countries, "peace-time" is full of "minor" aggressions against "backward" peoples (intervention in China, Cuba, Mexico, Haiti, Nicaragua, etc., in the instance of U.S. imperialism, for example).

Thus, theory and practice alike show that the Soviet Union, ruled by the working class, *cannot* engage in an aggressive war; it has no objectives for which to fight such a war; and no power engages in war just for the sake of fighting.

But the warmongers and their liberal apologists argue: maybe it is not in the interests of the Soviet workers to start a war, but "the country is run by the 13 men of the Politburo, who are determined to increase their power by conquest," and that is the source of "Soviet aggression."

These arguments are, of course, completely illiterate and demagogic.

Countries are not ruled, in the basic sense, by individuals or cliques, but by *classes*. Even the classic fascist dictator of modern times—Hitler—and the "divine" dictator—Hirohito—both ruled only as agents of their respective capitalist classes. And how well this truth is borne out by the current phenomenon of the Tito-fascist clique, which, systematically frustrating the Socialist aspirations of the Yugoslav people by its foreign policy of anti-Soviet provocations and its domestic policy of reviving capi-

talism
bough
Fu
ing
note
by no
leader
the c
right
—onc
mark
Th
Party
tators
Party
refute
mous
ican
Unio
repli
"Is it
muni
ment
It a
contro
have
contro
talist
big b
ence
parlia
trol t
fact, t
is pre
contro
ums.
not a
the C
tion t
nates:
pressu
fall f

talism, now stands exposed as the bought agents of the imperialists.

Further, as to the question of "seeking to increase their power," let us note that a hankering after power is by no means a recommendation for leadership in the Soviet Union. On the contrary, it is considered, and rightly so—as in the case of Trotsky—one of the most dangerous hallmarks of *pseudo*-leadership.

This entire attempt to distort the Party's leading role as meaning "dictatorship of the Party" or of a small Party group was long ago classically refuted by Stalin. Thus, in his famous Interview with the First American Labor Delegation to the Soviet Union (September 9, 1927), Stalin replied in answer to the question: "Is it correct to say that the Communist Party controls the government?"—as follows:

It all depends upon what is meant by control. In capitalist countries, they have a rather curious conception of control. I know that a number of capitalist governments are controlled by big banks, notwithstanding the existence of "democratic" parliaments. The parliaments assert that they alone control the government. As a matter of fact, the composition of the government is predetermined, and their actions are controlled by great financial consortiums. Who does not know that there is not a single capitalist "power" in which the Cabinet can be formed in opposition to the will of the big financial magnates? It is sufficient to exert financial pressure to cause Cabinet Ministers to fall from their posts as if they were

stunned. This is real control exercised by banks over governments in spite of the alleged control by parliament. If such control is meant, then I must declare that control of the government by money-bags is inconceivable and absolutely impossible in the U.S.S.R., if only for the reason that the banks have been nationalized long ago and the money-bags have been expelled from the U.S.S.R.

Perhaps the delegation did not mean control, but the guidance exercised by the Party in relation to the government. If that is what the delegation meant by its question, then my reply is: Yes, our Party does guide the government. And the Party is able to guide the government because it enjoys the confidence of the majority of the workers and the toilers generally, and it has the right to guide the organs of the government in the name of this majority.

But the warmongers shout that "there is no 'freedom' in the U.S.S.R. We must defend 'freedom' against Soviet Communism." In this connection let us remember that our Abe Lincoln said a long time ago: "The wolf and the lamb are not agreed on the definition of the word 'liberty.'" And it is a fact that the slaveowners in Lincoln's day defended slavery in the name of "liberty"—*their* liberty to own slaves. And our modern American capitalists, in the name of "freedom," defend *their* freedom to exploit the American people and the peoples of other countries. Their exploitative capitalist system is thus dressed up with the fancy name of "free enterprise."

But the Soviet people do not agree with the capitalists' definition of the word "freedom." Their freedom means freedom of the whole people—freedom *from exploitation*. They recognize no freedom *to exploit*. To them the "freedom" of an unemployed man or woman is no freedom. The threat of starvation robs one of freedom and therefore the Soviet Constitution establishes "the right to work." Discrimination and prejudice rob a Negro or a Jew of his freedom, and therefore in the Soviet Union, discrimination is a crime. And the Soviet people also cherish their freedom *to progress* to Communism—won at the cost of years of incredible struggle, revolution, defense against intervention and against the hordes of fascism. And they will not permit the clock of history to be turned back.

One could do no better than again to quote Fadeyev, the eminent Soviet writer, who declared at Madison Square Garden:

It is high time to understand that to confront a Soviet person with the question of the existence of or lack of freedom is more absurd than to have put the same question to an American in the period following the War for Independence. An American of those times would have said: "This is my country. I have fought for it to gain the right to a free life. To hell with you!"

The demagogy of the warmongers, finally, centers around the appeal to "self-defense," the cry that the Soviet

Union with its "religious fervor" will start a war to "spread Communism" by conquest everywhere in the world.

This is perhaps the oldest and most hoary of all the slanders. Lenin and Stalin have stated that "Communism" and "revolution" are not articles of export—that they cannot possibly be imposed on a country from outside. Socialist emancipation can be achieved only when the majority of the given nation become convinced, on the basis of their own struggles and experience, that this is the only given path, and that any other path will lead only to renewed and increased frustrations, disasters and decay.

But of course the demagogues can work a sleight-of-hand and say that every time a nation moves toward Socialism, this is by definition a Soviet "conquest" and "extends the Soviet military machine." In other words, they start with the pretense that no nation could possibly be so un-American as to *want* Socialism, and therefore if it does move toward Socialism, it shows there has been "secret infiltration" and "internal conquest" by the Soviet Union through its "agents," the Communists of the country. This is more or less the official State Department position on Czechoslovakia. Therefore, in the North Atlantic Pact, such developments are made a justification for unleashing an anti-Soviet war.

But this is in reality an attempt by U.S. imperialism to set up a law throughout the world that no coun-

try, no
perien
ings a
steril
tem,
system
upon
lar to
Holy
to ste
North
to g
again
make
movan
ples o
revolu
try is
laid o
depen
consti
the a
ciety
of all
the sy
ous g
worth
origin
all th
insist
sians.
Bu
mean
is no
Com
it is
the s
the S
not l
know
butic

try, no matter what its condition, experiences, or development, or the feelings and opinions of its people, or the sterility of its existing capitalist system, shall dare to move beyond the system of capitalism and dependence upon the United States. This is similar to the ill-fated attempts of the Holy Alliance, a hundred years ago, to stop the tide of progress. The North Atlantic Pact, in its attempts to guarantee other governments against "internal aggression," would make reactionary governments irremovable and would deny to the peoples of other countries the right to revolution on which our own country is based—the profound principle laid down in the Declaration of Independence and in many of our state constitutions. Such damming up of the arteries of development in a society can lead only to suppuration of all the sores and contradictions in the system, ending again in the hideous gangrene of fascism. It is well worth noting that this "theory" was originated by Hitler and Franco, who all through the Spanish Civil War insisted they were fighting "the Russians."

But the warmongers ask: "Do you mean to tell us that the Soviet Union is not interested in the spreading of Communism?" Of course it is. But it is an axiom of Marxism-Leninism, the scientific principles embodied in the Soviet Power, that Socialism cannot be exported. The Soviet Union knows that its most essential contribution to the spreading of Commu-

nism lies in the power of its example—in showing that Socialism works, that it leads to peace, security and the tremendous progress and development of culture for a vast population, wiping out the evils of capitalism, setting a new high value on human life, giving the people a new aim and purpose and making them masters of their own fate. It is *a propos* to quote in this connection the telling refutation by Engels of parallel charges levelled at the very originator of Marxism, when Russia was still lost in the depths of Czarism. In a letter to Eduard Bernstein, Engels wrote in 1881:

But what most annoys the petty carpers who are nothing and would like to be everything is this: by his theoretical and practical achievements Marx has won for himself the position that the best people of all labor movements in the various countries have full confidence in him. . . . It is therefore not Marx who imposes his opinion, far less his will, on these people, it is these people themselves who come to him. And that is just the basis of the peculiar influence of Marx. . . . Any attempt at influencing [them] against their will would only do us harm and destroy the old confidence . . . and for that we have too much experience.*

Thus it is possible to see, in the real conditions of Soviet life, the foundations of the Socialist foreign policy.

This policy is based first and foremost on the historical duty of pre-

* Karl Marx, *Selected Works*, Volume II, p. 636.

erving the Socialist system in the U.S.S.R. in the interest of its own people, and of the future of Socialism everywhere, as an example and inspiration to the working people of all countries. This requires *peace*—peace to insure the existence of the Soviet Union and peace to build Socialism; peace, so that the surplus of the country's output can go into machinery, construction, consumers' goods and culture, instead of into armaments. And the Soviet Union, as the land of Socialism, desires peace, because imperialist war is a catastrophe to the working class in every country of the world.

PEACEFUL CO-EXISTENCE IS POSSIBLE AND NECESSARY

But is it possible for a Socialist system to exist peacefully in a capitalist world? Does not the contradictory character of the two systems lead to an inevitable war of elimination? In its earliest days, the Soviet government answered this last question with a resounding "No!" and Lenin and Stalin laid down as the basic principle of Soviet foreign policy the possibility of peaceful co-existence of the Socialist and capitalist sectors of the world.

It was Trotsky who held that peaceful co-existence was impossible—in accordance with his whole treacherous and provocative line. But Stalin not only held to Lenin's principle of peaceful co-existence; he demonstrated it in fact. The Soviet

government avoided all provocations and secured peace for twenty years, and had the Western powers accepted its proposals for collective security in the years before World War II, that war could have been avoided. And when that war finally took place, it was not a united capitalist war against the Socialist country, but the capitalist powers were split, and it was war against the fascist Axis.

The imperialist warmongers make no bones about their feverish desire to crush the Soviet Union. No one can ever forget Herbert Hoover's momentary frankness: "It is the ambition of my life to crush out Soviet Russia!" The warmongers see the growth of the Socialist sector of the world from 1917 to the present day, when it is being joined by China's 450,000,000. They know that the path of historical development is toward Socialism, and that Socialism becomes stronger while capitalism declines. They become desperate and shout for a "preventive" war.

But we should not forget the statement of the Communist Information Bureau that there is a great gap between the desire of the imperialists to launch a new world war, and their actual ability to organize one. Aside from all other considerations, the people have barely begun to make themselves felt in the struggle against a new mass slaughter.

As part of its affirmation of the possibility and necessity of the peaceful co-existence of the two systems, Soviet foreign policy likewise follows

the pr
of no
affairs
in the
lar in
the 20
China
and t
have a
any su
the B
electio
ent "
later a
Un-A
cry of
to esta
But th
facts.
of no
affairs
on thi
On
perial
its ann
to org
and co
Union
Throu
blatan
openly
instru
in its
lions o
ica" r
propag
to arc
ments
ing h
ferenc
In 1

the principle toward other countries of *non-interference in their internal affairs*. Despite the terrific hullabaloo in the capitalist press, and the regular indoor sport in all countries in the 20's and 30's, from England to China, of raiding Soviet embassies and trade representations, nowhere have any actual cases been found of any such alleged "interference." True, the British Tories won a national election on the basis of a non-existent "Zinoviev Letter," which they later admitted was a forgery, and the Un-American Committee uses the cry of "Soviet agents" as a weapon to establish a police state in America. But these frame-ups do not alter the facts. The well-known Soviet record of non-interference in the internal affairs of China makes its position on this point crystal clear.

On the other hand, American imperialism is perfectly brazen about its announcements of its "Project X" to organize sabotage, assassinations and counter-revolution in the Soviet Union and the New Democracies. Through various instrumentalities it blatantly calls for such action, and openly calls for the recruiting and instruction of agents to participate in its secret warfare. It spends millions on its so-called "Voice of America" radio program to spread its propaganda in these countries and to arouse resistance to the governments, while all the time complaining hysterically about "Soviet interference."

In keeping with its stand for the

possibility and necessity of achieving peaceful co-existence, the Soviet Union also works for close business relations with all countries. It is ridiculous to hear State Department apologists talk of "Russia's self-imposed isolation" when it is the American government itself that has imposed a boycott on virtually all trade with the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe on the grounds that everything has "war potential." Certainly, no truly independent country (least of all a Socialist country) could accept the economic dictation of the Marshall Plan, but the Soviet government has always engaged in mutually beneficial trade relations with any willing country on equal terms.

The Soviet Union's policy of stressing the necessity and possibility of peaceful co-existence does not mean that its foreign policy is a passive one. The U.S.S.R. engaged actively in the effort to organize collective security against fascist aggression. It participated with Roosevelt at Teheran and Yalta, and with Truman at Potsdam, in working out a *modus vivendi* for peaceful co-existence, and had not America's ruling class cynically reneged on these pacts, there would be no war danger facing the world today.

The Soviet Union has, furthermore, repeatedly raised the question of total or partial disarmament to relieve the peoples of the crushing economic burden of war budgets and to reduce the vested interest in war. Andrei Vishinsky, Foreign Minister

of the U.S.S.R. and head of the Soviet delegation at the U.N., has spoken out sharply on this question at the current session of the General Assembly on numerous occasions. On September 23, after boldly exposing the campaign of war incitement and the armaments race unleashed by imperialist Western powers, Vishinsky submitted the concrete, realistic proposals of the Soviet government for ending the threat of atomic warfare and securing the peaceful cooperation of the big powers. The Soviet delegation proposed the adoption of the following decision:

1. The General Assembly condemns the preparations of a new war which are being conducted in a number of countries, particularly in the United States of America and Great Britain, and which find their expression in government-encouraged war propaganda, in the armaments race, and in inflated war budgets which fall as a heavy burden on the population, in the establishment of numerous military, naval and air bases on the territories of other countries, in the formation of military blocs of states pursuing aggressive aims in regard to the peace-loving democratic countries, and in the execution of other measures aimed at aggression.

2. Just as civilized nations had long ago condemned the use for military purposes of poison gas and of bacteriological weapons as being a most heavy crime against mankind, so the General Assembly recognizes that the use of atomic weapons and other means of mass destruction of human beings is incompatible with the conscience and honor of nations and with member-

ship in the United Nations organization, and considers any further delays in the adoption by the United Nations of practical measures for the unconditional prohibition of atomic weapons and for the establishment of an adequate and rigid international control to be inadmissible.

3. The General Assembly calls upon all nations to settle their disputes and differences peacefully without resorting to the use of force or to threats of force. The General Assembly taking note, at the same time, of the unbending will and determination of the peoples to ward off the threat of a new war and to secure the maintenance of peace, as expressed in all countries in the mighty, popular movement for peace and against warmongers, and bearing in mind that the Five Powers, permanent members of the Security Council, bear primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security, unanimously expresses the wish that the United States of America, Great Britain, China, France, and the Soviet Union join their efforts for this purpose and conclude among themselves a Pact for the Strengthening of Peace.

Several days later, Vishinsky called on the Assembly to adopt a resolution for the same five big powers to reduce all existing armed forces by one-third within one year, "as the first step in the reduction of armaments and armed forces. . ."

American monopoly capital shudders at what would happen to its designs for world domination, to its golden rain of profits and to its capitalist economy, if the huge war budget that is fed with some 80 percent

of the funds
And so
the rep
countri
cynical
posals
ganda"
in a se
serve t
The
consist
fought
for the
remnar
partme
anti-Co
torious
Germa
picable
cists th
the sa
whom
strong
The
Union
ceeds f
peace
pointm
due, no
but to
ministr
vert th
of natio
and in
of their
ward p
instrum
as a cl
ciently
to assu

of the government's immense tax funds were reduced or abolished. And so its official representatives and the representatives of its vassalized countries continue in their course of cynically denouncing these peace proposals of the Soviet Union as "propaganda" and refusing to discuss them in a serious manner in order to preserve the peace.

The Soviet Union, in pursuing its consistent peace policy, has likewise fought in the U.N. and in all spheres for the extirpation everywhere of the remnants of fascism. The State Department, however, in its pursuit of anti-Communist allies, has been notoriously cuddling up to Nazis in Germany, Fascists in Italy, the despicable Franco in Spain, clerical fascists throughout Europe, as well as the same Japanese militarists for whom Americans found no epithet strong enough during the war.

The outstanding role of the Soviet Union in the United Nations proceeds from its tested and unwavering peace policy. The so-called "disappointments" in the U.N. have been due, not to the Soviet use of the veto, but to the fact that the Truman Administration has been trying to convert the U.N. from a meeting-place of nations, where, discussing as equals and in accordance with the realities of their positions, they can work toward peace and agreement, into an instrument of compulsion to be used as a club by the U.S., which is sufficiently rich and powerful to be able to assure itself a mechanical major-

ity. The unanimity principle was recognized from the start as an essential feature of the U.N. which prevents it from becoming the tool of any single power, and the outcry over its use has been thoroughly hypocritical.

Bearing an organic relationship to its consistent peace policy is the Soviet Union's unyielding opposition to colonial exploitation and oppression. The U.S.S.R. has cast a powerful searchlight on the crimes of the colonial powers, crimes that were once successfully kept secret. Its own example of guaranteeing national and racial equality and outlawing prejudice and discrimination, has served as an inspiration to colonial peoples throughout the world in their struggles for liberation. It was the assistance of the Soviet Union that frustrated the Anglo-American attempt to smother the Israeli nation before and after its birth. And it is the Soviet Union that has refused to allow the question of Indonesia to be buried under a "gentlemen's agreement."

In all of these policies, the Soviet Union has acted, not on behalf of some special, selfish interests, but on behalf of the common peoples of all countries, thus inevitably occupying the position of the leader of the mighty world camp of peace and democracy. Masses of people throughout the world support the Soviet Union in these policies, not because they are its "agents," but because these policies are their policies—the

policies that mean peace and security for the people.

These are the facts behind the Hitler-like distortion picturing the Soviet foreign policy as a policy of aggressive war and a threat to the United States. And not even the vast and complex propaganda machine of American imperialism can change the *facts*. Americans must refuse to

surrender their minds and wills to the nightmare world and persecution mania of a Forrestal, as the German people did with Hitler, but rather, firmly basing themselves on the historic American respect for *facts*, insist upon a policy of peace and cooperation, a policy that is in the true interest of the American people as well as the peoples of the world.

by M

NOV
32nd
ber S

The
of the
vealed
balist
talis
chain
ished
try. T
filling
surfac
kind
explo
comp
Marx
Party
worki
Stalin

Un
of Le
of po
obsta
dame
of Sov
are in
transi
been
myth
not c
state,
mana
creati

Socialism Means Peace

by Marvin Reiss

NOVEMBER 7 of this year marks the 32nd anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution.

Thirty-two years ago, in the midst of the First World War, which revealed in all its nakedness the cannibalistic character of imperialist capitalism, the Russian peoples broke the chain of world imperialism and abolished capitalist slavery in their country. This world-shaking event, fulfilling on one-sixth of the earth's surface the age-old dream of mankind for emancipation from class exploitation and oppression, was accomplished under the revolutionary Marxist leadership of the Bolshevik Party guided by the geniuses of the working-class movement, Lenin and Stalin.

Under the leadership of the Party of Lenin and Stalin, and in the face of powerful internal and external obstacles, the Soviet people have fundamentally completed the building of Socialism in the Soviet Union and are irrevocably set on the path of transition to Communism. Thus has been demolished for all time the myth that the common people are not capable of setting up their own state, running their own government, managing their own industries, and creating a happy, cultured life truly

worthy of man. Thus has been established for all time the truth that only a workers' state, founded on the principles of Marxism-Leninism and guided by the vanguard Communist Party, offers the people the way out of misery, chaos, and human degradation.

The cartellists, foremost among them the Wall Street oligarchs who are striving for world domination, meet this truth by heaping the vilest abuse on the land of Socialism. Desperately attempting to undo the laws of social progress, the imperialists are bending their every effort to clamp down the iron heel of fascism and unloose a new, atomic blood bath. To this end, they are striving to "outlaw" Marxist-Leninist science, the compass of social progress, to fasten an iron curtain of thought control on the people's minds, and to innoculate the masses with their Nazi-like doctrines of "the American Century" and "Anglo-Saxon superiority."

This is the true meaning of the fascist-like indictments, trial, sentencing, and jailing without the right to bail of the vanguard fighters in behalf of the American working class, the Negro people and all the oppressed—the leaders of the American Communist Party. This is the

motivation which underlies the hysterical campaigns of Red-baiting and anti-Soviet demagoguery. This is the significance of the multi-billion-dollar armament program, and the knocking-together of "defensive" alliances and blocs.

On this 32nd anniversary, the land of Socialism is mightier than ever before, exerting a powerful influence on the whole present and future course of mankind. Despite the unprecedented campaigns of hate and calumny directed against it by the men of the trusts and their hirelings and apologists, the prestige of the workers' state among all peoples grows from day to day and year to year. As the staunch leader of the world camp of peace, democracy, national independence and Socialism, the Soviet Union champions the struggles of the war-weary peoples for an enduring peace and inspires all peoples in their striving for social advance.

THE SOVIET UNION'S UNWAVERING STRUGGLE FOR PEACE

The occasion of this 32nd anniversary of the founding of the first Socialist state, presents to the peace forces in the United States, and foremost among them the Communists, the appropriate task of enlightening the American masses as to the true facts about the Soviet Union and the true reasons for the hysterical campaign of anti-Soviet calumny and vilification.

It is in the supreme interest of the American working class and the whole American people to study the facts and learn the truth about the Soviet Union; it is the highest *patriotic* duty and responsibility of all peace-loving Americans to do so. The anti-Soviet hate cult has already taken its tragic toll of millions of lives in the Second World War, whose great lesson is that one cannot fight against war and fascism except with the U.S.S.R., nor fight against the U.S.S.R. except with the warmakers and fascists.

