

Star

Political affairs

DECEMBER 1949 • 25 CENTS

LIBRARY
DEC 27 1949
DARTMOUTH COLLEGE



"The Lenin of Today"
FIFTIETH BIRTHDAY OF J. V. STALIN

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

C O N T E N T S

Stalin: On His Seventieth Birthday *Alexander Bittelman*

Stalin: The Lenin of Today

United Front Is the Key to Victory Over Reaction *Gus Hall*

The C.I.O. Convention and the Struggle for Labor Unity *Sid Stein*

New York's 1949 Elections *Lillian Gates*

Despotism and Deportation *Beatrice Siskind*

Against Reformist Tendencies In Works On Imperialism *Eugene Varga*

BOOK REVIEW

The Tito-Rajk Conspiracy Against the Camp of
Peace and Democracy *Zoltan Deak*

Index, 1949

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.

by Alex

ON DECE
70 years
the work
allies, wh
celebrate
It will
overwhel
a histori
dreds of
out the v
belief a
cause, in
will exp
the victo
democrat
the Soviet
They w
mination
Stalin's
out so c
progress
culty in
greatness
more th
voted, w
cause of
the cau
everywh
progress
To liv
to fight
work un
of his to

Stalin: On His Seventieth Birthday

by Alexander Bittelman

ON DECEMBER 21, 1949, Stalin will be 70 years old; and all over the world, the working class and its progressive allies, whole peoples and nations, will celebrate in confidence and triumph.

It will be a historic moment of overwhelming significance. It will be a historic moment in which hundreds of millions of people throughout the world will demonstrate their belief and confidence in Stalin's cause, in Stalin's leadership. They will express their undying faith in the victory of the camp of peace, democracy and Socialism, headed by the Soviet Union and led by Stalin. They will express their firm determination to bring this victory about.

Stalin's greatness and genius stand out so clearly and beautifully that progressive humanity has no difficulty in recognizing them. Stalin's greatness is Stalin's life, of which more than fifty years have been devoted, wholly and completely, to the cause of the Socialist revolution, to the cause of all working people everywhere, to the cause of human progress and happiness.

To live with Stalin in one age, to fight with him in one cause, to work under the inspiring guidance of his teachings is something to be

deeply proud of and thankful for, to cherish. And hundreds of millions in all parts of the world will joyfully celebrate this fact on Stalin's seventieth birthday and will send him heartfelt wishes for many and many happy returns.

WHAT STALIN MEANS TO THE WORLD

What Stalin means to the world is what the Great October Socialist Revolution means to the world. In that revolution, which opened up the epoch of world liberation from capitalism and imperialist oppression, from class exploitation and national oppression, Stalin was Lenin's most faithful comrade and closest collaborator. Together with Lenin, he built the glorious Bolshevik Party, organized and led the October Revolution, organized and led, under Lenin's guidance, the victories of the Red Army against the landlord-capitalist White Guard armies and against the foreign invaders of the imperialist interventionists.

As we recognize that the October Revolution blazed the path of liberation for mankind from the horrors of imperialism, of dying capitalism,

pointing the way to humanity's Socialist future, we also recognize that together with Lenin, Stalin has led the historic struggles which brought about these tremendous transformations. And hundreds of millions of people everywhere are profoundly grateful to Stalin for this achievement.

We know from their leader, Mao Tse-tung, that the people of China feel that way. They know that the victory of the Chinese revolution in 1949 was made possible by the victory of the October Revolution in 1917. We also know that the peoples of the European New Democracies feel that way because they realize that the existence and the aid of the Soviet Union, the child of the Great October Socialist Revolution, made possible their victory in the struggle against the fascist invaders, against feudalism, imperialism and capitalism. Increasing millions among the working people of all capitalist countries and the oppressed nations and peoples feel the same way because they see in the October Revolution and in Stalin's leadership the path to their own liberation, the main highway to their own happy future.

And we know full well how the Soviet people feel about their October Revolution and Stalin. They have demonstrated their pride, joy, gratitude and confidence in deeds of heroic and transcendent scope.

This is what the October Revolution has meant to the world. This,

therefore, is what Stalin means to the world.