The cold war against the Soviet Union has already imposed a heavy burden of hardship on the shoulders of the American people. That burden will grow by the day, beyond all anticipation, unless the ruinous, bankrupt policies of the monopolists are brought to a halt by the united will and peace actions of the people. Already the revelation that the Soviet Union possesses the atomic bomb, which has precipitated a crisis in the war strategy of the brass hats and admirals of U.S. imperialism, is being made the occasion for vast new outlays for militarization and for the frenzied piling up of atomic bombs. In face of growing recognition that U.S. imperialism cannot possibly win any war that it may succeed in unleashing against the U.S.S.R. and the People's Democracies and that such a war would bring inconceivable hardships down on the heads of our people, the Wall Street warmongers persist in their refusal to adopt

meas
law a
isitins
are u
Comm
impr
tacks
living
clamp
And v
again
to de
the t
stand
From
years.
these
unwa
Social
of the
prom
Betwe
govern
in its
It exp
frenzi
nopolis
name
non-fa
rity to
vent t
in the
ful, fr
with a
like p
sult o
Ameri
in the
ing A
his tre
the So

measures genuinely designed to outlaw atomic warfare and destroy existing stocks of atomic bombs. They are utilizing the railroading of the Communist leaders to long terms of imprisonment to intensify their attacks on the people's civil rights and living standards with the aim of clamping a police state on the nation. And with their strident hymn of hate against everything Soviet, they seek to deafen the American people to the truth that the Soviet Union stands guard over the peace.

From 1917 to 1949 — thirty-two years. And the record shows that these have been thirty-two years of unwavering struggle for peace by the Socialist state. The first official act of the young Soviet republic was its promulgation of the Decree of Peace. Between the two wars, the Soviet government left no stone unturned in its efforts to prevent another war. It exposed the war propaganda and frenzied war preparations of the monopolists; it called aggression by its name and endeavored to rally all non-fascist states for collective security to curb the aggressors and prevent the outbreak of war anywhere in the world; it strove to build peaceful, friendly and business relations with all countries willing to follow a like policy toward it. When as a result of the persistence of Anglo-American and French imperialism in their Munich course of encouraging Axis aggression, Hitler launched his treacherous attack on the U.S.S.R., the Soviet Union, with the epic hero-

ism and self-sacrifice of its people, fought its Great Patriotic War for the cause of world peace.

Since the Second World War, the Soviet Union has worked untiringly to carry out its responsibilities under the Teheran, Yalta and Potsdam agreements by extirpating fascism in, and guaranteeing the peaceful, democratic development of, the countries it occupied. It has worked with unparalleled consistency to strengthen the United Nations and make of it a genuine instrument for the guaranteeing of a durable peace and the independence and democratic advance of nations.

In the Soviet Union, there are no cartellists, no kings of finance and industry to unleash imperialist wars and wax fat on profits and spoils of war. As a socialist state, the U.S.S.R. has no imperialist striving for colonies, markets, or "spheres of influence." It repudiates the cynical imperialist practice of intervening in the internal affairs of other countries, big or small. Engaged in peaceful construction on a vast scale, the Soviet people and their government need, want, and determinedly strive for a lasting peace.

It is in accordance with this need and policy that the voice of the Soviet Union in the United Nations boldly rings out in the exposure and condemnation of war propaganda and renewed armaments races and offers realistic proposals for putting an end to the monarcho-fascist butchery of the people in Greece in a civil

war fomented and sustained by U.S. imperialism.

It is in accordance with this need and policy that, although it had the atomic bomb as early as 1947, the Soviet Union, in contrast to the bomb-brandishing of Wall Street-Washington, at no time indulged in the bullying of other countries or interference in their internal affairs. On the contrary, the land of Socialism has firmly striven in the U.N. to secure the outlawing of atomic weapons, the destruction of existing bomb stocks, and the establishment of effective international control. At the current session of the General Assembly, A. Y. Vishinsky, Foreign Minister of the U.S.S.R. and head of the Soviet delegation to the U.N., concluded his noteworthy address of September 23, by submitting the following Soviet proposals for adoption by the General Assembly: condemnation of the feverish war preparations of Anglo-American imperialism; unconditional prohibition of atomic weapons and establishment of rigid international control; U.N. encouragement of the permanent members of the Security Council, "for the maintenance of international peace and security," to "join their efforts for this purpose and conclude among themselves a Pact for the Strengthening of Peace." Again, on September 25, Vishinsky urged the Assembly to adopt a resolution calling on the big five powers, "as the first step in the reduction of armaments and armed forces," to "reduce by one-

third, within one year, all existing land, naval and air forces."

In the face of these facts, the spokesmen of Wall Street have been given the special task of shifting the responsibility for the war danger from their own shoulders to the Soviet Union. The cry of the hirelings of the monopolists, the reactionary Social-Democrats and the professional "liberals" is that it is "impossible" to cooperate with the Soviet Union because the land of Socialism is "imperialistic."

In order to put over this big lie, the State Department gleefully presents, as its "exhibit A" of "Soviet aggression," the Tito gang of "independent Communists."

The Rajk trial in Hungary has fully exposed the colossal demagoguery of this anti-Soviet slander. The Titoites now stand naked before the world as a gang of fascists and paid intelligence agents recruited by the notorious "Project X" headed by Allan Dulles and assigned the special "job" of converting the Balkans into a gigantic war base against the U.S.S.R. As revealed at the trial, the master plan involved the permeation of the People's Democracies with nests of spies, wreckers and assassins; the "softening up" of the New Democracies by these fifth-column agents in preparation for a full-scale military invasion timed to coincide with the plotted overthrow of their governments; and the formation of a Balkan-Danubian "Confederation" headed by Tito as Wall Street's gau-

leiter
world

Thu
far fr
viet a
itself

sive p
ternal
racies
and, f

ism,
taken
vertin

Hence
peace-

strugg
and p
est vi

and d
and it
tion in
mine

Eve
U.S. i
zealou

Thu
eign c
Times

writte
compl

Europ
ments

the U
a high

of the
19, Su
One

Econ
United
an "c

leiter in unleashing a third war for world domination.

Thus, it is clear to the world that, far from being the "victim" of "Soviet aggression," the Tito regime has itself carried out a ruthlessly aggressive policy of intervention in the internal affairs of the People's Democracies and of anti-Soviet provocation; and, further, that it is U.S. imperialism, not the U.S.S.R., which has taken over Yugoslavia and is converting it into a colony and war base. Hence, it should be clear to every peace-desiring American that the struggle against the war incendiaries and provocateurs demands the firmest vigilance and struggle to isolate and defeat all attempts of Tito-ism and its agents to bring demoralization into the peace camp and undermine its unity.

Every now and then, the mask of U.S. imperialism is lifted by an overzealous bourgeois spokesman.

Thus, C. L. Sulzberger, chief foreign correspondent of *The New York Times*, in one of a series of articles written for that newspaper after his completion of a tour of Western Europe, listed some of the "arguments" put up by the spokesmen of the U.S. satellites in order to squeeze a higher price for their services out of their masters' pockets. On October 19, Sulzberger wrote as follows:

One such argument is as follows:

Economically speaking, it is the United States and its allies that require an "empire" today. . . . The under-

populated* and insufficiently industrialized Soviet Union has no such basic need.

Yet the current political contest is paradoxically in reverse, with the United States leading those who seek to prevent Russia from acquiring an empire she does not need and could not absorb.

The alleged "paradox" can exist, of course, only for those who have lost all semblance of sanity or whose assignment it is to twist logic into its opposite. It would never occur to this chief correspondent of a Wall Street organ that the "paradox" vanishes into thin air if, in accord with the facts, it is made plain that U.S. imperialism is up to its neck in plans, preparations and aggressive activities designed, not to "stop Soviet imperialism," but to fasten Wall Street's domination on the world. But then logic cannot be expected from the spokesmen for an outworn system riddled with insoluble contradictions.

HISTORIC SURVEY

As we have seen earlier, the consistent and indefatigable peace policy of the U.S.S.R. throughout its thirty-two years of existence arises organically out of the Socialist character of the Soviet state. On the occasion of this anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution, and in the face especially of the barrage of anti-

* The Soviet Union is alternatively "underpopulated" and "overpopulated," as the warmongering whims of the imperialists require. Thus William Vogt, author of the much-ballyhooed neo-Malthusian best-seller, *Road to Survival*, proclaimed that the "overpopulation" of the U.S.S.R. makes it the great danger to world peace.

Soviet vilification and distortion designed to misrepresent and conceal the true essence of Socialism from the American people, it is both fitting and necessary to review briefly some major aspects of the achievements of the first Socialist state.

The vast destruction wreaked by the imperialist First World War and the years of imperialist military intervention and blockades left the young Soviet republic close to prostration at the termination of the civil war. But by the year 1925-26 industrial production reached the prewar level, and agricultural production approximately the same point. There soon came a succession of Stalin Five-Year Plans, which created a modern, powerful heavy and light industry and produced a growing stream of consumers' goods. New cities and new industries came into existence in all parts of the U.S.S.R., including the areas of Asia which had been the most undeveloped economically and culturally due to Czarist oppression. The old, backward, individualistic agricultural methods, which had fattened only the kulaks and constituted a constant threat of the restoration of capitalism, were eliminated, and a Socialist form of agriculture, the collective farm, was established. Women began to play an important and leading role in every walk of life as their political, social, and economic equality was fostered by law and guaranteed by the Socialist nature of society. The barbarous Czarist "prison of nations" receded in mem-

ory as the full right to self-determination and the fraternal equality of the many nations in the Soviet Union were realized in practice; racism, anti-Semitism, and chauvinism in any expression were outlawed as heinous crimes and banished forever.

By the mid 'thirties, the working people in the U.S.S.R. had built a Socialist economy, and life had become joyous. Full employment was a reality such as it could never attain under capitalism, and the standard of living advanced steadily as prices declined and wages rose simultaneously.

These profound changes in the life of the Soviet people were reflected in the adoption of the Stalin Constitution of 1936, which recorded the triumph of Socialism in the U.S.S.R. and laid down democratic rights more extensive and incomparably higher than contained in any other constitution in the world—rights which, moreover, are not formal, but actual, concrete, realized in life itself.

The basis of these great achievements was outlined by Stalin, in his Report to the Eighteenth Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, delivered on March 10, 1939, in the course of delineating the chief distinguishing feature of Soviet society:

The feature that distinguishes Soviet society today from any capitalist society is that it no longer contains antagonistic, hostile classes; that the exploiting classes have been eliminated, while

the w
who r
work
capita
able
and c
and la
instab
from
a pict
tween
tuals.
which
velopm
moral
ciety,
tions
otism.
Consti
Novem
democ
supren

The
rupted
cultur
ness a
Union
destru
sands
were
the m
of the
main
Second
fascist
life bl
people

The
and t
the N
world
are a

the workers, peasants and intellectuals, who make up Soviet society, live and work in friendly collaboration. While capitalist society is torn by irreconcilable contradictions between workers and capitalists and between peasants and landlords—resulting in its internal instability — Soviet society, liberated from the yoke of exploitation, presents a picture of friendly collaboration between workers, peasants and intellectuals. It is this community of interest which has formed the basis for the development of such motive forces as the moral and political unity of Soviet society, the mutual friendship of the nations of the U.S.S.R., and Soviet patriotism. It has also been the basis for the Constitution of the U.S.S.R. adopted in November 1936, and for the complete democratization of the elections to the supreme organs of the country.

The savage Hitler invasion interrupted the tremendous material and cultural progress, the growing richness and fullness of life in the Soviet Union, and brought indescribable destruction and hardship. Thousands of cities, towns and villages were razed. Millions perished. But the magnificent, victorious struggle of the Soviet people, who bore the main brunt of the fighting in the Second World War, turned back the fascist tide and liberated with their life blood the enslaved and tortured peoples of Europe.

The historic victory at Stalingrad and the epoch-making victory over the Nazi hordes, armed with the world's most powerful war machine, are a testimonial to the vitality, truly

popular character and great stability of the Socialist order and the Soviet state. The victory of the Soviet Army was the product of the matchless moral and political unity of the Soviet people, the triumph of Socialist economy in the U.S.S.R., and the profound patriotism of the multinational Soviet peoples; it was achieved through the guiding genius and tireless efforts of the great Stalin, best co-worker, disciple and continuator of V. I. Lenin, founder of the Soviet state and of the Bolshevik Party.

The military victory of the Soviet people testifies, not only to the emancipatory character of Socialism, but to the truly vanguard character of the Party of Socialism, the Communist Party, and to the profound truth of the Marxist-Leninist theory on which the Party of Lenin and Stalin is undeviatingly founded. The victory of the U.S.S.R. would have been impossible without the uncompromising vigilance and struggle for the purity of Marxist-Leninist theory against enemy ideologies and against the defeatist, counter-revolutionary "theories" of the Right and "Left" opportunist blocs and nationalist deviators. The utter rout and defeat of the Trotskyist and Bukharinist centers of counter-revolution was a vital necessity for the triumph of industrialization, of farm collectivization, and of the Leninist-Stalinist national policy—which in turn enabled the equipping of the Soviet Army with the most modern technique and weapons

and welded the indissoluble unity of the Soviet people.

The superiority of the Socialist way of life and the mighty, constructive force of Marxism-Leninism have again been magnificently confirmed in the striking rapidity with which the Soviet Union has succeeded in rebuilding cities, factories and homes and rehabilitating farms and thousands of cultural and social institutions in the Western areas of its territory devastated by the fascist invaders. No capitalist country exposed to the unparalleled rapacity of the occupationist German armies could have recovered as quickly or profoundly as has the Socialist U.S.S.R.

TRANSITION TO COMMUNISM

Since 1945, the Soviet Union has resumed its steady advance along the path of gradual transition to a Communist society.* As Marxism-Leninism teaches, this historic transition from the first, the Socialist stage of Communism, to its advanced, higher stage, involves the following chief features: the abolition of all remnants of private ownership of the means of production and the establishment of fully collective, social ownership; the unprecedented development of the productive forces—including the greatly increased productivity of labor—to the point where a super-abundance of all arti-

cles of consumption is ensured, thus enabling the distribution of the fruits of labor according to the principle of need, rather than that of work performed; the liquidation of contradictions between town and country and between physical and mental labor; and the overcoming of all hangovers of capitalism in the consciousness of man. The process of the withering away of the state, as Stalin profoundly developed the question in his Report to the Eighteenth Congress of the C.P.S.U., in 1939, has both an internal and an external aspect; it is predicated, not solely on the triumph of Socialism within the U.S.S.R., but on the disappearance of the capitalist encirclement, with the constant danger it poses of imperialist aggression. The process of withering away, therefore, can be achieved fully only when the capitalist encirclement has given way to a Socialist encirclement.

The gradual transition from Socialism to Communism, the salient features of which were outlined above, does not involve a struggle between hostile classes within the Soviet Union, inasmuch as Soviet society no longer contains antagonistic classes. But this does not at all signify that Communism develops spontaneously out of Socialism. On the contrary, it is a process of guided development of the Communist consciousness of the masses by all the educative forces in Soviet society. To this end, the Soviet government and the Communist Party exert their

* For a fuller discussion of this historic process the reader is referred to *Political Affairs*, July 1947, pp. 632-649.—Ed.

leading role in all spheres of Soviet life for overcoming the hangovers of capitalist ideology lingering in the attitude toward labor and toward social ownership and for further strengthening the bonds of fraternal collaboration uniting the peoples of the U.S.S.R. and the toilers by hand and brain, in town and country.

It is in the light of the various tasks confronted by the Soviet people in navigating the gradual transition to Communism that one must examine recent developments in the various spheres of life in the Soviet Union.

As regards economics, the Postwar Five-Year Plan of Reconstruction and Rehabilitation, which is being fulfilled far ahead of schedule, is healing the deep scars left by the war and pouring out an ever-greater abundance of means of production and consumers' goods. As announced several months ago by the Central Statistical Administration of the Council of Ministers of the U.S.S.R., the average daily gross industrial output in the prewar year of 1940 was exceeded by 41 percent in June of this year. The third quarter of 1949 has witnessed a further remarkable growth of the country's productive forces and improvement of the material conditions of the Soviet people. A growing abundance of consumers' goods—items of food and clothing, modern housing, household equipment, automobiles, etc.—is reaching the Soviet public. An ever-widening network of retail shops offers an

ever-wider variety of higher quality goods at constantly reduced prices.

Contributing to these developments are the constant advances in Soviet agriculture. An historic, long-range plan has been adopted and is under way for the transformation of nature in the steppe and forest-and-steppe districts of the Soviet Union. This plan involves afforestation on a large scale, fuller utilization of the latest agro-chemical techniques (including Michurin-Lysenko breeding methods and practices) and the further electrification and mechanization of agriculture. The mass project of rural electrification envisions, this year, the electrification of 12,500 collective farms — almost twice as many as in 1948 and almost 20 times that in 1940. Labor in the countryside is being lightened and made more productive by the mass production of a whole host of new improved agricultural machines and mechanical devices: automatic tree planters, cotton pickers, self-propelled mowing machines, etc. The third-quarter (1949) report of the Central Statistical Administration, as summarized in *For A Lasting Peace, For A People's Democracy!* (October 21, 1949), emphasizes the current successes of Soviet farmers:

Making wide use of the latest achievements in agricultural science and mechanization, they brought home an overall grain harvest in excess both of the 1948 crop and that of the prewar year of 1940. By October 1, the collective farms had more than 75,000 special

cattle, sheep-breeding, pig and poultry farms. The collective farm herd of horned cattle has increased by 20 percent over the year, and the number of pigs by 76 percent.

In keeping with a decision of the Soviet Government, forest belts are being planted over a vast area. The annual plan in this field of work has already been carried out by 102 percent. Trees have been planted on an area of over 280,000 hectares and another 540,000 hectares have been prepared for the purpose.

Of immeasurable significance for economic development is the revelation (Tass statement of September 25) that the Soviet Union has begun to tap the revolutionary industrial potentials of atomic energy on a large scale for purposes of peaceful construction. The results of such a development—which bourgeois scientists in the United States have claimed is "impossible" for many years to come—can scarcely be conceived.

All of these developments in the transformation of nature and material existence have contributed to the remaking of man himself under Socialism. The law of capitalist accumulation, Marx wrote, "rivets the laborer to capital more firmly than the wedges of Vulcan did Prometheus to the rock." With the abolition of capitalism and capitalist accumulation, labor has been emancipated and its Promethean character unbound. The social ownership of the means of production by the Soviet people, who garner the fruits of their

own labors without having to pay a tribute to capitalists or landlords, has given rise to a profoundly new attitude toward labor as a matter of honor and glory. The agony of toil under capitalism has given way to inspired, technically-advanced, collective construction which calls forth, instead of distorting or lulling, the creative powers of man.

Great work has yet to be performed in the Soviet Union along the lines of increasing the productivity of labor, greatly extending the achievements already scored in this regard. Friendly and cooperative Socialist emulation in the factory and on the farm has become a lever to raise productivity and simultaneously raise the Communist consciousness of the Soviet people.

A new intelligentsia devoted to the betterment of the life of the whole people has arisen out of the ranks of the working people. Science and culture, previously the monopoly and the toy of the wealthy classes, have been placed at the disposal of the millions. The great classics of world literature, in tens of millions of copies, stream off the Soviet presses. Music, literature, works of art, the drama, the ballet and the other art forms have become a daily necessity and enjoy a vast audience. And the people are provided with every opportunity for voicing their criticism and expressing their own artistic yearnings.

The large scale criticism and self-criticism which has taken place in

the
initia
and
the
and
liber
ideol
ideol
deca
and
prin
ture
their
Na
ture
prop
ern
mon
syste
ture
Unio
with
color
sire
peace
Sovie
in co
and
of A
At
going
shad
the
the
fact
ists
worl
has
of
peak
1948

the Soviet arts and sciences, usually initiated from below by audiences and readers—far from “restricting the freedom” of the Soviet artist and intellectual—are the means for liberating them from bourgeois ideological remnants and from the ideological fumes released by the decaying capitalist world. Criticism and self-criticism is a fundamental principle of Soviet life, of fusing culture and science with the people and their needs.

Naturally enough, this whole picture is not at all a happy one for the propagandists of imperialist “Western values” and the virtues of the monopoly-gripped “free enterprise” system. The healthy, bustling, cultured life of the people in the Soviet Union is too markedly in contrast with reality in the capitalist and colonial countries; the profound desire and determined striving for peace by the Soviet people and the Soviet government is too markedly in contrast with the war incitement and frantic armament preparations of Anglo-American imperialism.

At a time when another, deep-going economic crisis is casting its shadow over the capitalist countries, the crisis-less economic progress of the Soviet Union is an intolerable fact for the financiers and industrialists who dominate the capitalist world. In the United States, there has been a sharp drop in the level of production since the postwar peak of October and November 1948 and an alarming rise of unem-

ployment and part-time employment.

Despite recent seasonal fluctuations, unemployment still stands at about five million and shows signs of continued rising (according to the Department of Commerce, unemployment rose by 225,000 in the month ending October 8), and the part-time employed are estimated as numbering between 8 and 11 million; while in the Soviet Union the labor force *increased* by two million since the end of 1948. Whereas in the Soviet Union overall industrial production leaped ahead by 41 percent by June of this year over the prewar year of 1940 (with further increases since), industrial production in the U.S. has dropped sharply, by 29 percent, from the wartime peak of 1943 to September of this year. The contradictory trends in real wages in the United States and the Soviet Union are revealed by the following data: while in the Soviet Union real wages more than doubled over 1947 by the end of 1948, in the United States they dropped by 15 percent from the beginning of 1945 to the end of 1948 and have continued to decline during 1949. This general contrast assumes an all the more decisive significance in view of the colossal enrichment of U.S. capitalism by the war and the thorough economic devastation of the European part of the U.S.S.R. by the Axis invaders.

Growing economic deterioration in the citadel of world capitalism

and the remarkable forward surge of the Socialist economy of the U.S.S.R.—such is the picture.

And what of the highly-touted "culture" in monopoly-dominated U.S.A.? Can anyone deny the barbarously anti-human character of contemporary "Western values" as expressed in the endless stream of degraded motion pictures, books, journals and radio and television broadcasts which assail the senses and minds of the people with the cynical glorification of brutality, perversion and contempt for mankind? And can anyone deny that there has been a veritable spate of "artistic" and "scientific" works aimed at inculcating chauvinist nationalism and praising war as a way of life?

Exactly 150 years ago, in 1789—the same year in which the bourgeois French Revolution began—there appeared Parson Malthus' *Essay on Population*, which Frederick Engels fittingly labelled "a hideous blasphemy against nature and man." Today, after 150 years of revolutionization of the productive forces, the propagation of the ultra-reactionary notion that "man is doomed to extinction" because the growth of population is allegedly more rapid than the growth of the means of subsistence has veritably become a large-scale "enterprise" in the "free enterprise" system of U.S. monopoly capitalism. Numerous assemblages of monopoly-maintained scientists and sociologists, and tons of paper, have been devoted to publicizing

this Malthusian theme long ago refuted by Marxism as a pseudo-scientific population "theory."

William Vogt, one of the more frank propagandists of what has been termed "the apology for modern cannibalism"—whose book was given a prefatorial send-off, appropriately enough, by the "elder statesman" and "wizard of Wall Street," Bernard Baruch—blurted out the true meaning of the phrase, "defense of Western values." Bitterly deploring the advances of medical science which serve to lower the death rate, and writing an apologia for Hitler's rapacious war of aggression as being due to "population pressures," Vogt advocates that birth-control and sterility-effecting devices be made a major item of export under the Marshall Plan. His book reeks with ill-concealed chauvinism and hatred for "backward" peoples and for the land of Socialism and gives expression to the most barbarous pseudo-scientific and anti-scientific philosophy.

Casting doubt on the ability of science and the productivity of labor to provide an ever more abundant existence has become a very common phenomenon in the philosophical, sociological and art works produced in the capitalist countries and especially in the United States. The various expressions of these anti-scientific attitudes serve the following major functions: to hide the vast accumulation of productive and private wealth by a relatively tiny group of parasites; to "justify" the

anti-
resea
to in
and
by al
order
out f
favor
ing
most
and l
troop
all, t
parat
war
natur
In
to see
becau
the li
Malth
richly
ian te
ing v
to ren
a sup
and n
nist m
Are
to gro
at a t
put r
Weste
order
of can
univers
as in
combi
tion
Kirche
as the

anti-human uses to which scientific research and developments are put; to intensify the moods of despair and cynicism sedulously promoted by all the agencies of Big Business in order to rule out possibility of a way out for the masses; to create a more favorable climate for the flourishing of chauvinist nationalism, the most varied types of superstitions and hate-creeds and outright storm-trooper manifestations; and, above all, to justify the imperialist preparations for war by characterizing war as an uncontrollable "act of nature."

In the light of the above, it is easy to see why bourgeoisdom is outraged because the Soviet way of life gives the lie to the bankrupt "theory" of Malthusianism (old and new) and richly confirms the scientific Marxian teachings; because it is registering victory after victory in its plans to remake nature in order to provide a super-abundance of material goods and mold a new, cultured, Communist man.

Are we to expect the war inciters to grow happy over the fact that, at a time when they are striving to put the youth of America and Western Europe into uniform in order to prepare another generation of cannon-fodder, there are as many university students in Moscow alone as in all of France and England combined? When monopoly reaction is thrusting the "Kinder, Kirche, Küche" dogma on women as their "place" in life under capital-

ism, what response can we expect from the pen pirates of Wall Street to the news that in the U.S.S.R. 126,000 women are doctors and an additional half million members of local soviets?

Should it surprise anyone that spokesmen and apologists for a "way of life" expressed in Jim Crow, lynching by mob action and "robed justice," the police murder of Negroes, the fanning of anti-Semitism and national hatreds and Red-baiting hysteria—all of which came to a head in Peekskill—should rage against that land where a cultured people regards and punishes racism as an outrageous crime against the dignity of man? Is it surprising that the camp of Soviet-haters fulminates against that workers' state, which, on the basis of proletarian internationalism, has turned into a reality the brotherhood of man in a union of free and equal nations and peoples?

THE ROAD TO PEACE

History lays bare the sharpening contrast between the two systems, but at the same time it affirms the possibility and urgent necessity for them to co-exist in peace.

That peaceful co-existence is possible is amply proven by the wartime cooperation of the Western capitalist countries and the U.S.S.R., despite their fundamentally different ideologies. That the achievement of peaceful co-existence is in the urgent national interest of the American

working class and the whole American people is amply proven by the heavy burdens which the cold war is imposing on the shoulders of labor and the people and by the disaster, to America and to the whole world, which a third world war would mean. That cooperation in peacetime, the achievement of peaceful co-existence, has been and is regarded by the Socialist world as both desirable and necessary is amply attested by the words and deeds of the Soviet government and its representatives. There is the whole record of struggle of the Soviet Union for the full implementation of the Teheran, Yalta and Potsdam agreements, for disarmament and the outlawing of atomic weapons and for the conclusion of a Pact of Peace among the Big Five powers—the incontestable record of unwavering struggle for peace on the part of the land of Socialism. It is fitting to recall Stalin's clear-cut reply (April 1947) to Harold E. Stassen's question as to whether "these two economic systems can exist together in the same modern world in harmony with each other." Re-affirming his well-known and recorded position on the possibility and necessity for peaceful co-existence between the two systems, Stalin stated:

Of course, they can. The differences between them are not of essential importance insofar as co-operation is concerned. The systems in Germany and the United States are the same, yet war broke out between them. The U.S. and U.S.S.R. systems are different,

but we have not waged war against each other and the U.S.S.R. does not propose to. If during the war they could co-operate, why can't they today in peace? . . .

To co-operate one does not need the same systems. One should respect the other system when approved by the people. Only on this basis can we secure co-operation.

What is necessary, then, to maintain the peace, is the reversal of the Wall Street-Washington-Pentagon "get tough with Russia" policy, the reversal of the bipartisan diplomacy of cold war. U.S. imperialism, it is clear, will not undertake voluntarily to cooperate peacefully with the Soviet Union and the People's Democracies, to re-establish trade relations on the basis of equality, or to negotiate all existing differences in a peaceful manner. To achieve a lasting peace, the deep peace yearnings and sentiments of the American working class, the Negro people and all democratic Americans must be given full and organized expression.

The recent National Labor Conference for Peace which convened in Chicago demonstrates the rank-and-file attitude in the camp of labor; it demonstrates that the American working class can be won to take its proper place in the forefront of the peace struggle. And there are numerous signs that the democratic sections of the population, irrespective of the degree to which they already discern the real face of American imperialism as the organizer of a third world

war, are beginning to participate in the fight for peace. This is to be seen in the broad sponsorship and strong public statements of the Committee on Peaceful Alternatives to the North Atlantic Pact formed this past spring; in the firm pro-peace stand adopted by many Negro fraternal and religious bodies, reflecting the growing awareness of the Negro masses as to the close tie-up between the struggle against Jim Crow, lynch terror and the systematic firing of Negro workers from industry on the one hand, and the war-and-fascism offensive of Wall Street on the other; in the growing peace sentiments voiced by many religious denominations and church conferences, reflecting the rising aversion to the stark immorality and anti-humanity of the bipartisan foreign policy; in the rise of local peace organizations in various communities and states dedicated to struggle against specific aspects of the imperialist war drive. It is to be seen in the warm reception being accorded the outspoken anti-imperialist and anti-war candidates in the election campaign struggles this fall, as evidenced especially in the mass enthusiasm for Marcantonio, notwithstanding the barrage of vilification directed against him, and in the popular response of devotion and affection for Ben Davis, in the face of reaction's dastardly frame-up and gang-up against him and his fellow-leaders of the Communist Party.

What is required is the rapid building of a great coalition for peace and

democracy, firmly based in the working class, and oriented against the monopolists and their lackeys in the labor movement and the people's organizations. What is required is the mass education, mobilization and action of the people to preserve the Bill of Rights, defend the living standards of the masses and achieve a genuine policy of peace and friendship with the Soviet Union sealed in a Pact of Peace.

It is here that the Communists especially have the task of bringing clear understanding among the people that the fight on these issues cannot be waged as though these were separate and unrelated issues. What must be shown, specifically and concretely, is that the very nature and scope of reaction's assault today against labor's gains and rights, against the civil rights of the masses, against the Negro people and against the Communist Party is an integral part of the war-and-fascization drive of Wall Street, and that the fight, therefore, must be an *integrated* fight on all these issues. By intimately linking up the domestic and foreign-political aspects of the aspirations and struggles of the masses and thereby deepening the content of the democratic strivings and struggles of the people, our Party will contribute greatly toward cementing, from below—in the trade unions, in all mass organizations, in the shops and communities—a genuine United Front of struggle for peace, democracy and social progress.

The National Labor Conference For Peace

by Carl Ross

THE NATIONAL LABOR Conference for Peace ushered in a new phase of the people's fight for peace. Up to this point the growing peace forces in the United States represented largely movements or activities of those engaged in the arts, sciences and professions, of farmers' anti-war sentiments expressed by the Farmers Union, of women's and youth movements on the American scene, and through delegations to international conferences of certain Negro spokesmen and organizations, and of various church groups and leaders, etc. Lacking was an organized expression of the growing peace sentiment in the ranks of the working class and an expression of labor's leading role within the broader people's movement for peace. This does not take away from the fact that a number of unions, particularly those under Left-leadership, have at conventions and in special resolutions taken a firm position against the war-makers. Undoubtedly, this weakness of American labor has also been viewed as a major weak point of the emerging world peace front, especially in view of the energetic support rendered to Wall Street's aggressive war policies

by the top officialdom of American trade unions.

WHAT THE CONFERENCE SIGNIFIED

The anti-war conference of the rank and file of American labor, held in Chicago on October 1 and 2, without any pretensions of speaking for all or even a majority of the labor movement, brought forward a clear-cut minimum program of anti-war struggle and established a voice and medium for undertaking the historic task of uniting the American working class in the struggle for peace.

Establishment of this program and movement is a reflection of new developments and of new opportunities to organize and unite wider sections of the working class in resistance to the war drive of U.S. imperialism.

Among these new developments the announcement by President Truman of an "atomic explosion" in the Soviet Union had the most immediate impact upon the Conference, which took place hardly a week later. Though the full significance of this acknowledgement

of the non-existence of a U.S. atomic bomb monopoly could not register in the preparatory activity, the Conference noted that this further emphasized the bankruptcy of the cold war policy, whose success was based on the fiction of an atomic bomb monopoly. It reacted by urging Truman to undertake immediate direct conversations with Stalin to end the cold war and to re-establish U.S.-Soviet cooperation. Further, the Conference, in a message to the heads of the C.I.O. and A. F. of L., noting that "millions of Americans of all walks of life and varying political beliefs have begun seriously to re-examine their attitude toward the cold war," urged abandonment of support to the cold war on the part of these labor bodies "and that they re-evaluate their present position."

This reflected, not illusions in Murray or Green, but rather the dramatic recognition of a new situation and a new possibility of labor unity for peace. A special message to be conveyed by a labor delegation to the U.S. representatives to the U.N. Assembly and to the representatives of all five permanent members of the Security Council also urged outlawing of atomic weapons, prohibition of their manufacture, destruction of existing stock-piles and institution of effective control measures through the U.N. Henry Wallace's speech, largely devoted to the atom bomb, developed a similar

policy and was warmly received by the Conference.

All in all, the delegates to the Conference grasped the fact that the new situation facilitated the exposure of the warmakers and the winning of a deeper response among the workers, who are undoubtedly increasingly alarmed at the prospect of the "cold war" unfolding into World War III.

The other major factor making for the success of the Conference and presenting greater possibilities for building a labor peace movement is the growing burden imposed upon the workers, and especially upon the Negro people, by the reactionary domestic policies accompanying the war drive. Outstanding at the Chicago meeting was the attendance and participation of rank-and-file delegates in the separate panel discussions on economic effects of the cold war, labor and civil rights, the struggle for the rights of the Negro people and youth-veteran problems.

Here was spelled out in detail the enormous price the workers are paying for the war program in lowered living standards, growing unemployment, high taxes for armaments, speed-up, anti-labor attacks by the employers, rising terror against the Negro people and attacks upon civil rights generally. The common concern of masses of workers with their worsening economic position, and the militant resistance of the Negro

people to the attack upon their rights, became the main bridge for uniting in this Conference representatives of the more advanced and conscious anti-war forces with representatives of those wider masses who are moving in struggles around these domestic aspects of the war drive without having formulated a position on issues of foreign policy.

This reflected also the growing disillusionment in the performance of President Truman and the 81st Congress as contrasted with their glowing election promises. It showed that the efforts of the top labor leadership to plump for the Marshall Plan have not succeeded in concealing from the workers the fact that it has not benefited American labor, has failed to restore economic stability to Western Europe and represents a danger of war rather than a plan for peace.

The success and the possibilities of developing this labor peace movement are, therefore, grounded in the fact that its program demonstrates the necessity of fighting for peace in order to defend the most elementary economic interests of the workers and the fight for the existence of the trade unions.

It is of prime importance that all Left-progressive trade unionists understand thoroughly the united-front character of this Conference in order to be able to make their best contribution toward its development.

THE PROGRAM AND POLICY OF THE CONFERENCE

The policy and program of action adopted is a *minimum program for labor's fight for peace*. Its central features are: a call for immediate discussions among the major powers, especially the U.S. and the Soviet Union, aimed at ending the cold war and for the peaceful settlement of differences, as the basis for cooperation among the permanent members of the U.N. Security Council to maintain peace; outlawing atomic weapons, prohibiting their manufacture, destroying existing stock-piles and instituting necessary controls through the U.N.; international agreement on universal disarmament to lift the huge armaments burdens from the peoples; defense of democratic liberties, the rights of the Negro people, labor rights—and the right to speak and organize for peace; for a policy of economic aid to nations through the U.N. without infringing national sovereignty; and, provide jobs for millions of American workers by lifting the cold war trade embargoes and promoting trade with the Soviet Union, other countries of Eastern Europe and China.

It predicated these specific points upon the fight for restoration of the Roosevelt conception of the possibility of peaceful cooperation between the United States and the Soviet Union, despite their different social

system
the
war
the
atta
righ
final
this
pons
keys
asso
peop
Su
best
ers
evol
wher
its
unic
Left
be a
for
stan
their
and
anal
resp
upon
supp
port
disc
vary
TH
C
C
O
bor
poli
sent

systems. It rejected the Atlantic Pact, the arms aid program, the drive toward an atomic armaments race by the U.S., and resolved to resist every attack upon the living standards and rights of the American people. And, finally, the Statement of Policy of this Conference underscored the responsibility and role of labor as the keystone of the fight for peace and associated this movement with all people's movements for peace.

Such a program represents the best interests of the American workers and people. It will certainly evoke a widespread response everywhere in the labor movement among its rank and file and local trade-union organizations. Certainly, the Left-progressive trade unionists will be among the most vigorous fighters for such a program, while understanding that it does not incorporate their own full program on all issues and does not base itself upon their analysis of the world situation in all respects. *In fact, the very agreement upon this minimum program presupposes that even among its supporters there is wide latitude for discussion, debate and expression of varying views upon various issues.*

THE REPRESENTATIVE CHARACTER OF THE CONFERENCE

Obviously, those forces in the labor movement subscribing to these policies in Chicago do not yet represent their full potential. But it

would be equally wrong to say that here was nothing new, or to say, as some of the poison pen scribblers in the newspapers say, that this was a gathering of Communist trade unionists and their immediate supporters. What did this Conference represent in this respect?

The 1250 representatives came from 26 states and most major industrial centers; they came from a total of 55 International unions, 24 C.I.O., 18 A. F. of L., and the balance Independent and Railroad Brotherhoods. Among the delegates were several hundred local union officers, several hundred stewards or committeemen and 21 international officers. Some 130 delegates (excluding observers and visitors) came from A. F. of L. and independent unions.

It was the broadest gathering to date of all the peace forces in the ranks of the labor movement. Among those present were the representatives of the progressive International unions of the C.I.O., some of which have adopted relatively sound foreign policy positions in the past. But these delegations reached far into their ranks among workers not hitherto involved in the fight for peace. The most militant elements of the unions led by the Murray and Reuther forces were represented, outstanding being the auto industry. A wider section of the A.F. of L. and independent union rank and file was assembled here than

has existed on a national scale for many long years.

That this representation went beyond the Left-progressive forces is clear, although this did not express itself in sharp debate and many of the delegates representing more conservative elements may have listened and watched without voicing their own sentiments. Undoubtedly many delegates came with reservations and, in the main, were won to the Conference program.

Of outstanding significance was the new high point in participation of Negro workers, men and women, in any national trade-union gathering, and a high point in the forging of Negro and white unity. A prime source of strength was the participation of outstanding Negro trade unionists as chairmen, discussion leaders and speakers from the platform and floor. The enthusiasm with which Paul Robeson was welcomed undoubtedly reflected this spirit of fighting unity among the delegates, of whom some 30 percent were Negro workers. The general militancy pervading the Conference was in no small part due to this conscious unity being developed in the fight for peace and for Negro rights. It is clear that any perspective for development of this movement must recognize that the strongest immediate reserve of strength in labor's fight for peace is in the ranks of the Negro workers. It is imperative that a strong link be forged

between the fight for a peace policy and a consistent struggle for Negro rights in the ranks of labor.

This conference truly represented the American workers and their interests. It is itself an interesting commentary upon the policy pursued by the top councils of the C.I.O. and upon the policy adopted by the A. F. of L. Convention, which voiced policies the State Department itself is reluctant to express publicly, that a Minneapolis paper quotes "an A. F. of L. spokesman" as saying it "should not be construed as calling for a declaration of war against Russia but there was no question of its endorsement of preparation for war."

It was this kind of policy that the National Labor Conference for Peace rejected when it denounced in its Statement of Principles, and again in a Message to World Labor, "those leaders of American trade unions who support the cold war and do not speak for the working people." The line of these misleaders was further exposed by the appeal of this Conference to the C.I.O. and A. F. of L. to reconsider their dangerous policies of support to the cold war, in order to seek out "peaceful alternatives" to cold war.

ON IMPLEMENTING THE ACHIEVEMENTS OF THE CONFERENCE

The Conference will be a powerful instrument for conducting the

fight for unity of the American workers for peace, despite the current pro-war line of the dominant labor leadership. It speaks with the voice of thousands of rank-and-file workers, local officers and stewards, who are part of the flesh and bone of American trade unions.

It is more clear every day that it is not the peace forces but the advocates of war policy who are responsible for splitting the ranks of the labor movement. In the C.I.O. it is the Murrays and Reuthers who demand subordination of labor's interests and acceptance of Wall Street's war policy upon pain of suffering gag rules or expulsions. On the other hand, it is from among the best fighters for peace in the C.I.O. that there comes the clearest demand for trade-union unity, despite differences upon political and foreign policy issues.

Those who undertake the fight for peace in the ranks of labor should understand several things. They need to speak unhesitatingly for, and represent the interests of, the rank and file of labor and mobilize them for peace action, despite all obstacles. While being uncompromising in opposing every act of those labor leaders who support the war policies, they need to demonstrate their willingness and ability to unite with any who will agree on even a minimum program of joint activity. They should remember that events and experiences have an im-

pact upon the masses of workers and will produce new recruits for the fight for peace even from among those who yesterday or today may follow the harmful policy of the Murrays and Greens. Only such an approach will successfully advance the forging of a broad united-front movement of workers against war and fascism.

The movement of labor for peace will face its main problems in extending its influence and activity in the shops and industrial communities. The program of organization of the now permanent National Labor Conference for Peace consisting of a national committee of some 150 trade-union leaders, local city, state or area committees of the national movement does not pretend to be any blue-print that spells out how its supporters can build the movement. Undoubtedly many new forms of activity and organization will grow out of the initial local committees of individual trade-union leaders which already exist in a number of cities and which now set out to bring their program into the shops and unions. No doubt in many instances where local unions or shops failed to send delegates to the National Conference they will rally behind the specific project for 1,000,000 rank-and-file signatures and hundreds of official local union endorsements to a four-point program addressed to President Truman and Congress. Most urgent will be the

question of whether this new movement is able to enlist the active support of thousands of shop workers to represent it in each shop and mobilize on its behalf in the shops.

A broad general program yet remains to be translated into specific activities and into more concrete programs for given shops and industries. For example, it is obvious that on the Pacific Coast a movement for China trade can unite wide sections of labor; farm implement workers will see the necessity of the demand for trade with the nations of Eastern Europe who want to buy agricultural equipment; and A. F. of L. building trade workers will rally around proposals to divert billions from the war budget into housing construction, public works and other means of solving their problem of growing unemployment. This will be a test of the initiative and imagination of the local labor peace movements.

Forging bonds of cooperation with non-labor groups, national and local, with the Negro people, farmers, churches, committees for "peaceful alternatives" and other people's peace groups will become realistic only with a stronger base among the workers. But labor cannot exert its leading role in the fight for peace without bolder cooperation with, and participation in, these various movements. Undoubtedly, experience will show the greatest immediate progress is possible in cementing

cooperation in the fight for peace and Negro rights with the Negro people's organizations, especially as many of their working-class leaders are also enrolled in the labor peace movement. Approaches to some farm organizations also will bear fruit. To win acceptance from the predominantly middle-class church peace groups, etc., labor's newly born peace movement must yet demonstrate its effectiveness and help overcome much of the hesitations in these movement with respect to undertaking the new experience of working with, and accepting leadership from, the labor movement.

INTERNATIONAL LABOR COOPERATION FOR PEACE

Finally, the National Labor Conference for Peace marks a turning point in the fight for unity of American labor with the world trade-union movement. As against the efforts of the chiefs of the C.I.O. and A. F. of L. to knife world labor unity and to engage in shameful disruption of the trade unions of other lands through their agents, this Conference boldly stated its aim of fraternal cooperation with the trade unions of all countries for peace and the advancement of the economic interests of the workers everywhere. It did not and could not act directly to overcome the dangerous split in the ranks of the working class of the world created by the

with
W.F.
tiona
will
the p
of la
Th
Conf
of m
the
the L
Labor
Fede
are a

withdrawal of the C.I.O. from the W.F.T.U. But its policies of international cooperation of labor for peace will undoubtedly be of great aid to the progressive cause of world unity of labor.