After Lenin's death, Stalin has led the Bolshevik Party in the building and to the victory of Socialism in the Soviet Union, and is leading in its development to Communism. To the world this is a conclusive demonstration that Socialism is possible, that it is no mere dream or utopia, that it is realizable, that it has been realized in a country occupying one-sixth of the globe, the home of many nations and peoples, populated by nearly 200 million human beings. To the world this was a conclusive demonstration that, having won in the Soviet Union, Socialism is bound to win in the rest of the world.

Life itself is brilliantly demonstrating these conclusions. A large part of Europe is now in transition to Socialism aided by and learning from the Soviet Union and Stalin. In another part of Europe—in the West—the working classes, headed by their respective Communist Parties, are fighting to create the conditions for the transition to socialism, as they achieve victory in the current historic struggles for peace, against fascism, for democracy. China is seeing clearly its socialist perspective and is deliberately moving toward it. Socialist ideas and sympathies are growing in the United States and other parts of the world as ever larger masses become aroused against capitalism and imperialist oppression, and become convinced from the achievements of the Soviet

Union possible

The more t in the abolition man an means crises means ing sta ple, con true de people is that workin ineviab

This world.

Stalin against cal, m nifican struggl militar in this

camp cialism great h of fasc Wall S

Stalin over t nese r is ind and m everyw manity forces titanic from

Union that Socialism is practical and possible.

The masses here are learning ever more that the victory of Socialism in the Soviet Union means the total abolition of exploitation of man by man and nation by nation; that it means the elimination of economic crises and unemployment; that it means a guaranteed continually rising standard of living for the people, complete economic security and true democracy for the people, of the people and by the people. And this it is that strengthens the faith of the working people everywhere in the inevitable triumph of Socialism.

This is what Stalin means to the world.

Stalin's leadership in the fight against fascism—ideological, political, military—is of tremendous significance. His leadership in this struggle was decisive in the historic military victories. His leadership in this struggle is now helping the camp of peace, democracy and Socialism to advance—and win—the great battle against the new dangers of fascism and war emanating from Wall Street and its allies.

Stalin's leadership in the victory over the Nazis, fascists and Japanese militarists in World War II is indelibly inscribed in the hearts and minds of the masses of the people everywhere, of all progressive humanity. Leading the Soviet armed forces and the Soviet people in the titanic struggle to save the world from fascist slavery, Stalin has led

in saving the future of mankind, the entire course of human progress.

It was Stalin's wise and tested leadership that defeated the Munich conspirators and thus defeated the criminal plans of the monopolists of Britain, France and the United States to join with Hitler-Germany in turning the full fury of the fascist aggressors against the Soviet Union and against the whole of progressive humanity. It was again Stalin's wise and tested leadership that helped bring about the war coalition of the Soviet Union, Great Britain and the United States against the fascist aggressors.

When we think of Marshal Stalin and of Generalissimo Stalin we think of the glorious victories of the Soviet Army—of Stalingrad. We think of the victory of the anti-Nazi war coalition which saved the world from Hitler.

This is what Stalin means to the world.

Stalin's leadership in the fight for peace is another aspect of his life, another significant aspect of his meaning to the world.

Informed people are well aware by this time that from its very inception the Soviet Union has waged a consistent fight for world peace. The October Revolution itself took place under the banner of the struggle for peace. At different times, it applied different forms and methods of struggle, but the U.S.S.R. always fought for peace.

Together with Lenin, Stalin

worked for and led in this cause of world peace, and after Lenin's death, Stalin has unswervingly further developed this struggle. Led by Stalin, the Soviet Union always sought normal and peaceful trade and diplomatic relations with all capitalist countries willing to enter into and honestly maintain such relations on the basis of equality. Led by Stalin, after Lenin's death, the Soviet Union consistently advocated, and championed, and realized on its own territories, the principles of national equality, mutual help and fraternity of peoples.

Beginning with the October Revolution, the Soviet State fought for the prevention of World War II. After Lenin's death, Stalin led this historic struggle to save humanity from the misfortunes and sufferings of a second world war, the danger of which was continually being sharpened by the intensification of the contradictions of dying capitalism throughout the period from 1917 to 1939. When, despite the peace struggles of the Soviet Union, leading all peace-loving forces of the world, World War II came upon us, the Soviet Union continued to lead the fight for peace by its leadership in the struggle to destroy Nazi-fascism, since without this no peace was possible. Stalin led in this historic fight.