The messages received by this Conference from the trade unions of many countries including Poland, the U.S.S.R., Italy, France, China, the Latin-American Confederation of Labor (C.T.A.L.) and the World Federation of Trade Unions, etc., are an encouragement to the peace-

striving workers of the U.S. that their first determined steps toward resisting the drive to war and fascism are eagerly welcomed by the workers of all countries. The real test will be in giving life to the Message to World Labor adopted by the Conference that "Just as you are shouldering the responsibility in the fight for peace in your countries, we will strive to fulfill the responsibility that falls upon American workers in the battle for peace."

Browder's "Coalition"—With Monopoly Capital

by Gilbert Green

[*This is the continuation of the article by Comrade Green published in the October issue of Political Affairs. This second part, written, as was the first section, during Comrade Green's imprisonment, is necessarily incomplete because it was not possible for Political Affairs to obtain the balance of this installment after the conviction of the eleven leaders of the Communist Party. The article will be continued in an early issue of this publication.—Editor.*]

IN THE October issue of *Political Affairs*, we showed how palpably false it is to believe, as does Earl Browder, that it is possible for U.S. imperialism to play anything but a reactionary role in the world of today. We also showed that any attempt to resurrect or reconstruct the class relations of the war period is like trying to restore the snows of yesterday—that the only way to continue Roosevelt's policies of U.S.-U.S.S.R. collaboration is by constructing a new coalition, based upon a new relationship of class forces, to meet the entirely new postwar world and national scenes.

But Browder is altogether incapable of visualizing a coalition that is not based on an alliance with monopoly capital. According to his reasoning, to reject such an alliance, is only to acknowledge the inevitability of a third world war. For without the working class being wedded to Wall Street, *i.e.*, its "intelligent" section, Browder sees no hope whatsoever for a lasting peace—only dismal disaster.

THE ESSENCE OF BROWDER'S "COALITION" POLICY

His argument on this score is relatively simple: To deny that there is a progressive potential inherent in American imperialism, is to declare "that there is no practical, effective obstacle to the march of American imperialism towards world conquest except 'the final conflict,' the proletarian socialist revolution in America" (*Where Do We Go From Here*, page 11). And Browder insists that this is precisely the position of our Party, which "has been given an immediate perspective of concentration camps, storm troopers march-

ing in the streets, a full-fledged American version of Hitlerism, against which it must fling words of defiance, but which can be defeated only when the American working class rises up to establish socialism" (*Ibid.*, p. 11). And whereas there is no immediate prospect of such a social revolution, the Communists, concludes Browder, have given up all hope of preventing fascism and a third world war.

Thus, Browder accuses the Party of defeatism and fatalism. He says that we have no real coalition policy and in effect are committed to a course of action which makes socialism the immediate issue, whether we admit this or not.

In order to "prove" his contentions about the potential progressivism of U.S. monopoly capital and the "dogmatism" and lack of coalition policy of the Communist Party, Browder takes us on an excursion around the globe. And the purpose of this sight-seeing voyage is to convince us that what the Communists in this country characterize and attack as Browder revisionism, is recognized and hailed as creative Marxism in the rest of the world (1). And if U.S. Communists cannot understand this, it is only because they fail to grasp that the difference in the character of World War II, as compared with that of World War I, has resulted in a completely different world Communist "strategy and tactics." In fact, he says, this is so

"fundamentally" different, "as to require a general re-examination and reevaluation of all problems of strategy and tactics" (*World Communism and U.S. Foreign Policy*, p. 2).

After setting for himself this rather ambitious task, Browder proceeds to give us a glimpse of what he is referring to. He is not referring to the deepened general crisis of world capitalism; to the process of rot and decay of which fascism and war are the most acute expressions; and to the need therefore of democratic unity on the broadest basis to check the forces of war and fascism. Nor is he referring to the fact that the struggle for the national independence of nations is no longer limited to the colonial and semi-colonial lands, but today even includes developed capitalist countries such as France. Had he dealt with these matters in a Marxist fashion, he would have found much that is new in the tactical approach of the Communists throughout the world, not only as a result of World War II, but even prior to it.

Such an examination would have led him to the only Marxist conclusion possible today, that after World War II, the main threat to the independence and freedom of nations, to the peace and democracy of the world, emanates from Wall Street, and that the main objective of the tactical line of all world Communist and democratic forces must be

to combat and defeat the aggressive expansionist designs and drive of U.S. imperialism.

But Browder draws other and far different conclusions. He contends that the big difference in world Communist strategy and tactics today, as compared with the period following World War I, is precisely its coalition policy, and that on this basic question the Communists of the United States are out of step with the Communists of other lands. "Of such far-reaching importance has the coalition form become," Browder tells us, "that it is perhaps no exaggeration to say that the maturity and adequacy of Marxist leadership may be measured, from country to country, by the degree of success it displays in extending and stabilizing the democratic national coalition" (*Ibid.*, p. 27).

What Browder means by "extending and stabilizing the democratic national coalition," we shall examine later. At this point suffice it to say that when Browder stresses the importance of coalition tactics and hurls his paper-maché lance at the imaginary opponents of coalition policies (the Communists), he is only tilting at windmills. But in so doing, he begs the real question, which is not coalition in the abstract, but what kind of coalition and in whose interests. For there are coalitions and coalitions, and the issue is not whether one is for or against some general abstract con-

cept of coalition, but the *concrete* coalition policy proposed for the given concrete objective situation.

ON THE CHARACTER OF WORLD WAR II

To provide theoretical justification for his policy of coalescing with finance-capital, Browder gives us his analysis of the specific character of World War II. He accuses the Party leadership of a failure to comprehend and hence draw the necessary tactical conclusions from the fact that while "World War I was an *imperialist war*" on both sides, that "World War II, on the contrary, was a war of *imperialist conquest* on the part of *Germany* and her Axis partners, but a peoples' war of *National Liberation* on the part of the victorious United Nations" (*Ibid.*, p. 2).

With reckless abandon he also charges that the Party leadership "disagrees" with Stalin's characterization that World War II assumed from the very outset "the nature of an anti-imperialist war of liberation."

And what is the purpose of this slander, if not to rewrite history, whether by hook or crook, so as to white-wash the role of the imperialist powers! To Browder, the mere fact that U.S. imperialism was a part of the "victorious United Nations" (what imperialist and class contradictions this neat phrase conceals!), is apparently sufficient to change its

react
form
avar
dove
W
cuse
ing
only
rejec
of S
tries
zatio
own
seek
visio
Briti
form
erati
set"
the f
W
"fros
ture
tion,
of th
of S
peop
tries,
Nazi
dom
as ce
to th
dasta
and
late
a un
Sovi
Br
nam
cour

reactionary character and to transform the imperialist eagle, from an avaricious bird of prey into a cooing dove of peace.

When Browder frivolously accuses the Party leadership of rejecting Stalin's estimate of the war, he only means that we unconditionally reject his own malicious distortions of Stalin's position. For Browder tries to sneak into Stalin's characterization that which is not there—his own apologies for imperialism. He seeks to foist upon us his own revisionist estimate, that American, British and French imperialism performed "just," "anti-fascist" and "liberating" missions "from the very outset" of the war. But this is absurd on the face of it!

When Stalin said that the war "from the very outset assumed the nature of an anti-fascist war of liberation," he was most certainly thinking of the heroic struggles of the peoples of Spain, China and Ethiopia, of the peoples of the various occupied countries, and of the threat which the Nazi Axis represented to all freedom-loving peoples. But he was just as certainly *not* referring to Munich, to the period of "phony" war, to the dastardly attempts of British, French and American imperialism, even as late as 1940, to turn the war into a united imperialist assault upon the Soviet Union.

Browder desires to hide the dynamic changes that occurred in the course of the war itself; changes

which for a period of time made the imperialist elements the dominant ones, but which in time *compelled* the imperialist ruling classes of Britain and the United States to enter into an alliance with the Soviet Union and to fight in the anti-fascist war of national liberation, even though they fought, not for liberating purposes, but to save their own imperialist skins.

ON COALITIONS IN THE POSTWAR STAGE

Having given us his own oversimplified and highly glorified (for imperialism) evaluation of World War II, Browder then proceeds to draw his conclusion: that the central problem of strategy and tactics today is precisely how to maintain the class unity that was created during the war and that expressed itself in the various war-time national coalitions. And it is in this respect that he tells us that the worth and maturity of Communist Parties throughout the world can be measured by the degree of success displayed in "extending and stabilizing" these war-time coalitions. Furthermore he asserts that this is precisely the course being pursued by the world Communist movement, with the single exception of the United States, where, according to Browder, it is the Communists who bear responsibility for the break-up of the war-time coalition which supported Roosevelt.

How gigantic a fraud is this pitting of the policies of the United States Communists against those of the rest of the world, we shall soon see. For we shall examine this matter more closely and concretely.

Let us start with Britain. Is the coalition which existed during the war in effect today? But to ask this question is to answer it. The wartime coalition has ceased to exist because the British ruling class is no longer haunted by the fear that German imperialism will wrest its empire and world position from it. As for British Social-Democracy, it continues to curtsy before its royal British masters, doing their every bidding against the working class at home and the democratic peoples' movement throughout the world. Certainly, no one in his right mind would hold the British Communists responsible for this, or ask them to join with Churchill and Bevin in their plan to make Britain the junior partner in a Wall Street *über alles* world.

What about France? Is the coalition in France the same as during the resistance? Obviously not! Yesterday, the French Communist Party sought to unite with *all* who were opposed to Nazi occupation; today, it seeks to unite all who are opposed to Wall Street's attempt at the imposition of a more subtle form of financial, military and political occupation.

Against the Nazi occupation, not

only a Leon Blum, but even a De Gaulle were allies, although vacillating, unstable and temporary ones. Would even a Browder have the gall to ask for any alliance with a De Gaulle today? For with Nazi imperialism defeated, DeGaulle has united with the French Quislings of occupation days against his new *main* enemy, the working class and people of France and the world democratic movement headed by the U.S.S.R.

When Browder explains recent developments in France and Italy by pointing to the reactionary pressure emanating from the United States, he treats this as if it were some accidental occurrence that but temporarily upset his calculations. But this pressure was not some fortuitous occurrence. It was not the result of the whim of some individuals or group of individuals, whether in this country or in France, but an inevitable consequence of the fundamental change that took place in all world relations as a result of the war.

It is when Browder dwells on the new democracies of Eastern Europe, that he most fully exposes his pro-imperialist concept of coalition tactics. Browder sees no qualitative difference whatsoever between the coalition governments set up in Western Europe at the end of the war, and those set up in Eastern Europe. He sees no difference whatsoever in the *class* character of these governments. In fact, he glibly tells us that "the

unt
Eur
frot
coal
had
mer
An
by
Yal
izec
one
tem
port
soci
key
(Ib
S
favo
prop
ism
we
firs
rial
no
told
Roo
not
we
all
tion
key
Or,
"imp
T
or s
clusi
favo
* 7
of his
imper
of thi

universal type of government for European countries that emerged from the defeat of the Axis was the coalition of all parties and groups that had united in the liberation movement, including the Communists." And that "the perspective announced by the Big Three at Teheran and Yalta of a long-term peace, organized in the United Nations, had as one of its foundation stones this system of coalition governments, supporting programs transitional toward socialism with nationalization of key industries as a central feature" (*Ibid.*, p. 14).

So, Churchill and Roosevelt both favored coalition governments with programs "transitional toward socialism"! How ducky! But why were we led to believe that Roosevelt "was first, last and all the time" an imperialist? And Churchill certainly no less a one? Why also were we told that the difference between Roosevelt, Churchill and Hitler lay not in their class objectives? Are we now to revise this estimate that all three of them made the preservation of the imperialist system "the key to all their detailed policies?"* Or, were Churchill and Roosevelt "imperialist socialists" perchance?

There is no need to spend time or space demolishing this stupid conclusion that Churchill and Roosevelt favored coalition governments that

would be transitional to socialism. Sure, both of them favored coalition governments and helped set them up in Western Europe. But what a world of difference between these and the coalition governments set up in Eastern Europe! In Eastern Europe the coalition governments that were set up were based in the first place on the working class and the common people, and the liberating Red Army enabled the revolutionary, anti-fascist upsurge of the masses to sweep the accumulated filth of imperialist and feudal exploitation and oppression into the rubbish heap of history. In Western Europe, in contrast, the liberating armies of the United States and Great Britain held back the revolutionary sweep of the anti-fascist masses, disarmed the heroic resistance fighters and made sure that the coalition governments that were set up would be first, last and all the time obedient to imperialism. No difference, Mr. Browder? Only the differences between working-class rule and bourgeois rule!

In his attempt to sprout wings on Roosevelt, Browder reminds us that it was F.D.R. who intervened with both Churchill and De Gaulle to obtain Communist representation in the French Resistance Government when it was set up at Algiers. But he conveniently forgets to remind us that the same Roosevelt also recognized Petain and did business with Darlan. Or, when he tells us that

* These quotations from Browder, in the context of his thesis about the "progressive" character of imperialism, were dealt with in the first installment of this article.

Roosevelt "never wavered" in his attitude toward the Soviet Union and always "acted consistently" in the knowledge that "a long term peace" could be secured only "by acceptance of the Soviet Union as an equal," he is again permitting his memory to lapse about the period in 1940 when Roosevelt called for assistance to "brave little Finland," just a year before this same "democratic" Finland publicly proclaimed her alliance with Hitler Germany.

As we had occasion to note in our article last month, Roosevelt's role in history was that of a highly intelligent representative of his class, but to canonize him and to ignore the class policies that he represented, is to participate in a gross distortion and vulgarization of history!

How little Browder understands of the class character of the coalition governments that sprang up in the new democracies can be seen in his stress that these governments unite *all* those opposed to the Hitler occupation, irrespective of class. This was to a certain extent true during the war itself, but even then only to a certain extent; for in Poland, for example, two "resistance" governments came into being, even though one of them resided in London and resisted the liberation forces of the people far more than the Nazis.

But when the war ended, in fact as soon as victory became apparent, a new class relationship developed

in each of these countries. With national independence won, the masses in these countries faced a new problem—either to move forward toward the bright sun of socialism, or be thrust backward into the darkness of feudal and imperialist obscurantism. On this issue, the class relations were not and could not be similar to those in the previous period of struggle against Nazi occupation. Thus, here too, a regrouping took place, and individuals and class groups that were "progressive" in the sense of being opposed to the main enemy represented by the Hitler occupation forces, ceased to be "progressive" in face of the most progressive force of all—the social revolution. That this new struggle, necessitated a new form of coalition strategy and a new class alliance, can today be seen by all.

Nor has the transition been "peaceful," in the sense of capitulation on the part of the capitalist and kulak elements. These have practiced and continue to practice violence and to conspire against the legally established authority of the gigantic majority of the people headed by the working class. This sharpening of the class struggle in the new democracies does not fit into Browder's conception of nebulous, amorphous, all-class coalitions, that move toward socialism even with the blessing of the imperialist powers. Browder even devotes a full chapter of his booklet, *World Communism and*

U.S. Foreign Policy, to opine that the dictatorship of the proletariat is now "obsolete" for all "non-Soviet lands." "In none of the countries of the new democracy," writes Browder, "has the dictatorship of the proletariat been put forward as an immediate goal" (p. 23).

The events of the past year, since this was written, have given the lie to this assertion. These have amply made plain that the Communist leaders of the new democracies understand full well that there is and can be no other transition from capitalist society to Communist society, except by the path of the dictatorship of the proletariat. The form of this dictatorship may differ from country to country, but in basic class content, it must remain essentially the same. Only in Yugoslavia has there been an abandonment of this cardinal principle as part of the Tito renegade betrayal of Socialism.

BROWDER'S CHINESE "LESSONS"

Not content with teaching us the lessons of Europe, Browder also wrote a special pamphlet on the "Chinese Lessons for American Marxists." Browder tells us that the Chinese Communists, too, have pursued a coalition policy from which we can learn. He reminds us that in 1937, the Chinese Communists intervened to save the life of Chiang Kai-shek when he was taken prisoner

in Sian by the rebel General Chang Hsueh-liang, and that history has confirmed the correctness of this policy, for it helped make possible the national front against Japanese imperialism. Browder asks: "Can American Marxists imagine . . . their own present leader, Foster, adopting the wise and far-seeing attitude of the Chinese Communists?" And in agent-provocateur fashion, Browder sneers: "Of course not! . . . Foster's main slogan of action is 'off with their heads,' applied indiscriminately to enemies, potential enemies, [and] long established friends . . ." (pp. 28-29). This brazen lie, mind you, being made on January 17, 1949, the very day of days upon which the trial of William Z. Foster and his comrades began at Foley Square! Truly a gratuitous assist from Browder to McGohey!

As for the lessons of China, we admit that we have much to learn, as from Communist experience in Europe and elsewhere. But not what Browder thinks. Certainly, the Chinese Communists had one position toward Chiang Kai-shek in 1937, when unity, even with scoundrels such as he, had to be sought to save China from Japanese enslavement. But the Chinese Communists did not make a virtue of this necessity, they did not glorify Chiang Kai-shek, they had no illusions as to who he was and what he represented. Nor did they lower their guard or give

up their independent class positions because of this unity.

Thus it was possible for them, once the war against Japan was over, to take with them the great mass of the Chinese people and to isolate Chiang Kai-shek and his imperialist and feudal lords. They were able to forge a *new* people's coalition to meet the new historic stage of struggle for Chinese independence and social progress.

Is this the lesson Browder is speaking of? Hardly! He thinks the following is the big lesson of China:

The basic principles of this [Chinese Communist] tactical system, although developed in a special Chinese form, are adaptable everywhere in situations where the Marxists face an enemy of superior immediate forces, in the political as well as the military struggle.

The central idea of this tactical system is, in the words quoted by Miss Strong [Anna Louise Strong], as follows:

"We shall fight only when conditions are favorable to us. Every such battle must be short and decisive, we must win every battle."

These are the guerrilla tactics Browder wants us to apply to the United States!—for, says he, "this tactical system is adaptable to the current problems of American Marxists. Its application during the past three years could have enabled the American movement to avoid almost every defeat and setback which it has suffered" (pp. 33-34).

Now we have it! The answer to all our problems! We are not to fight unless we can "win every battle," and each such battle "must be short and decisive." Thus, if the Marshall Plan and the bi-partisan foreign policy of Wall Street cannot be won in a short decisive encounter, why fight it at all? Apparently, then, we'll avoid defeat!! If the battle against Jim-Crow can't be won immediately, let's not engage in it either! Truly a remarkable formula—for complete capitulation! All defeats and setbacks can be avoided by the simple expedient of not fighting! It's amazing that this brilliant solution never occurred to us before!

Is this the lesson from China? A thousand times, no! Certainly, it is necessary to know when and how to fight. Certainly, it is necessary, when confronted with a foe of superior strength, to decide on what ground and over what issues to fight. And, certainly, China can teach us much in this respect.

But to elevate this into the great lesson of lessons, is like telling a prize fighter that all he needs to know is how to roll with the punches, and when hit, how to stretch out for the count. No, Mr. Browder, in order to FIGHT and in order to WIN, there are other lessons as well: 1) Never indulge in marijuana illusions that your enemy has suddenly become your friend! 2) Never capitulate to cowardly rationalizations that by deserting the fight

today, you'll live to fight another day!

These too are very important lessons from China. Three years ago when the Chinese Communists were forced either to make an irrevocable break with the Chiang Kai-shek imperialist forces or to face capitulation, they decided on the former, even though it meant giving up their ten-year old capital of Yenan and suffering other temporary "setbacks." But had they bemoaned their fate and whined over the break-up of the old coalition (which was inevitable!), where would they be today?

Flexibility of tactics is of paramount importance, and we undoubtedly have very much to learn in this respect, but it must be the flexibility of a steel-band not a rubber-band. For all the flexibility in the world cannot help where there is not the will to struggle.

AN OLD TRICK

Thus, Browder's political excursion around the globe has not proved his contention that the national coalitions forged in wartime have been kept intact everywhere but in the United States. The evidence has

proved the very opposite—that everywhere the wartime coalitions had to give way to new coalitions, basing themselves on a realistic appraisal of the *new* class relations internally, and the new main threat to the peace and democracy of the world emanating from Wall Street.

All that Browder has accomplished, by trying to don the mantle of spokesman for world Communist policy, is to remind us of the prophetic words of Lenin, used against a Russian bourgeois apologist of his day, by the name of Struve. Lenin wrote, "the liberal bourgeoisie *always and everywhere* uses the strategy of persuading its adherents in a given country to believe that the Social-Democrats [read: Communists] of that country are the most unreasonable, whereas their comrades in the neighboring country are 'good boys,' . . . but," exclaimed Lenin, "this is an old trick, Mr. Struve! You will only catch children and ignoramuses with that bait" (*Two Tactics of Social-Democracy*, p. 54). Yes, Mr. Browder, by this time it is indeed an old trick! Today the bait can catch nobody!

[To be continued.]

The Truman Plan For Development of Backward Areas

by Blas Roca*

ON TAKING OVER his new Presidential term last January 20, and on reading his regular message to the Congress of the U.S., President Truman, in the midst of his coarse and shameless slanders about Communism and the Soviet Union, presented what he himself characterized with manifest immodesty as a "bold" plan to help develop the backward areas of the world.

Such a plan was the fourth point that the Yankee President recommended to the Congress as the basic elements of United States politics to "combat Communism." It is worth the trouble to enumerate the other three:

1. An attack on the principle of unanimity in the decisions of the Security Council of the United Nations and a step toward the acceptance of new countries subordinate to the U.S., which will add to its control of the General Assembly, to the end of making this organ an instrument of political aggression and of North American world domination.

2. The continuation of the Marshall Plan and of efforts to eliminate the "obstacles" to international

commerce, that is, to eliminate the obstacles for North American domination of world commerce.

3. Approval of the North Atlantic Pact and the granting of credits to arm the countries which form it.

The fourth point, the "bold" plan for the development of backward areas, must be seen as closely united to these three as part of one and the same politics: the imperialist politics of world domination and of preparation for war to establish it.

Both Truman in his message and the minor agents and lackeys of imperialism everywhere present the question in their propaganda as though the U.S., under the rule of the great monopoly capitalists, proposed to take on the task of developing backward countries—whose backwardness is precisely due to imperialist politics—in order to raise the standard of living of their peoples.

To create this effect, Truman painted the economic situation of "backward countries" in colors sufficiently real. "More than half the peoples of the world," he said, "live in conditions neighboring on misery. Their diet is insufficient; they are victims of disease; their economic life is primitive and immobile; their

* Comrade Blas Roca is the General Secretary of the Popular Socialist Party of Cuba.

poverty is an obstacle and a threat as much to themselves as to more prosperous areas." He thus fixed the pretended objectives of the plan, carefully hiding all reference to the true intentions of exploitation and imperialist monopolization:

... We must embark on a bold new program for making the benefits of our scientific advances and industrial progress available for the improvement and growth of under-developed areas.

These words are given the lie by the every-day practices in our countries which suffer the brutal imposition, the rapacious exploitation, of United Fruit, Standard Oil, the Chase Bank, Bond and Share; of the North American monopolists and rulers. But, notwithstanding all this, they were received as sincere and genuine by the leading mouthpieces of the native dominant classes and were used to demonstrate the munificence of the U.S. and the altruism of its rulers.

Two weeks after Truman's message to Congress, the fourth point began to be concretized. According to a cable of the United Press, dated Washington, February 2, the functionaries charged with detailing the plan—who, significantly, had worked under the well-known imperialist magnate, William Clayton, on the editorial staff of *Letter Of the International Trade Organization*—declared that "the much discussed

ideal of a steel factory in each country is not quite convenient." They suggested that "it would be better in many cases if the nations develop their agriculture with modern technicians and equipment, rather than try to reorganize their economies with the goal of industrialization."

"The majority of these men"—ended the cable—"support the reduction of the customs tariffs"; that is, they support the policy of eliminating all obstacles to the unbridled invasion of all the countries with the products of the powerful North American industry.

Its very propounders started to demonstrate the fundamentals of the plan, to show with what it was definitely concerned: no industrialization, without which there is no possible economic progress; at most, development of agricultural production in those materials which suit the U.S., and tariff reduction for its manufactured goods.

This raised, apparently, murmurs of discontent among the Latin-American representatives in Washington, for in a cable of the International News Service, of the fourth of February, we can note the following significant paragraph:

The comments made in some Latin-American circles over the lack of co-ordination between the program expressed by Truman and the actual reality are frankly judged as irresponsible, ignorant or simply malicious.

In June, Mr. Truman advanced his explanation of his "bold" plan, directing himself again to Congress with declarations in which he said:

"The grinding poverty and the lack of economic opportunity for many millions of people in the economically under-developed parts of Africa, the Near and Far East, and certain regions of Central and South America, constitute one of the greatest challenges of the world today. . . . If they [the peoples of these zones] are frustrated and disappointed, they may turn to false doctrines"—or, rather, they can turn to Communism, as already has occurred in no small regions. With these words, Truman solicited of Congress 45 million dollars credit to put his "bold" plan into execution.

That is the whole of the "Plan To Develop the Backward Areas." Many words on the misery of those people, on the necessity of helping them, and, finally, a credit for 45 million dollars and a few declarations to develop the "guarantees" and the facilities for the private investments of the financial trusts of the U.S.

It is worth pointing out that, in the words of Truman which we have quoted above, he speaks of Africa, singling out Asia Minor specifically, and of only *certain* regions of Central and South America; that is, the plan points to areas not yet under the monopolistic control of the United States. In Latin

America, only "certain" regions of Central and South America are backward and require "help."

Examining solely the very words of Mr. Truman we can arrive, as resumé, at the conclusion that the so-called plan for the development of backward areas is:

First, a part of aggressive politics, warlike and for world domination, which the United States has been developing; something like a colonial complement of the Marshall Plan.

Second, a demagogic curtain for covering with pretended philanthropic and progressive theories the efforts of the Yankee imperialists to monopolize commerce and the sources of raw materials of the colonial, dependent and semi-dependent countries of Africa and Asia, dislodging their competitors, principally the British.

Third, a mockery of the hopes of financial and technical aid from the United States which certain circles of the ruling classes of Latin America have held and still hold.

Fourth, a means of accentuating the colonial exploitation in Latin-American countries, forcing them to abandon their attempts to develop their incipient industries in order to dedicate themselves to the production of raw materials and agricultural products which the United States needs.

This, which flows directly from the very words of Truman, is confirmed

by t
coun
Ne
peria
devel
ing
and
unio
a "h
nomi
coun
Th
Tru
posit
point
decla
Presi
Th
have
react
eye
A. I
creat
Ame
a m
towa
—an
direc
Th
as a
tive,
thou
the f
men
trodi
In
plan
tion
a sta
to j

by the facts, by the reality of our countries, as we will show later on.

Now, while the well-known imperialist clamor around the "Plan to develop the backward areas" was being developed, the C.I.O. presented and circulated among the trade-union organizations of our countries a "hemispheric plan for the economic and social development of the countries of Latin America."

The program does not mention the Truman plan either negatively or positively, but it is evident that its point of departure is the reiterated declarations of the North American President.

The leaders of the C.I.O., who have leaned more and more toward reactionary politics, who see eye-to-eye on essential problems with the A. F. of L., apparently intend to create in the ranks of the Latin-American trade-union movement—a majority of which orients itself toward the Left and anti-imperialism—an air of approbation, however indirect, of the "bold" plan.

The C.I.O.'s program is presented as an independent workers' initiative, without official connections, although we know that it was given to the functionaries of the State Department for approval and that they introduced some modifications.

In the document explaining its plan, the C.I.O. says that the situation in Latin America has reached a stage of crisis, and adds, in order to justify the program it presents:

"Their backward and rudimentary economy has suffered a great dislocation during the period of the war and postwar, and a disintegration has set in which they will be incapable of restoring if left alone, depending only on its own resources."

Further on it emphasizes:

The purpose of this plan, as the C.I.O. suggests, is to liberate Latin America from its colonial and semi-colonial chains, to put her on her economic feet, and in this way to place her in a situation for taking her place among the nations of the world in equality, and for cooperating with them in a constructive way for the benefit of a better life and a better world.

These generalities are not bad. In them the tone employed by Truman in his declarations is accentuated and the watch-word of the trade-union movement in Latin America is concretely formulated: to break the colonial and semi-colonial chains which imprison our countries.

Before formulating the concrete propositions of the plan, the C.I.O. document insists on describing the difficulties that arise for it in Latin America. It is worth reproducing that part of the document for our readers' benefit. It says:

Before making proposals for alleviating them it is necessary to enumerate briefly the principal difficulties and obstacles on the road of permanent progress in Latin America and of its eco-

conomic stabilization. . . . Concretely these difficulties are the following:

Permanent Problems

a. Political: Intervention and coercion by foreign interests and governments. Dictatorships and militarism.

b. Financial: Lack of national reserves and foreign exchange. Unstable currency. Inadequate credit and political and financial organization.

c. Resources: Lack of conservation and utilization of existing resources and potentialities. Waste of the soil and other resources by primitive and inadequate exploitation.

d. Type of colonial and semi-colonial production: Single crop and lack of economic diversity. Production of food and raw material fundamentally for export. Foreign domination of industry and of the majority of the soil and sub-soil. Fundamental dependence on extractive industries for the outside world and lack of heavy industry and manufacture for domestic consumption. Relative smallness of the industrial section of production and low productivity. Lack of qualified skilled workers. Bad distribution of the land. Faulty system of credit. Lack of funds for investments. Exportation of profits because of foreign property. Lack of transportation.

Commerce

Local market undeveloped owing to the lack of population and to the small buying power.

Social

Bad health conditions owing to the lack of sanitation and medical services.

Social legislation inefficient or inadequate. Servitude and forced labor.

Illiteracy; lack of education.

Labor

Lack of organization. Restrictions, oppression and persecution of organized workers. Domination of the workers' movement by the governments and by political tendencies which interfere with their union work.

To these difficulties should be added the following, which have originated in the postwar period:

a. Dislocation of production as a consequence of the war;

b. Inflationary pressure;

c. Lack of foreign exchange especially dollars; lack of foreign investments due also to the cessation in the flow of capital from Europe;

d. Difficulties in obtaining capital goods and new equipment due to the priorities for Europe and to our high prices;

e. Growing unrest and the increase of the threat of military dictatorships.

The description, despite the space given to problems of a secondary and derivative nature and despite its vagueness, gives a picture which points up many of the principal factors which keep Latin America backward and which are actually leading it to a catastrophic economic crisis.

It is useful to call attention to the formulation which the document makes about the Latin-American trade-union movement being dominated by "political tendencies" which interfere with their union work. Given the anti-Communist and divisive activity adopted lately by the top leaders of the C.I.O., it is evi-

dent t
in sla
nists
tions,
the im
ican g
predom
fluence
ments

The
the pr
one-ha
a perio

It s
"devel
terpris
tated
created
should
of a
velopm
council
the w
groups

It s
private
der rea
tive p

Afte
points
genera
and "p
parties
the C
points

1. T
effort
Ameri
2. T
Ameri

dent that such a formulation alludes in slanderous form to the Communists, who, despite all the persecutions, arbitrariness and crimes of the imperialists and the Latin-American governments, continue to be the predominating force, in regard to influence, in the trade-union movements of our countries.

The C.I.O. calculates the cost of the program it proposes at three and one-half to five billion dollars over a period of 20 to 30 years.

It suggests that financial help to "develop the essential economic enterprises of modern states" be facilitated by government agencies, created for that purpose, which should be concentrated in the hands of a "bank of Inter-American development," whose administrative council would have representation of the workers and other "democratic groups."

It suggests, in like manner, that private investments be realized under reasonable terms and for productive purposes.

After formulating a series of points that more or less figure, as general declarations, in the "plans" and "programs" of the government parties in a number of our countries, the C.I.O. indicates three concrete points for commerce:

1. That the U.S. make a major effort to increase imports from Latin America.

2. That they must give Latin America a substantial part of the

exports of Europe under the Marshall Plan.

3. That the U.S. supply capital goods and equipment necessary for economic, and particularly industrial, development.

Also, it indicates that it recognizes the need for tariff protection for the growing secondary industries of Latin America, although this does not signify the abandonment of the "general policy of the C.I.O. in favor of free commerce."

Examining this program of the C.I.O. in detail, we find that:

1. It is a utopian program on the whole. It is utopian to think that the North-American imperialists and the Truman government are going to undertake a program for the industrial development of Latin America under the conditions outlined by the C.I.O. In the form that it is presented, it tends to create illusions that would tend to separate the peoples and the workers from their practical struggle for national liberation.

2. The C.I.O. is circulating this program among the trade-union organizations of Latin America, ignoring completely the existence of the C.T.A.L. which is in the position, because of its many years of experience and its relations on the whole continent, to give an authoritative and guiding opinion on the matter. The action of the C.I.O. has all the characteristics of a maneuver against the C.T.A.L., coinciding with the efforts of the North-Ameri-

can imperialists and their agents to destroy it.

3. The program could be presented in two forms:

(a) In opposition to the imperialist content of the Truman Plan for the development of backward areas, denouncing it. In this case the program would be presented, freeing it of some utopianisms, as what is to be done to help really develop our countries.

(b) As the literature of the C.I.O. suggests, as an unfolding of the Truman Plan, as propositions for modifying or "improving" it which can in part be accepted and in part rejected by the Yankee rulers.

In the first form, as opposition and denunciation of Truman's word-play, it could play a positive role. In the second, it is negative and contrary to the interests of the people since it only helps make acceptable a plan to accentuate the imperialist monopoly over our countries.

4. The C.I.O. raises the problem of Latin America falsely, trying to plant the idea that it can save and transform its colonial and semi-colonial economy only if it has the financial help of the United States.

Such an idea is completely contrary to reality.

The peoples of Latin America can reconstruct and develop the economies of their countries even without foreign financial aid, if they take their destiny in their own hands, if they defeat the lackey govern-

ments of imperialism, if they institute governments of national liberation which would concentrate all national resources in the struggle against imperialist oppression and exploitation and for economic progress.

From all that has been said about it, one can conclude that the C.I.O. program "for the economic and social development of the countries of Latin America" is an attempt to sow illusions among the laboring masses of Latin America about Truman and his "plan to develop the backward areas," an attempt to confuse and mislead the working-class forces, which fight against imperialism and for national liberation.

Consequently, the trade unions of Latin America did not approve this program in its present form. Latin-American workers feel the necessity for tightening and strengthening the bonds of friendship, of solidarity and cooperation, with their brother North-American workers, but this is possible only in a just and durable form, on the basis of struggle against the common enemy: Yankee imperialism. The Latin-American workers would salute and would be deeply grateful for a program of the C.I.O. or any other organization of North-American workers which would have for its objective real help to overcome the terrible economic, social and political conditions in which they are held. But they cannot help but criticize what brings them illusions and confusions, what

can b
who
W
belie
Th
man
plan
are d
exper
action
ernm
ica.
All
and t
in ope
desire
tries
establi
standa
The
man's
vening
the se
which
attemp
economi
monopol
source
The
kinds
among
ica, be
countr
with t
ple's D
been a
the for
tries t
of the
North

can be used to paint as friends those who are their enemies.

Words are of little worth if deeds belie them.

The reiterated declarations of Truman on his intentions to undertake a plan for developing backward areas are daily belied by the reality we experience in our countries, by the action of the North-American government with respect to Latin America.

All that the Yankee imperialists and their government try to do is in open contradiction to the supposed desires to "help" backward countries to develop their economy, to establish industries and raise their standard of living.

The Yankee imperialists and Truman's government have been intervening in our countries to maintain the semi-colonial economic system which prevails in them, to defeat all attempts to develop an independent economy, to reinforce the foreign monopoly over their markets and sources of raw materials.

The United States has used all kinds of pressure to prevent trade among the countries of Latin America, between themselves or with the countries of Europe, and, especially, with the Soviet Union and the People's Democracies. Their efforts have been and are bent toward making the foreign trade of all these countries through or under the control of the trusts and monopolies of North America; they have already

accomplished this to a considerable degree. The case of Cuba when it wanted to buy meat from Argentina, when it wanted to meet the deficit of national production, is well known. It was threatened by the North-American embassy with an embargo on Cuban products destined for the United States, due to the danger of spreading hoof-and-mouth disease, which Argentinian cattle supposedly suffer from. Cuba was unable to make these purchases, but months later the North-American Army announced the purchase of Argentinian beef.

The U.S. has used and is using every means in its power to ruin the efforts of Latin-American countries bent on creating and developing their own systems of maritime and air transport. To illustrate this, it is sufficient to record the action developed against the Great Columbian Fleet (*La Flota Gran Columbiana*), which was created by the combined efforts of Venezuela, Ecuador and Colombia, and which is subjected to the strongest attacks on the part of the great navigation monopolies and the governmental agencies of the United States.

The U.S. has been insistently attacking the incipient and secondary industries established in some Latin-American countries and has been destroying the many enterprises that could contribute to the diversification of its production. In Cuba, to bring the case nearer home, hardly

was the war over when the Yankee government proceeded to paralyze and dismantle the plant of the Nicaro Nickel Co., bringing on the unemployment of 2,000 workers. The same was done with a vegetable dehydrating plant.

Using the so-called International Charter of Commerce, the U.S. has attempted to force the countries of Latin America to reduce their tariffs on North-American products, while the production of Latin America finds itself subjected in the U.S. to quotas and other restrictions.

With veritable commercial dumping methods, the Yankee monopolies are destroying the few light industries which managed to have a certain development during the war. Such is the case with the industries for the production of packaging goods, glass, textiles, hides and shoes, etc. In Cuba the majority of textile factories have been forced to close as a result of competition from Yankee industries and the fabrics manufactured in occupied Japan.

The U.S. has not as yet given any financial aid to the Latin-American countries to develop their own enterprises. On the contrary, the North-American government has utilized the financial needs of some nations to wrench concessions ruinous for their economies, and humiliating for their national sovereignty. Mexico, for example, made efforts to secure a loan from the U.S. to improve her nationalized petroleum industry.

To obtain it, she agreed to give Edwin Pauley, crony of Truman, a rich petroleum concession so that he would influence the granting of a loan. North-American functionaries hinted that the inscription on the ballot of the Mexican Communist Party and that the influence of Lombardo were prejudicial to the negotiations and the Mexican government denied electoral inscription to the Mexican Communist Party and deprived the Popular Party of Lombardo of all parliamentary representation. Also, they suggested that Mexico ought to devalue its currency and the government of Aleman lowered the official exchange of the Mexican peso to 8.75 per American dollar.

And after all this, Mexico has had to give up all negotiations for the loan without getting it, after a minor functionary of the Yankee State Department had a letter published saying that in place of the official loan they recommended that Mexico annul the petroleum nationalization and hand anew the exploitation of petroleum to foreign private monopolies.

In Cuba, too, there is talk today of Yankee loans and investments. According to what it has been possible to learn of the loan, it follows the traditional lines which made these operations so odious to Latin-American countries. In exchange for a new mortgage on the Republic, which will place new burdens on the

shou
gove
law
cians
ploys
nate
in th
ers f
secur
work
firing
tions
der t

Ins
vor
been
Treat
which
a spe
can o
of C
Amer

The
Cuba
zation
en it
North
prom
place
any
these
the s
depen
the s
econo
The
lar o
for t
Amer
It is

shoulders of the people, the Cuban government has offered to annul the laws which protect Cuban technicians and workers by preferential employment, to reduce salaries, eliminate the obligation to respect seniority in the promoting or firing of workers from an industry, as well as to secure official approval to discharge workers and to justify reasons for firing them. These are the conditions that the Yankees impose in order to consider a petition for a loan.

Instead of any means tending to favor its development, the U.S. has been trying to impose on Cuba a Treaty of Residence and Navigation which would convert our coasts into a special preserve for North-American coast-wise ships and the whole of Cuba into a territory of North America.

The interest of the Yankee in Cuba consists in raising the mechanization of sugar production, to cheapen it for the benefit of the great North-American companies, and to promote the cultivation of Kena in place of jute. If Truman's plan has any practical application in Cuba these are its only objectives, with the sole result of accentuating our dependence on the U.S. market and the semi-colonial character of our economy.

The Truman plan will have similar objectives and identical results for the other countries of Latin America.

It is our duty to unmask this char-

acter of the "bold" plan for developing the backward areas. It is our duty to combat all the attempts of imperialism further to colonize our economies. It is our duty to strengthen our fight to unite all our national forces for a common effort to defeat the impositions and politics of imperialism, to save our industries threatened with ruin by Yankee competition, to advance the cause of national liberation.

The attacks of the imperialists on the economy of our countries are raising a resistance each time greater and each time more extended.

The action of the imperialists against La Flota Gran Colombiana provoked demonstrations of protest in Colombia.

The maneuvers to hand Brazilian oil to the North-American trusts have raised a militant struggle among the people of Brazil, which each day reaches new sections and which is carried on under the banner of the Communist Party, the valiant party of Luis Carlos Prestes.

In Guatemala, the struggle of the banana workers against United Fruit and the decision of this enterprise to ignore the national laws and decisions of the government aroused the nation.

In Mexico, the national protest against the terms of the loan efforts made by Aleman have been widespread and sustained.

In our country, the struggle

was the war over when the Yankee government proceeded to paralyze and dismantle the plant of the Nicaro Nickel Co., bringing on the unemployment of 2,000 workers. The same was done with a vegetable dehydrating plant.

Using the so-called International Charter of Commerce, the U.S. has attempted to force the countries of Latin America to reduce their tariffs on North-American products, while the production of Latin America finds itself subjected in the U.S. to quotas and other restrictions.

With veritable commercial dumping methods, the Yankee monopolies are destroying the few light industries which managed to have a certain development during the war. Such is the case with the industries for the production of packaging goods, glass, textiles, hides and shoes, etc. In Cuba the majority of textile factories have been forced to close as a result of competition from Yankee industries and the fabrics manufactured in occupied Japan.

The U.S. has not as yet given any financial aid to the Latin-American countries to develop their own enterprises. On the contrary, the North-American government has utilized the financial needs of some nations to wrench concessions ruinous for their economies, and humiliating for their national sovereignty. Mexico, for example, made efforts to secure a loan from the U.S. to improve her nationalized petroleum industry.

To obtain it, she agreed to give Edwin Pauley, crony of Truman, a rich petroleum concession so that he would influence the granting of a loan. North-American functionaries hinted that the inscription on the ballot of the Mexican Communist Party and that the influence of Lombardo were prejudicial to the negotiations and the Mexican government denied electoral inscription to the Mexican Communist Party and deprived the Popular Party of Lombardo of all parliamentary representation. Also, they suggested that Mexico ought to devalue its currency and the government of Aleman lowered the official exchange of the Mexican peso to 8.75 per American dollar.

And after all this, Mexico has had to give up all negotiations for the loan without getting it, after a minor functionary of the Yankee State Department had a letter published saying that in place of the official loan they recommended that Mexico annul the petroleum nationalization and hand anew the exploitation of petroleum to foreign private monopolies.

In Cuba, too, there is talk today of Yankee loans and investments. According to what it has been possible to learn of the loan, it follows the traditional lines which made these operations so odious to Latin-American countries. In exchange for a new mortgage on the Republic which will place new burdens on the

should
govern
laws w
cians a
ployme
nate the
in the
ers from
secure
worker
firing
tions th
der to

Inste
vor its
been t
Treaty
which
a speci
can co
of Cul
Americ

The
Cuba c
zation
en it
North-
promot
place o
any p
these
the so
depend
the se
econor

The
lar ob
for th
Ameri
It is

shoulders of the people, the Cuban government has offered to annul the laws which protect Cuban technicians and workers by preferential employment, to reduce salaries, eliminate the obligation to respect seniority in the promoting or firing of workers from an industry, as well as to secure official approval to discharge workers and to justify reasons for firing them. These are the conditions that the Yankees impose in order to consider a petition for a loan.

Instead of any means tending to favor its development, the U.S. has been trying to impose on Cuba a Treaty of Residence and Navigation which would convert our coasts into a special preserve for North-American coast-wise ships and the whole of Cuba into a territory of North America.

The interest of the Yankee in Cuba consists in raising the mechanization of sugar production, to cheapen it for the benefit of the great North-American companies, and to promote the cultivation of Kena in place of jute. If Truman's plan has any practical application in Cuba these are its only objectives, with the sole result of accentuating our dependence on the U.S. market and the semi-colonial character of our economy.

The Truman plan will have similar objectives and identical results for the other countries of Latin America.

It is our duty to unmask this char-

acter of the "bold" plan for developing the backward areas. It is our duty to combat all the attempts of imperialism further to colonize our economies. It is our duty to strengthen our fight to unite all our national forces for a common effort to defeat the impositions and politics of imperialism, to save our industries threatened with ruin by Yankee competition, to advance the cause of national liberation.

The attacks of the imperialists on the economy of our countries are raising a resistance each time greater and each time more extended.

The action of the imperialists against La Flota Gran Colombiana provoked demonstrations of protest in Colombia.

The maneuvers to hand Brazilian oil to the North-American trusts have raised a militant struggle among the people of Brazil, which each day reaches new sections and which is carried on under the banner of the Communist Party, the valiant party of Luis Carlos Prestes.

In Guatemala, the struggle of the banana workers against United Fruit and the decision of this enterprise to ignore the national laws and decisions of the government aroused the nation.

In Mexico, the national protest against the terms of the loan efforts made by Aleman have been widespread and sustained.

In our country, the struggle

against the attempts to flout the rights of Cuban technicians to favor the Yankee enterprises evoked a violent fight by the students and university professors of the faculty of commercial sciences. The struggle against the loan has taken on extraordinary scope, after the interview of our Socialist Popular Party with Dr. Grau to treat of this matter. In all these struggles the anti-imperialist sentiments of the masses are demonstrated and accentuated: hatred of foreign oppression, the aspir-

ations to achieve national liberation.

If we know how to unify these varied struggles, if we know how to clarify for the masses the true meaning of the present events and of the actions of imperialism, we will be able to defeat the oppressive plans of the imperialists, truly help the development of our backward country, and open the way to full national liberation.

*Translated from the Spanish
by Jose Yglesias.*

by Oli

DOLLAR
madde
blasting
eastern
up its
in Gre

The
ately a
"Greek
jectives
loving
the em
Democ
dents a
order t
people'
provok
the Bal
ing a
amply
Rajk
clique,
imperia
small r
imperia

As p
for a la
sentativ
land a
peatedly
stake i
have la

The Struggle For Peace, Liberty and Bread in Greece

by Olive Sutton

DOLLAR IMPERIALISM, clinging with maddened intensity to its plans for blasting a military entry into South-eastern Europe, has greatly stepped up its campaign and machinations in Greece.

The warmongers are now desperately attempting to "wind up" the "Greek incident." Their major objectives are to conquer the freedom-loving masses of Greece and prevent the emergence of a Greek People's Democracy, to foment border incidents against Albania and Bulgaria in order to subvert and overthrow those people's democratic republics and to provoke large-scale armed conflict in the Balkans as a prelude to unleashing a third world war. As made amply clear by the revelations in the Rajk trial in Hungary, the Tito clique, long in the paid service of the imperialist secret services, plays no small role in the calculations of the imperialists.

As part of their vigorous struggle for a lasting peace, the U.N. representatives of the Soviet Union, Poland and Czechoslovakia have repeatedly exposed the real issues at stake in the Greek conflict. They have laid bare the true nature of the

Athens monarcho-fascist regime as a puppet of Anglo-American imperialism dutifully carrying out the latter's policy of terror, rapine and genocide. More than this, the Soviet Union has offered constructive proposals, which have been accepted by the Provisional Democratic Government of Greece, for bringing the war in Greece to a speedy conclusion, thereby greatly strengthening the cause of world peace.

Thus far, however, all peace proposals have met only with sharp rebuffs on the part of the Athens regime and its arrogant masters, U.S. finance capital and the U.S. State Department. Far from showing any willingness to end the war in Greece, a war which they have inspired and are conducting in flat violation of the U.N. Charter, the Wall Street-Pentagon war incendiaries are trying to fan ever higher the flames of war in Greece. And they count heavily for the success of their ventures on U.N. sanction commanded by the Anglo-American powers.

GREECE AT THE U.N.

Wall Street's design is to bring about large-scale intervention of for-

eign troops in Greece and the Balkans generally, under the guise of setting up a U.N. "police force" to "patrol" the Greek-Albanian and Greek-Bulgarian borders. This scheme is offered on the basis of the fantastic, unsubstantiated charge that Albania "sustains" the Greek Democratic Army.

There are numerous utterances by U.S. officials which serve to expose the "Stop Thief!" demagoguery that it is Greece's Northern neighbors which feed the Greek civil war.

Thus, General Van Fleet is also on record condemning Albanian "support" to the "rebels," which, he said, "should not be allowed to continue." But at the very same time—on September 14, 1949, on his return from the Vitsi-Grammos front, he stated that the war "is not over—not by a long shot. . . . We shall still train the Greek Army in field tactics and infantry problems, and we shall continue to instruct in maintenance of equipment and material."* And a month earlier Van Fleet had given virtually the direct lie to the accusations against Albania: "The war will not be over with the reduction of the border pockets. A long period lies ahead in which we must make this country [Greece] secure. . . . We must continue full-scale military assistance through the fiscal year 1950, but I am optimistic that we will have succeeded by then. . . ."

And John Nuveen, head of the

* *The New York Times*, September 15, 1949.
 ** *Ibid.*, August 15, 1949.

Marshall Plan mission in Greece, has stated the following:

Because of the international responsibilities of the United States, which we are not at all prepared to confront . . . it is in Greece that the methods and policy to be followed by America are necessarily tried. Greece constitutes an opportunity for us, a God-sent opportunity to understand international realities. Greece is a very substantial case of the cold war with Russia. In reality we should not be talking of a cold war because it is already sufficiently hot, and because it represents our direct contact with the enemy and a defeat here would have serious consequences. One can say definitely that Greece constitutes the access to the Balkans, that is to say, to the countries behind the iron curtain. We believe that the door has already been half opened by Yugoslavia.*

The intrigues of the warmakers to utilize the U.N. for their own devices as regards Greece have been long in the making. The U.N. "Special Committee on the Balkans" has been doing Wall Street's work for more than two years, submitting reports to the General Assembly levelling unproved charges of assistance to the Greek democrats from the North. This summer, the committee exonerated Yugoslavia and expressed its optimism that "normal relations" would soon be established between the Tito-ites and the Athens regime. In addition, it centered its attack on the People's Democracy of Albania, which, as a

* Published in the Athens daily newspaper, *Eleftheria*, February 27, 1949.

result
 ple's c
 is geo
 cally
 perial
 front

The
 pointe
 interv
 sustain
 Nikos
 of the
 and pr
 of the
 summ

We
 that th
 tinues
 is supp
 knows
 war m
 lions
 and E
 Greek
 month
 wiped

Gen
 of the
 Greece
 true.
 during
 ington
 at pre
 Fleet
 Greece
 But
 comm
 Weste
 blind

* To
 Democr
 ** T

result of Tito's betrayal of the people's camp of peace and democracy, is geographically isolated and logically offers the next target in imperialism's assault against the peace front in the Balkans.

The Greek democratic forces have pointed out repeatedly that foreign intervention is indeed the element sustaining the war in Greece. As Nikos Zachariades, General Secretary of the Communist Party of Greece and president of the High Command of the Democratic Army, wrote this summer:*

We do not contest the contention that the civil war in our country continues exclusively and solely because it is supplied from without. All the world knows that if the thousands of tons of war materials and the hundreds of millions of dollars which the American and English imperialists give to the Greek plutocracy were to stop for one month, monarcho-fascism would be wiped out.

General James A. Van Fleet, head of the U.S. military mission in Greece, himself admits that this is true. When a reporter asked him during a press conference in Washington, "If we withdraw from Greece at present, what will happen?" Van Fleet candidly replied: "We lose Greece."**

But the representatives of the U.N. committee (all of whom are from the Western powers) are obediently blind to the figure of Van Fleet strid-

ing along the battle lines in the Vitsi and Grammos mountains and commanding the Royalist Army—an army equipped and kept in action at a cost of more than a billion dollars to the American people! They are oblivious of the numerous frank admissions of official Greek Royalist and U.S. circles that Anglo-American imperialism started, prolongs and openly conducts the war in Greece.

The plot to extend the war in Greece with U.N. approval is, among other things, impelled by the dire need of U.S. imperialism to hide from the world the fact that its dive-bombers, tanks, artillery, poison gas, and its military personnel directing their use, are unable to vanquish the patriotic Greek democrats and turn Greece into a more secure base of operations against the People's Democracies and the U.S.S.R. How else explain the loss of 32,000 monarchist troops in Vitsi and Grammos this summer—except in terms of "Cominform" aid to the heroic democratic fighters? How else explain that the Greek Democratic forces are, in fact, not "annihilated," but courageously battling the monarcho-fascists all over Greece—except in terms of Albanian "refuge" and "military assistance"?

And so, with polite admonitions to the warmongering Royalist regime, whose aspirations to annex Southern Albania and parts of Bulgaria are well known, imperialist spokesmen in the U.N. and British and American officialdom prate about

* *Toward Victory*, daily newspaper of the Democratic Army, June 11, 1949.

** *The New York Times*, June 24, 1949.

"peace" while blood flows in torrents in Greece, and the Greek masses call to the friends of peace and democracy: "Shout to the world the longings of our people! Peace!"

Resolutions demanding a peaceful, democratic settlement have deluged the United Nations. They have come from the Provisional Democratic Government of Greece, which urges adoption of the Soviet peace proposals as a basis for discussions; from peasant organizations, from doctors, lawyers, women, the families of victims incarcerated on Makronisos Island, the Dachau of royalist Greece, etc. It is to the shame of the American press, particularly the progressive press, that at this writing so pitifully little has been done to publish for American readers these eloquent testimonies to the brutality and futility of U.S. intervention in Greece.

THE TRUMANIZATION OF GREECE

The creature of Wall Street's intervention in Greece is a combination concentration camp and battlefield. It cannot bear the slightest exposure in the bourgeois press; for all of its horrible fixtures bear the labels Truman Doctrine, Marshall Plan, Atlantic Pact—plans for a third world war to secure for Wall Street world domination.

The human losses in the Greek civil war have been enormous for so small and impoverished a country. As detailed by the *Second Blue*

Book, issued by the Provisional Democratic Government in August 1949 (p. 106):

By 1948, the losses suffered by the people as a result of the civil war were estimated at about 60,000 officers and soldiers killed and wounded, without counting the casualties among the civilian population. To these figures, enormous for tiny and ruined Greece, must be added the losses for this year, during which even bloodier battles took place, while worse are being prepared. During the first half of 1949 alone, the High Command of the Democratic Army of Greece placed the figures of enemy losses in killed and wounded at 47,000.

And in August and September of this year, as we now know, the royalists lost another 40,000 men.

Known executions from July 1946 through July 19, 1949, totaled 4,711. More than 70,000 Greek patriots languish in concentration camps where gauleiters once in the pay of the Nazis invent ever more incredible tortures to kill and drive insane.

While the Democratic Army has been breaking imperialism's grip on this "access to the Balkans," plans have gone forward to equip the country with the necessary installations to launch a major war. We can now understand why the U.S. Military Mission in Greece is so pettish about "sabotage." Last summer General Vandenberg, chief of staff of the U.S. Air Force, and Air Secretary Symington went to Athens to elaborate plans on American use of Greek airfields

in the
kan co
Naval
with
Staff t
ports
ing to
come
the Ar
1949:
tives o
of the
be un
used i
militar
In C
Street
der co
of por
cordin
U.S. c
ized tr
Intern
graph
in Re
Airlin
the tw
Hellas
Comp
factur
(Grec
and S
war pl
The
prizes
impo
With
sky-ro
upon
ately
strateg

in the event of war against the Balkan countries and the Soviet Union. Naval officials, similarly, have met with the Royalist Naval General Staff to discuss utilization of Greek ports by the American fleet. According to these plans, Hassani is to become the principal air base, and, as the Athens radio blabbed on July 19, 1949: "Speaking to the representatives of the press, the representatives of the U.S. State Department let it be understood that Crete would be used in the future as an advanced military base of the Western powers."

In Greece for the "killing" are Wall Street's representatives in tweed. Under contract for "reconstruction"—of ports, roads, railroads, etc., all according to military specification—U.S. corporations have already realized tremendous profits. In addition, International Telephone and Telegraph controls all communications in Royalist Greece; Trans-World Airlines has taken over and merged the two Greek airlines (T.A.E. and Hellas); the American Tobacco Company controls the buying, manufacture and export of tobacco (Greece's principal export product); and Sperry Gyroscope has set up a war plant in Greece.

The profit reaped by these enterprises is, of course, wrung out of the impoverished bodies of the workers. With the cost of living constantly sky-rocketing, and with thousands upon thousands of people deliberately uprooted by the displacement strategy of the Royalist Army, Greece

offers an abundant cheap-labor market. The Greek Peasant Party, in a memorandum to the current U.N. General Assembly, disclosed that 1,000,000 peasants had been torn from their homes by the monarchofascists in order to create a vacuum around the Democratic Army. Many of these have been herded into camps, while other thousands have been forced into the ranks of the Royalist Army and labor battalions.

According to a blithe piece on the fashion page of the *New York Herald-Tribune* of September 29: "A program sponsored by the Economic Cooperation Administration in Athens . . . is encouraging and developing Greek industries to give the natives an added source of income during the long winter months when agriculture is impractical." The product of the "natives" handiwork will be hand-woven materials, skirts, kerchiefs, prints and the like—for Saks Fifth Ave. consumption!

To complete the picture of Greece under Truman Doctrine colonization, we have but to visualize two of Athens' main thoroughfares, University Avenue, now "Truman Avenue," and famous Stadium Avenue, now "Churchill Avenue."

Thus does Albania foment the civil war in Greece!

THE TREACHEROUS ROLE OF THE TITO REGIME

The Greek people's struggle, their frustration of Wall Street's plot to convert the Balkans into a major war

arena, has taken on additional importance and new grandeur with the exposure of Tito's role as a Wall Street war agent. We now learn that the Greek democratic forces have not only been battling Wall Street machines of war, fascist terror and their many attendant horrors, but have had to contend also with the incessant divisive and murderous conspiracies of the Tito agents. In holding off U.S. imperialism, they have thus prevented Wall Street from making full use of Tito's Yugoslavia as an entering wedge in the Balkans. At the same time, the presence of a hostile state to the North, and the Tito agents' constant harassments, have constituted a serious obstacle to the rapid realization of peace. It is this factor more than any other which explains why the Democratic Army has not yet gone over to the offensive on a large scale throughout Greece.

Tito's stab in the back of the Greek democratic forces—his closing of the frontier, military collaboration with the monarcho-fascists and flank attacks on the Democratic Army—makes a decisive test of devotion to the cause of achieving peace in Greece, the denunciation and ruthless exposure of the Tito regime. It has been revealed that the network of Tito agents extends far and wide; thus, they have sought in the United States to divide the peace camp, and in the case of Greece, to discredit the Greek Democratic movement. The burden of their vicious propaganda (supplementing the line of *The New*

York Times, etc.) is that "the Cominform" has ordered the "liquidation" of the Greek Democratic forces and their diversion from resistance to U.S. imperialism to "an assault" on Yugoslavia! Ergo: the Greek democratic movement does not represent a force decisive for world peace and is unworthy of appreciable support; the Greek democratic movement's demand for a peaceful settlement constitutes "capitulation" and "treason" to the Greek people! That this sort of double-talk is of exemplary service to the warmakers should be apparent from the fact that certain liberals in the peace camp have been taken in by it.

As Nikos Zachariades wrote recently (*For A Lasting Peace, For A People's Democracy!*, August 1, 1949):

The people's democratic movement of our country has never, since the times of the first occupation, known such a cunning and foul enemy as the Tito clique. The Great Serbia chauvinism of the Tito-ites in relation to the resistance movement in Greece was evident as far back as 1943, when the leadership of the Yugoslav Communist Party declared that the people of Aegean Macedonia could only win their liberation within the framework of Yugoslavia. The corollary of this was that it was the prime duty of all Macedonian patriots to fight against the Communist Party of Greece and E.A.M. [National Liberation Front] and instead to collaborate with the Tito agents. . . . During all these years the Tito clique sent thousands of its agents

into th
and in
mining
and sp
liberati

Zach
agents
tion o
Maced
leading
Greece
by a T
dropp
1944 to
ika, sh
to hold
Thu
the T
nation
fuel th
tures a
Wall S
ple an
to the
flagrati
advant
donian
unders
forces,
vide th
The
determ
text o
monar
donian
the rul
tile an
Greece
in stru
became
own na

into the Communist Party of Greece and into E.A.M. with the job of undermining the Communist Party of Greece and splitting the unity of the people's liberation movement.

Zachariades reveals that Tito agents organized the mass emigration of Macedonians from Aegean Macedonia into Yugoslavia; that the leading Marxist theoretician of Greece, John Zevgos, was murdered by a Tito agent; and that the British dropped weapons to Tito's troops in 1944 to enable them to occupy Salonika, should the British not be able to hold Greece alone.

Thus, with slogans of "liberation," the Tito-ites exploited the ancient national question of Macedonia to fuel their own nationalistic adventures and carry forward the work of Wall Street, bringing their own people and the peoples of the Balkans to the brink of another major conflagration. And they have taken full advantage of the fact that the Macedonian national question is not well understood among world progressive forces, in a subsidiary attempt to divide the peace camp generally.

The question of Macedonian self-determination arises within the context of many years of bourgeois-monarchic oppression. The Macedonian people were separated under the rule of three—at that time, hostile and chauvinist—states: Bulgaria, Greece and Yugoslavia. Tempered in struggle against oppression, they became militant fighters for their own nationhood. Since 1943, we now

know, the Tito regime has systematically sought to obscure and distort the just aspirations of the Macedonian people, scuttling their opportunity to unite as one people after the victories over the Nazi invaders, attempting to neutralize them as a force against U.S. imperialism.

The Tito agent, Rajk, at his trial for treason in Budapest, revealed Tito's plans for Greece, as follows:*

Most important was Tito's plan for assistance to monarcho-fascist Greece. . . . It was in their interests that the United States should strengthen its base there as soon as possible in agreement with them, that is, with Tito and his associates. That is why Yugoslavia would, at first covertly and later more and more openly, follow the course of isolating democratic Greece from the other people's democratic countries, so that the monarchist forces could smash it.

THE CURRENT SITUATION IN GREECE

As Comrade Zachariades pointed out toward the end of 1948, a qualitative change took place at that time in the relationship of forces in Greece:**

The present internal and international situation differs greatly from that of December 1944. Then British imperialism, taking advantage of our mistakes and our relative isolation, compelled us to retreat temporarily. Since

* *For A Lasting Peace, For A People's Democracy!* September 23, 1949, p. 4.

** *Ibid.*, December 15, 1948.

that time, the situation in Greece, both economically and politically, has been steadily deteriorating. Today a regime of Anglo-American occupation and of monarcho-fascist terror rules the country. The country is experiencing a profound revolutionary crisis.

The popular democratic revolution in Greece has entered into a new phase. This phase dates from the moment when the popular resistance developed into armed struggle and the Greek Democratic Army became the vanguard of this resistance. . . . The Democratic Army, with the Communist Party in its vanguard, is heroically overcoming the difficulties and unswervingly advancing toward the victory of its just cause.

At its Fifth Plenum held in January 1949 the Communist Party of Greece, critically evaluating its work in the previous period, raised the perspective of the Democratic Army's taking the offensive and securing a decisive victory during the year 1949. As was pointed out in the leading article in the September 1949 issue of the monthly review, *Democratic Army*, this perspective was correct under the circumstances then obtaining. During the early months of 1949 the operations of the Democratic Army were geared to this outlook, and succeeded in carrying the struggle to the enemy on a wide front.

The forces of imperialism, aware of this threat to their plans, intensified their efforts to defeat the peace camp on a world scale by means of the Atlantic Pact, and to rout the

democratic forces of Greece. Their greatly increased military intervention in Greece was further facilitated by the open role of the Tito clique in aid of monarcho-fascism.

The above-mentioned article in *Democratic Army* states:

Here we must underline that we did not see in time the changes which took place in the relationship of forces [in the Balkans and in Greece, as a result of Tito's treachery—O. S.] and the consequences they had for us, and that there existed among us a certain underestimation of the enemy.

As a result, despite the continuing crisis in the morale of the mercenary army of Athens, and despite the magnificent resistance offered by the Democratic Army, the monarcho-fascists were able in the summer of 1949, to occupy and hold the Vitsi and Grammos mountain ranges. During the big battles of August, however, terrific losses were inflicted on the eight Royalist divisions which had been thrown into the battle and which were supported by large-scale air and artillery operations.

Although, as the quoted article states, certain military mistakes were made during these battles, these succeeded only "in making our position more difficult, but they were not the factors determining the outcome of the Vitsi and Grammos battles." The article continues:

Tito's treachery raised many obstacles in the way of the assistance which the People's Democracies provided the

Greek
this a
tary
the n
ists, a
ture.
only
of Yu
the D
makts
with
that t
in the
in fa
Tito's

As
in the
cratic
sume
ever.
porar
certai
will s
revert
(Ibid.)

The
its gro
tory,"
situati
looks
It cor
incapa
major
For t
contin
tory."

In s
Royal
suppo
the fo
crease
bread.

Greek people. It is well known that this assistance did not consist of military aid, which is so lavishly provided the monarcho-fascists by the imperialists, and that it was of a limited nature. . . . In the end, he [Tito] did not only permit the monarcho-fascists use of Yugoslav territory in order to attack the Democratic Army's flanks in Kaimaktsalan, but also hit us in the back with his own forces in Vitsi. *It is plain that the specific reason for the change in the relationship of forces in Greece, in favor of the monarcho-fascists, was Tito's treachery.*

As a result of the setbacks suffered in the summer campaign, the Democratic Army has been obliged to resume guerrilla-type operations. However, "this form of struggle is temporary and has been imposed by certain conditions which we believe will soon change, so that we may revert to regular Army warfare" (*Ibid.*).

The Athens government, despite its grossly exaggerated claims of "victory," has had to admit that "the situation is serious and the future looks dark," the cited article reports. It concludes: "Monarcho-fascism is incapable of solving any of the major problems of the Greek people. For this reason the armed struggle continues and will continue to victory."

In spite of the terror, the people in Royalist-controlled areas unite in support of the Democratic Army in the form of strikes for wage increases and demonstrations for bread. This past spring and sum-

mer, the greatest strikes in many years swept Royalist Greece, embracing civil servants, tram workers, gas workers, Social Security Organization workers, shoe makers, cinema workers, doctors at the Institute of Social Insurance and workers in other semi-official institutions. The corruption and inefficiency of the Athens regime, its shameless and complete subservience to foreign directors and its refusal to negotiate for a peace settlement also account for the growing support to the Democratic Government and Army.

While partisan warfare continued in many parts of Greece and on the islands, the Provisional Democratic Government announced on October 15, in a Proclamation to the Greek people, that it was withholding the main forces of the Democratic Army in order to advance the struggle to achieve peace. The Proclamation stated:

The Democratic Army has not been cowed and has not been smashed. It remains strong and with its forces intact. It has stopped the flow of blood to save Greece from total annihilation, since it puts the interests of the country and of the people above all other considerations.

The Proclamation calls on the whole Greek people to unite their strength and exert their will for peace and liberty. Exposing the disastrous course of the fascist regime "in transforming the country into a cemetery," the Proclamation concludes:

United, the people of Greece are in a position to impose their will. They are not alone. The entire democratic humanity is with us. Their long years of struggle have won the admiration of all the world. Our people has won the sympathy of all the peoples. And this world front of democracy and peace is today stronger, more powerful than at any other time. It is all-powerful!

At its head is the great Soviet Union, whose power and devotion, whose struggles for peace and freedom of all peoples, everyone, its friends and enemies, recognize.

The people of Greece, united and aligned with the world front of peace and democracy, would be able to fight with decision to prevent the deadly plans of its enemy, local and foreign, and to win those things which they desire—bread, liberty and peace.

In this struggle, let us all unitedly march with a firm faith in victory.

To this struggle we will dedicate all our forces.

Victory! The future belongs to the people, to a Free, Democratic Greece!

Signed: Provisional Democratic
Government of Greece

WHAT MUST BE DONE?

In the United States the newspapers and journals, with a few honorable exceptions, have carried on a concerted campaign in behalf of the quisling Athens regime and U.S. intervention. When it became impossible to censor the extent of U.S. military operations in Greece, the press set about brutalizing the American public, accustoming the

masses to the idea of planes, tanks, poison gases going perpetually to Greece in order to "contain" a "few thousand rebels."

One effect of this campaign, which has made itself felt even in the ranks of the progressive movement, is the cultivation of an attitude of skepticism and disbelief concerning the caliber and effectiveness of the Greek democratic forces. This type of imperialist propaganda, together with the sedulous suppression of all reports to the contrary, partially explains why the tremendous development during the past year of the Greek democratic movement, led by the Communist Party of Greece, has largely escaped the attention of American progressives, so that to this day their organizations have not effectively seized on the slogan of "Peace in Greece" as a slogan for advancing the struggle for peace in the whole world.

There was a time when the conscience of the American labor movement and the American people would have been outraged by the perpetuation of fascist terror and civil war in Greece.

The tasks are tremendous, but as citizens of the country mainly responsible for the bloodshed in Greece, the American people shoulder a weighty responsibility toward the long-suffering, liberty-loving people of Greece. This responsibility falls first and foremost, on the American labor movement and upon all American progressives; it imposes a special

task
nists.

In
dealin
sion
the U
of th
U.S.A.

It i
people
crime
name
Trum
high
dange
again
peace
world

Wh
about
able t
Street
the B
every
posals
the Pr
ment
U.N.

given
strugg
Demo
widely
room

by Tito
The
strugg
ple—w
terest
loving
by the
as a

task upon the American Communists.

In its statement of October 11 dealing with the scheduled discussion of the question of Greece in the U.N., the National Committee of the Communist Party of the U.S.A. declared:

It is high time for the American people to realize what a despicable crime is being committed in their name against the Greek people by the Truman Administration. It is also high time for them to understand how dangerous the continuation of the war against the Greek people is for the peace of the United States and for the world as a whole.

What must be done? The truth about Greece must be made available to the American people. Wall Street's plot to extend the war in the Balkans must be exposed in its every ramification. The peace proposals of the Soviet Union and of the Provisional Democratic Government of Greece submitted to the U.N. must be popularized and given wide support. The great struggles and achievements of the Democratic Army must be made widely known, so that there is no room for defeatism, be it inspired by Tito or by *The New York Times*.

The ideological and political struggle in behalf of the Greek people—which is also in the highest interest of all democratic and peace-loving Americans—must be taken by the Left and progressive forces as a rallying call into the trade

unions and the other mass organizations. The demand must be raised for an immediate halt to American military intervention in Greece, a project which has already cost our people more than one billion dollars in taxes and which promises to lay even heavier economic burdens on the masses, if the Trumanization of Greece is not brought to a halt.

The above-quoted statement of the National Committee of the Communist Party presents the key issues around which support must be rallied. It declares:

The Communist Party of the United States calls upon all American democrats to assist the Greek people and their Provisional Democratic Government in their efforts to restore peace, democracy and independence to their country through a peaceful, democratic settlement.

It calls upon all peace-loving Americans to demand the immediate withdrawal of all military and other forms of assistance extended by the Truman Administration to the Greek fascists.

It urges organizations and individuals to demand in statements and wires to Truman, Acheson and the U.S. chief delegate to the United Nations, Warren Austin, settlement of the Greek war on the basis of the Soviet proposals and the memorandum of the Provisional Democratic Government of Greece.

The statement further calls upon all organizations and individuals to raise an insistent demand for an end to the continuing executions of Greek patriot-democrats—trade

unionists, peasants, professional people, in behalf of whose lives the U.N. representatives from the Soviet Union and the People's Democracies are putting up a noble struggle.

Tito agents have been at work in the peace camp of the United States, as well as in other countries, striving to sow dissension in the ranks of the movement for peace in Greece. Alertness to, and exposure of, the Tito-ites as bought and paid-for tools of the imperialist Western powers is therefore one of the urgent tasks confronting the peace forces.

This winter promises to be the cruelest yet for the Greek people. Athens authorities have admitted that mass starvation, death from exposure and disease, are to be expected as in no other winter. There is no way to measure the need of the Greek people; but ways and means must be found, not only for expressing moral support to the Greek people, but for materially assisting them in this very trying period. A campaign to send food, clothing and medicines to the stricken people of

Greece can easily become the occasion to dramatize for the American people the issue of war and peace as it is expressed in Greece and to demonstrate concretely the peace aspirations of the American people.

The people of Greece, indeed the democratic masses throughout the world, look to the American people for full support and solidarity in the struggle against the aggressive expansion of Wall Street imperialism. The great democratic traditions of our country, whose revolutionary war of independence won the enthusiastic support of freedom-loving individuals and peoples throughout the world, as well as the present and future profound interests of the American people, emphasize the responsibility of the American labor movement and of all democratic Americans. The struggle against the Trumanization of Greece must become an important rallying point in the whole struggle against war and fascism.

by Al

HILAR
Trade
entitled
publish
ary 19exam
in con
omy o
marize
ing on
non-pr
produc
bor ha
and ha
ther el
the ArA sci
labor r
tality o
duction
the cri
constit
for dif
is limitPRODU
CAPMarx
cal eco
distinct

Productive and Non-Productive Labor Under Capitalism

by Albert Prago and George Siskind

HILARY MING, Polish Minister of Trade and Industry, in an article entitled "What Is National Income?" published in translation in the February 1949 number of *Political Affairs*, examined some fundamental issues in connection with the national economy of Poland. In so doing, he summarized the essence of Marx's teaching on the subject of productive and non-productive labor. The section on productive and non-productive labor has aroused considerable interest and has stimulated the urge for further elaboration of the question for the American reader.

A scientific definition of productive labor must take into account the totality of productive forces and production relations. As already noted, the criterion for determining what constitutes productive labor differs for different societies. This analysis is limited to capitalist society.

PRODUCTIVE LABOR UNDER CAPITALISM

Marx's various writings on political economy make references to the distinction between productive and

non-productive labor under capitalism, but the richest source of material on this subject is his *Theories of Surplus Value*. In this work, Marx defines productive labor (in capitalist society) as "that wage labor which, in exchange for the variable part of capital, reproduces not only this part of capital (or the value of its own labor power) but in addition surplus value for the capitalist."^{*}

Now it is obvious that even in the highly capitalistic United States, there is some material production which is not strictly capitalistic in nature. We refer to branches of material production in which there may be self-employed producers, as in the example of a small farmer who works his own farm without hired help and himself markets his own products. In fact, it would hold true for instances in which some wage labor is employed but in which the surplus product is appropriated by the employer for his personal consumption.

If no expansion of capital has taken place, the labor involved is non-pro-

^{*} *Theorien über den Mehrwert (Theories of Surplus Value)*, Stuttgart edition, 1905, Volume I, p. 253.

ductive. Clearly, the national wealth (*i.e.*, the total of use-values) may be increased through such production. However, since there would be no expansion of capital in the circumstances described, such labor cannot be considered productive. What is true in the epoch of monopoly capitalism is that the labor of those small farmers who do not hire labor is converted into surplus value for monopolists — for the dairy, canning, and packing trusts, etc. These trusts force the small farmers to sell their produce at prices below their value; in this way they appropriate the small farmers' surplus, and sometimes even part of their necessary labor time. As a general rule, the self-employed person will either grow into a capitalist or be pressed into the ranks of the wage-laborers. Potentially, he is both a capitalist and a wage laborer.

It is essential to understand that, in a country in which the capitalist system of production dominates, all production which does not conform to the capitalist production relations has nothing to do "either with the distinction of productive and non-productive labor, which is based merely on whether the labor is exchanged for money as money or money as capital." Continuing his discussion of "independent artisans or peasants who employ no workers, and hence do not produce as capitalists," Marx says: "Hence they belong neither in the category of productive nor that of non-productive labor, although they are producers

of commodities. But their production is not subsumed under the capitalist mode of production."^{*}

Throughout Volume I of his *Theories of Surplus Value*, Marx reiterates that only labor which produces surplus value is productive labor. Occasionally he uses the definition: "Only that labor which produces capital is productive labor."^{**} This definition is essentially the same as the former. For capital is not a thing but a social relationship; that is, it involves the relationship between the owners of the means of production, the capitalists, and the sellers of labor power, the wage workers. A portion of every capital is invested in the purchase of living labor power. This exchange involves the use of money which wants conversion into capital. Surplus value and capital are created when the purchased labor power has been applied to the means of production. Surplus value and capital cannot be created in any other way. It is not the exchange of money for the commodity labor power that is productive, but the labor power in use, *i.e.*, labor. Wage labor produces capital in the form of commodities which embody surplus value. Only those wage workers who are employed by capitalist owners of means of production can be productive.

LABOR AND THE CIRCULATION OF CAPITAL

But wage workers must be engaged in material production—in a

^{*} *Ibid.*, p. 422.

^{**} *Ibid.*, p. 258.

direct communion between man and nature—for their labor to be productive.

Now, the question arises whether that labor can be considered productive which is employed by capitalists whose capital increases but who, like merchants, are not involved in production.

An increase in capital does not, by itself, mean that the labor effecting that increase is necessarily productive labor. Capital is employed in all enterprises engaged in the sphere of circulation. But in the circulation process pure and simple, nothing is produced; capital is circulated, not created. For example, the workers in retail and wholesale trades, office employees, bank and insurance personnel, etc., are not productive workers, but are engaged in varied details concerned with the circulation of capital (whether it is converting commodities into money or money into commodities). While there may be an increase in the individual capital of, let us say, the owner of a department store, there has been no increase in the total capital of the nation arising from the labor in that store.

Moreover, the labor of clerks, bookkeepers, stenographers and other office personnel employed in a factory is non-productive, if their labor is limited to the purchase and sale of commodities. Such labor is not related to production; it is only a necessary expense of circulation. But, as we shall see below, not all clerical labor is non-productive.

The question of the expenses of circulation is developed by Marx in Chapter VI of the second volume of *Capital*. Without attempting to expand on his treatment, let us summarize Marx's exposition:

The increase in the merchant's capital has its source, not in the labor of his employees, but in the surplus value created in *production*. The capitalists who appropriate the surplus value created by workers in production have the task of *converting* the surplus value already produced in the form of commodities, into money. This task requires additional capital and the expenditure of additional labor power. But such labor creates neither products nor values. Marx's clear conclusion is that *all* labor engaged in selling and purchasing commodities is non-productive, however necessary such labor may be.

Even here, however, a sweeping generalization embracing all processes in the sphere of circulation would be incorrect, inasmuch as some productive functions take place within the process of the circulation of commodities. For example, once the use values have been created in the sphere of material production, they must be transported.

Within each process of production, the change of place, the object of labor and the required instruments of labor and labor-power—such as cotton which passes from the carding to the spinning room, or coal which is hoisted from the shaft to the surface—play a great role. The transition of the finished product,

in the role of a finished commodity from one independent place of production to another in a different location, shows *the same phenomenon on a large scale*. The transport of the products from one factory to another is finally succeeded by the passage of the finished products from the sphere of production to that of consumption. The product is not ready for consumption until it has completed these movements.*

Thus, transportation is production continued within the sphere of circulation; hence, the labor of transport workers is productive labor, adding value and surplus value to commodities.

Transportation is not the only productive function that takes place in the sphere of circulation. Marx mentions also storing, packing, sorting.** In this essay, we wish only to indicate that to determine the productive character of labor involved in storing, packing, and similar functions, the criterion is: Is the labor expended in these operations necessary for the preservation of commodities or for ensuring the continuity and regularity of the process of production or of reproduction? Thus, storing of perishables adds value to the commodities; storing for the socially pernicious purpose of hoarding in order to force prices up is non-productive.

All socially wasteful expenses incurred in the distribution of products are clearly non-productive. Adver-

tising, for example, is clearly wasteful, and the labor involved is an obvious instance of parasitical labor. The inefficient, socially unnecessary distributive apparatus under capitalism, which includes an intricate pyramid of wholesalers, jobbers, etc., must be viewed, not only as non-productive, but as parasitical. The great growth of non-productive labor in proportion to the total social labor is an earmark of the epoch of monopoly, testifying to the decay of capitalism in that stage. Statistics of the employed labor force in the period from 1910 to 1948 reveal the growing proportion of workers employed in distributive and personal-service enterprise, as compared to the declining proportion of those employed in productive enterprises. (See adjoining table.)

It is quite apparent that there has been a substantial increase in the relative number of persons engaged in the sphere of distribution and personal service while the proportion of those engaged in productive enterprises (the first three listed in the table) has declined considerably.

In 1910, 70.4 percent of those gainfully employed were in productive enterprises; in December 1948 they had been reduced to 50.6 percent. (No attempt has been made in this brief study to ascertain which of those workers were productive workers; it is sufficient, to illustrate the point at issue, to demonstrate the decline in the relative number of workers employed in productive enterprises.) The tables demonstrat-

* *Capital*, Volume II, p. 170.

** For Marx's elaboration of this question, see *Capital*, Volume II, Chapter VI.

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION ACCORDING TO INDUSTRY OF EMPLOYED LABOR FORCE*

OCCUPATION	1910	1940	Dec. 1948
Agriculture, Forestry, Fishing	33.2	18.7	12.4
Mining and Manufacturing	30.3	29.9	32.1
Transportation and Communication	6.9	6.8	6.1
<hr/>			
Total % of Gainfully Employed in Productive Enterprises	70.4	55.4	50.6
<hr/>			
Professional Services	4.4	7.3	—**
Commerce, Banking, Insurance, etc.	14.1	23.3	19.3
Domestic and Personal Service	9.9	9.7	7.8
Public Service	1.2	3.8	9.7
<hr/>			
	29.6	44.1	—

that, relatively, an ever-smaller number of workers produce the means of subsistence and the luxuries of society under capitalism. Capitalism, in the epoch of its decay, is compelled to waste an ever-growing percentage of capital and labor power in marketing the flood of commodities produced. And an ever-growing percentage of the surplus value created in productive enterprises is drained off into the coffers of the Wall Street manipulators and coupon clippers.

Moreover, it is clear that social usefulness, *per se*, does not make labor productive. The labor of retail clerks, as explained above, is socially useful and necessary, but it is not productive.

Thus, the Marxist definition of productive labor, taken in its manifold aspects, may be summed up as follows: productive labor is wage labor engaged in the material pro-

duction of commodities which embody surplus value appropriated by capitalists.

INTELLECTUAL LABOR

In the light of the above, in what category is the labor of intellectuals classified? Can the work of the author who writes books or of the professor who produces ideas be considered productive labor? In other words, can the acts of writing, teaching, singing, painting, sculpturing, acting, etc., be considered acts of production in which values are created?

On this question, there are veritable gems in Marx's *Theories of Surplus Value*, intended as the fourth

* Source for the figures is: 1910, *Statistical Abstract of the United States*, 1919; 1940, *Statistical Abstract of the United States*, 1948; 1948, *Survey of Current Business*, February 1949. The percentages are rough approximations; hence, minor inaccuracies exist.

** No figures available.

volume to his monumental *Capital*, and which, unfortunately, is not yet available in English translation. We therefore present below an extended quotation from Marx's famous polemic against the vulgar economist,* H. Storch, who had advanced the notion that the labor of intellectuals is productive:

According to Storch the physician produces health (but also disease), professors and writers enlightenment (but also obscurantism), poets, painters, etc., esthetic appreciation (but also lack of it), moralists, etc., morals, preachers religious worship, the work of sovereigns security, etc. It can just as well be said that disease produces physicians, esthetic appreciation poets and painters, immorality moralists, superstition preachers, and general insecurity sovereigns. This way of saying, in effect, that all these activities, these services produce a real or imagined use-value has been repeated by the latter [Storch] in order to prove that they are productive workers in the meaning of [Adam] Smith, that is, that they produce, not products *sui generis* directly, but the products of material labor and hence wealth directly. . . .

A philosopher produces ideas, a poet

* We offer here Marx's own explanation of what is meant by vulgar economy: "Once for all I may here state, that by classical political economy, I understand that economy which, since the time of W. Petty, has investigated the real relations of production in society, in contradiction to vulgar economy, which deals with appearances only, ruminates without ceasing on the materials long since provided by scientific economy, and there seeks plausible explanations of the most obtrusive phenomena, for bourgeois daily use, but for the rest, confines itself to systematizing in a pedantic way, proclaiming for everlasting truths, the trite ideas held by the self-complacent bourgeoisie with regard to their own world, to them the best of all possible worlds" (*Capital*, Vol. I, International Publishers, New York, 1947, p. 53 a.).

poems, a pastor sermons, a professor manuals, etc. A criminal produces crime. If one examines more closely the connection of the latter branch of production with that of society as a whole, he will avoid many prejudiced opinions. The criminal produces not only crime, but also criminal law, and accordingly, also the professor who lectures on criminal law, and, in addition, the inevitable manual by which this self-same professor throws his lectures upon the open market as a "commodity." Thus, there takes place an increase in national wealth, entirely aside from the personal gratification which, as a competent observer, Professor Roscher [*] tells us, the manuscript of the manual affords the creator himself.

The criminal produces, further, the whole system of criminal and police justice, constables, judges, hangmen, jurymen, etc., and all these various branches of industry, forming as many categories of social division of labor, develop various capabilities of the human mind, create new needs and new means of satisfying them. Torture alone has given rise to the most ingenious mechanical inventions and in the production of its implements employed a multitude of honest artisans.

The criminal produces an impression, in part moral, in part tragic, as the case may be, and thus renders the movement of moral and esthetic emotions of the public a "service." He produces not only compendiums on criminal law, not only penal codes together with their legislators, but also art, belles lettres, novels, and even tragedies, as is shown not only by Muellner's *Guilt* and Schli-

* Another vulgar economist of the nineteenth century.

ler's
Richa
mon
geois
stagn
sion
sting
this
produ
from
the s
sens
ventin
wages
part
sorbed
The
those
tain a
whole
tions.
the de
ductio
locksm
presen
not b
manuf
its pre
feiters
found
mercia
trade?
its dev
teratio
tempt
zeal o
ever n
dry, e
and th
the in
strikes.
And
dividu
ket ev
crime,

ler's *Robbers*, but even by *Oedipus* and *Richard III*. The criminal breaks the monotony and daily repetition of bourgeois life. Thus he keeps it from stagnating and evokes that restless tension and mobility without which the sting of competition would dull. In this way crime gives a spur to the productive forces. While crime removes from the labor market a portion of the surplus population and thus lessens competition among workers, preventing to a certain degree the fall of wages below the minimum, another part of the same population is absorbed by the struggle against crime. The criminal thus appears as one of those natural "equalizers" which maintain a correct balance and open up a whole perspective of "useful" occupations. The effects of the criminal on the development of the forces of production can be traced in detail. Would locksmiths ever have attained their present state of perfection if it had not been for thieves? Would the manufacture of banknotes have reached its present excellence without counterfeiters? Would the microscope have found its way into the everyday commercial spheres . . . without deceit in trade? Does not applied chemistry owe its development as much to the adulteration of commodities and the attempt to discover it as to the honest zeal of production? Crime, through ever new means of attack upon property, evokes ever new means of defense and thus has as positive an effect upon the invention of machines as have strikes.

And if we leave the sphere of individual crime, would the world market ever have arisen without national crime, indeed would nations ever have

arisen? And has not the tree of sin been the tree of knowledge since Adam's time?*

Thus Marx, in this brilliant satire, destroys the notion that all intellectual labor is productive.

It may be asked, however, are not ideas often incorporated in material products—as in the work of an artist on canvas, or of an author in a book? In these instances, are not value and surplus value created? In this connection, it may be argued that the act of intellectual creation cannot always be separated from the end product, which takes the form of a material use-value: the writer's ideas form the book in which they are incorporated, etc.

This question was brilliantly clarified by the Soviet economist, Kronrod, as follows:**

A picture, a sculpture, a book are goods of nature adapted and transformed in accordance with social needs. In that character they are a result of work expended in the process of production on canvas, paints, frames, sculptor's materials, the work of typographers and printers, of workers in a paper factory, etc. But the result of the work of the writer, artist or sculptor appears in the book only in its ideal content, as the sum of ideas expressed by means of an object. The objective form does not change the character of work of a painter, writer or sculptor. Similarly, it will not change the character of the work of a musician,

* *Theories of Surplus Value*, p. 385 ff.

** Quotation cited in the above-mentioned article by Hilary Minc.

whether he gives a live performance before an audience, or makes a recording. The objective form means only that, with the aid of matter, obtained from nature by way of productive processes on the basis of this matter, processes of spiritual creation are realized, the essence of which does not consist in direct relation of man with the matter surrounding him, but in a reflection and transformation in the human mind of the material world.

The act of the writer is the mental conception of an idea or ideas. If those ideas are translated into speech and thus conveyed to an audience, clearly, no material value has been produced. The spiritual character of the work of the writer is in no way altered if it is incorporated in the material substance, books. The book, *i.e.*, the paper, ink, binding, etc., is not the product of the author, but serves as the material embodiment of his ideas.

If there has been no increase in the total material values produced under the capitalist mode of production, then the labor is non-productive from the viewpoint of capitalist society as a whole. However, as Marx notes in a number of passages, the spiritual creations of those intellectuals, artists, etc., who are employed by capitalists, may be considered to reflect an *element* of productive labor, by virtue of the fact that their labor serves to increase the capital of their own respective employers. This increase, in reality, is brought about by the conversion of the unpaid labor time of

the artists, etc., into capital. However, the revenue which provides the increase in capital of the capitalists who employ writers, artists, teachers, etc., does not represent newly-produced values, but comes out of already-existing values—out of the incomes of the spectators, pupils, etc. The same holds for all service workers. It is clear, moreover, that such labor is not embodied in material commodities, but in services, and therefore does not add to the total social value.

In connection with wage labor of this kind—mental or spiritual labor involved in creating art works, teachings, etc.—Marx had the following pertinent comments:

... productive labor is that which produces a commodity, non-productive labor that which produces personal services. The former is embodied in a salable thing; the latter must be consumed during its operation.*

Further:

Thus it is clear that the labor of the doctor and the teacher do not immediately create the fund out of which they are paid, although their labor becomes part of the costs of production of the fund which create all values in general, that is, of the costs of production of labor power.**

To illustrate: a dressmaker reproduces the equivalent of his wages and more. With his wages, he purchases many kinds of commodities

* *Theories of Surplus Value*, pp. 279-80.

** *Ibid.*, p. 273.

Some of these commodities are in the form of services. Let us suppose that he buys a ticket to hear *The Marriage of Figaro*. The singing is, for the dressmaker, an act of consumption—speaking in terms of political economy. It is an act of consumption that takes place simultaneously with the very act of the creation of the music by the singer. The dressmaker's purchase of this or any other service or commodity, whether it is necessary or not, does not lead to an increase in the national wealth. However, the capital of the impresario who hires the singers and sells their services to the dressmakers, is increased by his appropriation of surplus labor time of the performing artists.

Thus, all that is involved here is a distribution of already-existing incomes. The increase in the impresario's capital has not come from a productive activity which has materially transformed nature. A portion of the dressmaker's income is transformed into (1) the incomes of the artists for services rendered, and (2) the profit of the impresario.

Contrast the process described above with that of material production—let us say, dressmaking. The dress manufacturer purchases labor power, which, on being employed, produces value greater than itself. The source of the dressmaking employer's profit, then, is not other people's incomes, but the unpaid labor of the dressmaker materialized in the form of commodities.

SPECIAL CATEGORIES OF INTELLECTUAL LABOR

There now remain several categories of intellectual labor which warrant further consideration. Is it correct to exclude all mental labor from the category of productive work? Definitely not. The productive work in a factory is collective in character. All manual labor requires some mental operations; such mental operations form an integral part of production. The increasing separation of functions between mental and manual labor, which derives from the peculiar division of labor characteristic of capitalist production, does not in any way invalidate this fact.

The following quotation from Marx makes clear that some engineers may be productive workers:

The workers that are the foremen of those workers who are directly involved in manufacture, are a step further removed; the engineer has another relationship again and works mainly only with his head, etc. But the totality of these workers, who possess labor powers of various values, produces the result which, considering the result of the labor process by itself, is expressed in commodities or a material product, and all together, as workers, are the living production machines of these products in that, considering the production process as a whole, they exchange their labor for capital and reproduce the money of the capitalist as capital, that is as value realized, as increasing value. For it is the very

peculiarity of the capitalist mode of production to divide and assign to different people the various kinds of labor, including therefore mental and manual labor, or labor in which the one or the other predominates. This, of course does not prevent the material product from being the common product of these people or materializing their common product in material wealth. Nor, on the other hand, does it at all prevent or change anything in the fact that the relationship of each of these persons is that of the wage worker to capital and in this outstanding sense that of the productive worker. All these persons are not only directly concerned in the production of material wealth, they exchange their labor directly for money as capital and thus reproduce directly, not only their wages, but surplus value for the capitalist. Their labor consists of paid labor plus unpaid surplus labor.*

In addition to those engineers who are employed in a factory and whose mental labor is an organic part of the process of material production, clerks, inventory clerks—as distinct from those clerks whose labor is engaged solely in the sphere of circulation—are productive workers, since they participate in the material transformation of nature. In general, all mental labors which enter directly into production and are actually materialized in the product, constitute productive labors.

Scientists who are engaged in theoretical research, on the other hand, must be considered non-productive

workers, although their work may be extraordinarily useful and important. The results of the work of theoretical research scientists and of experimental inventors may ultimately effect an increase in production and an increase in the surplus value appropriated by the capitalist class. Their work, however, is not directly involved in the material production of commodities. This holds true for laboratory technicians engaged in experimental work, even if they are employed by an industrial capitalist. They do not increase the total of values in society; their endeavors may lead to that result, but they do not participate in actual production.

Of course, it goes almost without saying that wage workers are exploited even though they may not be productive workers. Whether productive or not, all wage workers work longer than the labor time required to reproduce the value of their labor power, their surplus labor is converted into capital and they are therefore exploited.

PRODUCTION OF LABOR POWER

Some intellectual labor is involved in the production of that special commodity, labor power. An example would be that of teachers, who help students gain a knowledge of some skill. Is such labor productive? Obviously not.

Labor power is a commodity, but its peculiarity consists in the fact that

* *Ibid.*, pp. 426-27.

it is the only commodity whose consumption — which is labor — entails the production of all other commodities. An increase in the quantity or quality of the commodity labor power does not itself increase the material values of the nation, although such increase in the quantity and quality of labor power may lead to an increase in the nation's commodities. The teacher who imparts skill to a student and actually participates in creating labor power of a specific type is aiding in the creation of labor power which may or may not be utilized in whole or in part. Capitalists are not one whit the richer by the increase in quantity and quality of labor power if this labor power is not put to use. The reader may spend the rest of his or her life learning how to be an engineer, machinist, sailor, cabinet maker, upholsterer, or learning a dozen other trades and professions, but the act of creating such knowledge, no less that that of the mere possession of such labor power, in no way directly increases the wealth of the capitalist class.

But not only has no value or surplus value been created by the teacher or acquired by the student: there has been, in reality, a *consumption* of existing values. The very act of producing labor power necessitates consumption—non-productive consumption. However indispensable such training may be, in part or in whole, it is non-productive.

A QUESTION OF PRACTICAL IMPORTANCE

As a summary, we restate the basic theoretical principles which serve as the criteria for determining the productive character of labor in capitalist society: To be productive labor, (1) the labor must be involved in the production of useful things resulting from a direct relation between man and nature; (2) the products must appear in the form of commodities, for capitalism is predominantly a commodity-producing system; and (3) the labor must be wage labor employed by capitalists for the purpose of creating and expanding surplus value, for capitalism is a system of production of commodities for profit. This is what is implied in Marx's definition that "only labor which produces capital is productive labor."

The theoretical determination of the Marxian distinction between productive and non-productive labor, which, of course, assumes a qualitatively different significance under Socialist relations of production, is a question of substantial practical importance for the planned economies of the U.S.S.R. and the People's Democracies. A thoroughly scientific inventory of national productive resources and capacity, as a basis for setting the goals of the economic plan, must of necessity include a scientific breakdown of all categories of labor power. It is impossible to estimate anticipated national income

without such an inventory of labor power and determination of the magnitude of productive labor available, as well as labor in services, etc.

Thus, the above-mentioned article by Hilary Minc makes clear that the distinction between the different categories of labor is essential in determining the national income of the new Poland. This distinction is just as important in determining which sectors of the economy are fundamental and which are secondary, which non-productive laborers are necessary, and how to allocate the national income between the productive and non-productive enterprises.

For us, also, the Marxian distinction between productive and non-productive labor holds more than general theoretical interest. It provides us with a more basic, scientific view of the working class in its relation to production. It is indispensable in determining the rate of exploitation (the rate of surplus value), and the extent and distribution of the national income. An understanding of the different categories of labor, furthermore, sheds additional light on

the theoretical basis of the industrial concentration policy of the Communist Party. It becomes clearer that it is necessary for the vanguard Party of the working class to concentrate on sinking its roots among productive workers, particularly in the basic, mass-production industries, while extending its influence over all sections of the working class, including productive workers in light industry and workers in necessary and useful, though non-productive occupations in the services, in circulation, in the professions and in mental production. We have made clear the Marxian position that non-productive wage workers, both manual and intellectual, are also exploited by the capitalist class, and form an integral part of the working class. As such, all workers by hand or brain must be won to recognize the Marxist-Leninist Party as their political leader. Nevertheless, because of their position in capitalist production, and therefore in capitalist society generally, productive workers, particularly in basic, mass-production industry, constitute the main concentration of the Party of Socialism.

FAC

by Ro

Labor
Res
Pub
\$2.0

The
presen
coveri
tailed
numbe
labor
chief
1947-4
month
Mar
course
in per
ment
rial ha
and or
a limi
data.

Like
this ve
handbo
ested i
the ge
labor
analyse
contract
An i
nature
cated

Book Review

FACTS THAT ARM THE WORKERS

by Robert Hood

Labor Fact Book 9. Prepared by Labor Research Association. International Publishers, New York, 1949, 191 pp., \$2.00.

The Labor Research Association has presented us with a new fact book covering a prodigious amount of detailed research work. Based on a large number of government, industrial and labor sources, this volume presents the chief economic and labor events of 1947-48, as well as those of the first months of 1949.

Many of the individual items, of course, have appeared in the daily press, in periodical literature, and in government publications. But here the material has been carefully sifted, abstracted and organized, thereby bringing within a limited space a wealth of valuable data.

Like the previous Labor Fact Books, this volume is an absolutely necessary handbook for everyone active or interested in the labor movement, as well as the general student of economic and labor affairs. Many of the data and analyses serve to illustrate some of the contradictions of capitalism.

An important comment on the hollow nature of postwar "prosperity" is indicated in the chapter on Economic

Trends, where it is shown that, while during 1947 and part of 1948 the value of the national gross product in the U.S. rose about 8 percent, the actual rise in physical volume of the goods produced was probably less than 3 percent. Moreover, since the population during that period grew about 3 percent, the actual per capita amount of goods produced remained at best the same and probably declined slightly.

Furthermore, the worsening position of the mass of consumers is indicated by the fact that, while before the war nearly 75 percent of the national output had gone into consumption (of all classes), by 1948 this had fallen to less than 70 percent, the lowest "in any peace-time year for which statistics are available," as the Economic Report of the President pointed out in January 1949. Since 1945, real wages have declined by more than 9 percent for single men and 11 percent for married men with three dependents. As a result of this whole development, a decline of savings and an increase of credit buying by the lower-income groups has taken place. Consumer credit outstanding rose from \$8 billion in 1939 to \$16 billion in 1948, of which about half were installment credits. These are some of the elements tending to show that

underneath the so-called postwar prosperity the economic crisis was already setting in.

• • •

The concentration of wealth is documented in Chapter II, by the table of corporate profits for the years 1929 through 1948. Corporate profits reached \$12.8 billion in 1946, \$18.1 billion in 1947 and an all-time high of \$20.1 billion in 1948. (The 1948 figure is corrected on the basis of estimates in the Midyear Economic Report of the President.) This chapter also contains important data on the centralization of capital through the growth of large corporations and the swallowing-up of smaller firms by means of mergers and other corporate forms of absorption, thus documenting another aspect of the Marxist analysis of capitalist accumulation.

The volume also exposes one of the myths widely propagated by the N.A.M., bourgeois liberals and Social-Democrats anent the "growing democratization" of capital, by proving the narrowness of effective stock ownership in corporations. Only some 75,000 people own half of the stock of the country, while some 60 percent of all the dividends were paid to only 1 percent of the total families or individuals.

• • •

Some economic aspects of the imperialist stage of capitalism are brought out in the section of the book dealing with American foreign investments, which rose by 1949 to an all-time high of over \$30 billion (\$17.4 private, \$12.8 government). The qualitative change in U.S. foreign investments in the post-

war period is also emphasized, namely, the tendency to substitute for the less secure prewar loans to foreign governments, more profitable direct investments in foreign productive enterprises. The security of these enterprises is guaranteed by new treaties and by American economic and military missions, as well as by American military control of foreign governments.

The sections on Truman's "Bold, New Program" and the current budget show the cost of the cold war to the American taxpayer. Thus, while in the fiscal year 1941 about 61 percent of the Federal budget went for war (past, present and future), in 1950 it will reach more than 78 percent of the total budget.

And while in 1939 individuals with a net annual income of less than \$5,000 paid less than 10 percent of the total income taxes, in 1948 they paid more than 50 percent. This meant an increase of 400 percent, while the percentage paid by the big income brackets decreased by more than 44 percent during the same period. The tax law of 1948 shifted the proportion of this burden still further onto the low income brackets.

• • •

In analyzing the conditions of the workers, the Fact Book points out that half the families in the United States had annual incomes of less than \$4,530 in 1947, while more than a third had incomes of less than \$2,000 (and 14 percent received less than \$1,000). At the same time, the Heller family budget called for nearly \$4,000 as being necessary to sustain a family of four in moderate conditions.

The
table
work
by di
by th
shows
real v
clined
has d
mean
absolu
growi
creasi
going
equip
into w
const
capital
of V,
a verif
genera
ishmen

The
velopm
growth
rent ec
Book r
decepti
comes t
1949 th
risen to
has sinc
In th
there a
importa
with ho
needs, i
the spe
people,
workers
ers—all
tensity c

The Labor Fact Book has an original table on the "relative position" of the worker in manufacturing. It is obtained by dividing the real wages per worker by the output per worker. The table shows that since 1939 the ratio between real wages and output per worker declined 3.5 percent, and since 1899 it has dropped 34 percent. This does not mean that real wages have dropped absolutely by 34 percent, but that a growing relative proportion of the increasing productivity of labor has been going into building new plants and equipment, and relatively less and less into wages. It is an expression of the constantly heightening composition of capital—the growth of C at the expense of V, according to Marx. Here we have a verification of the Marxian absolute general law of the growing impoverishment of the working class.

* * *

The main factor reflecting the development of economic crises is the growth of unemployment. For the current economic situation, the Labor Fact Book makes a critical analysis of the deceptive government statistics and comes to the conclusion that by March 1949 the number of unemployed had risen to about 5 million, a figure which has since increased by at least a million.

In the chapter on Labor Conditions there are also many facts of special importance to trade unionists dealing with hours of work, speed-up, housing needs, industrial diseases and accidents, the special exploitation of the Negro people, the conditions of white-collar workers and of women and child workers—all indicating the extent and intensity of capitalist exploitation.

With the developing contradictions of capitalism and the growing portents of both a huge internal and world-wide capitalist crisis, the monopoly-dominated government is resorting to growing attacks on the living standards, the gains of labor, and the people's democratic rights. In order to frustrate the resistance of the working class and its allies to the bipartisan program for war and fascism, the state power of the capitalist class intensifies the corruption of top leaders in the labor movement and launches an internal "cold war" against all forces of democracy and peace. This internal cold war, which is aimed to cripple the trade unions, if not destroy them outright, by means of the Taft-Hartley Law, the growing strike-breaking by injunction, and government "seizure," is discussed in this volume. *Labor Fact Book* 9 has much valuable material on these aspects of this crucial struggle. In the extensive chapter on Trade Union Trends, the section dealing with the C.I.O. and the A. F. of L. Conventions of 1947 and 1948 indicates clearly how far most of the labor bureaucracy has come under the domination of American imperialism.

* * *

One of the most important and the longest chapter in the book is the one dealing with the struggle for civil rights. Here a detailed account is given of the various attempts to suppress those who have refused to approve the new reactionary offensive of Big Business. It describes the activities of the Un-American Committee, the various contempt cases arising out of them, and the growth of "loyalty" thought-control tests and purges. The deportation de-

lirium, the Mundt Bill, the various forms of discrimination against the Negro people, the frame-up of the Trenton Six, the Ingram Case, and the attacks on academic freedom are also studied at some length.

Labor Fact Book 9 devotes a special section to the grotesque frame-up of the 12 Communist leaders, and shows its crucial significance to the working class and all democratic forces. The book exposes the hollowness and frame-up character of the indictment, the rigged jury system and the general nature of the trial as a fascist-like, thought-control, heresy-hunting conspiracy against the Bill of Rights and the constitutional liberties of the American people.

In addition to this account of all these reactionary activities, the book also brings out the struggle of sections of the American people against this ultra-reactionary offer. . . . The chapter on political action analyzes the role and development of the Progressive Party and of the Communist Party in the 1948 elections. It describes the determined struggle of some of the unions within the C.I.O. against the sell-out of the workers' interests, the struggles of the Negro people against their exploiters and oppressors, the new forms

of solidarity of farmers and workers and the progressive activities of various professional groups. And, finally, it brings out the courageous stand of the Communists in exposing the aims of world domination of U.S. imperialism and in defending the rights of the masses.

On the international labor scene, the *Labor Fact Book* provides pertinent data on the W.F.T.U. It shows that the W.F.T.U. has maintained and strengthened itself despite all efforts of the C.I.O. misleaders to wreck it; and it gives an account of the tremendous growth and the expansion of the activities of the W.F.T.U., particularly in the new People's Democracies of Eastern and Central Europe. It also contains an informative section on the trade unions in free China.

Thus, *Labor Fact Book 9* not only presents information on vital aspects of the American economy and the American labor movement, but also gives us the ideological weapons which we can and must use in the crucial struggle to preserve, unite and strengthen the trade unions and to weld the democratic forces of the people in a united front of struggle against fascism and war.

Recent NEW CENTURY Titles

IN DEFENSE OF YOUR FREEDOM <i>by Eugene Dennis</i>	\$.15
IN DEFENSE OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY <i>by William Z. Foster</i>	.15
VERDICT AGAINST FREEDOM <i>by Joseph North</i>	.03
THE ECONOMIC CRISIS AND THE "COLD WAR" <i>edited by James S. Allen and Doxey A. Wilkerson</i>	1.00
WHY DEFEND THE RIGHTS OF COMMUNISTS? <i>by Herbert Aptheker</i>	.02
THE RECORD OF TRUMAN'S 81 ST CONGRESS <i>by Rob Fowler Hall</i>	.05
A NEW DEPRESSION? <i>by Bernard Burton</i>	.05
A TALE OF TWO WORKERS <i>by D. Engelstein and Carl Hirsh</i>	.05
MUST WE PERISH? <i>by Hershel D. Meyer</i>	1.00
STOOLPIGEON <i>by Elizabeth Gurley Flynn</i>	.05
THE CASE FOR THE COMMUNIST PARTY <i>by Eugene Dennis</i>	.10
LABOR'S OWN — WILLIAM Z. FOSTER <i>by Elizabeth Gurley Flynn</i>	.15

New Century Publishers

832 Broadway, New York 3, N. Y.

Miscellany of New Books

AMERICAN CAPITALISM: 1607-1800

By Anna Rochester

The author of *Rulers of America* and *The Nature of Capitalism* presents a vivid account of American capitalism in its early stages, tracing its roots in colonial and revolutionary times through the first two centuries of American history, and revealing the economic basis of the Revolution and its effect on the industrial and financial development of the young nation.

Paper \$.75; cloth \$1.50

THE COMMUNIST TRIAL: An American Crossroads

By George Marion

An effective and dramatic exposure of the stoolpigeon character of the government's "case" in the trial of the eleven national leaders of the Communist Party, this brilliant study by the author of *Bases and Empire*, thoroughly documented and basing itself on the verbatim court record of the trial, brings out the virulent bias and prejudice of Judge Medina and his role in the conviction of the defendants.

Paper \$1.25; cloth \$3.00

STUDIES IN ANCIENT GREEK SOCIETY

By George Thomson

An authoritative study of the social and economic organization, ethnology, religion and poetry of early Greece. It includes a discussion of Greek tribal society, the transition from tribe to state, the system of land tenure and formation of towns, and the early matriarchal peoples and deities of the Aegean. \$10.00

NEW CENTURY PUBLISHERS

832 Broadway, New York 3, N. Y.

KS

800

Capit-
early
rough
g the
istrial

\$1.50

char-
en na-
by the
basing
ut the
ole in
\$3.00

ganiza-
cludes a
ribe to
ns, and
\$10.00