Stalin continues to lead the fight for peace. While World War II was still on, he advocated the maintenance of the anti-Nazi war coal-

tion for the maintenance and strengthening of world peace after victory. Following the unfoldment of Wall Street's aggressive expansionism, its drive for world domination and the preparations of American imperialism for a new world war, the Soviet Union has assumed leadership in the struggles waged by the world camp of peace, democracy and Socialism to check and defeat the plans of the warmongers for a new world war. This is Stalin's policy—the policy of the Bolshevik Party led by Stalin.

In answer to the fantastic lies that the Soviet Union is following an imperialist policy or is seeking to subordinate and exploit smaller nations, which is now peddled around by the Tito gang of fascists and Wall Street flunkeys, here is a statement of the facts as they are and their true meaning. We quote from the significant report of G. M. Malenkov at the meeting of the Moscow Soviet on the occasion of the 32nd Anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution, November 6, 1949:

Our peace policy arises from the very foundations of our Socialist system and from the interests of the Soviet people. Having completely abolished in our country the age-old exploitation of man by man, we have eliminated the reasons and conditions which, in the capitalist world, give rise to the policy of exploiting and enslaving other peoples.

Having created a model of fraternal cooperation among peoples of different races and nationalities, unparalleled in human history, we have abolished for-

ever the
one Sta
States

A po
principl
sovereig
us. A S
eign ex
nial sei
tem has
to econ
rulers
seek to
gamble

Impe
tary ve
ful com
is quit
promise
disaster
The
ful com
why th
stand fo
convinc
of their

This
Soviet
given
peacefu
tems-
and of
compel
Stali
camp
cialism
peace,
ing in
whose
from
Ameri
leash a

ever the policy of basing the welfare of one State on the suppression of other States.

A policy, which has as its guiding principle the suppression of the national sovereignty of other peoples, is alien to us. A Socialist State does not need foreign expansion. It does not need colonial seizures. The Soviet Socialist system has uprooted the causes giving rise to economic crises, from which the rulers of the capitalist world usually seek to escape along the road of military gambles.

Imperialists pin their hopes on military ventures because they fear peaceful competition with Socialism. But it is quite clear that military gambles promise the imperialists nothing but disaster.

The Soviet people do not fear peaceful competition with capitalism. That is why they are against a new war and stand for peace, although they are firmly convinced and are absolutely confident of their invincible strength.

This is the voice of peace—the Soviet voice that has repeatedly given expression to the idea of the peaceful co-existence of the two systems—Socialism and capitalism—and of the desirability of peaceful competition between them.

Stalin stands for leadership of the camp of peace, democracy and Socialism—the camp that fights for peace, the camp that is daily growing in power and influence, the camp whose mission it is to save humanity from a third world war, which American imperialism seeks to unleash and for which it is preparing.

And this, too, is what Stalin means to the world.

WHAT STALIN MEANS TO THE INTERNATIONAL WORKING-CLASS MOVEMENT AND TO THE COLONIAL LIBERATION MOVEMENTS

After Lenin, Stalin is the teacher and leader of the international working-class movement and the colonial liberation movement.

Proletarian internationalism is with Stalin, as with Marx, Engels and Lenin, the very soul of his teachings and leadership. It was so from the very outset of Stalin's political and ideological life.

Together with Lenin, he built and guided the Communist International which played such an important role in helping the advanced sections of the working class in various countries to grow and mature into influential Marxist-Leninist political parties of the working class. It was only when the Communist International had fulfilled its historic mission that it decided to dissolve.

The Communist International rallied world support for the magnificent struggle of the Spanish people against Franco and his Nazi-fascist masters. It rendered historic service in the liberation struggles of the Chinese people and in defense of the Ethiopian people.

Stalin has continued, after Lenin,

and developed further, the world-liberating theory of Marxism-Leninism. Like Lenin, Stalin further developed the teachings of Marx and Engels, not as a dogma, but as a living, growing and creative theory guiding and directing the liberation struggles of the masses from class exploitation and national oppression.

Stalin's leadership in the fight for the building of Socialism in the Soviet Union was first of all a historic theoretical fight for the Leninist principle which demonstrates the possibility of the victory of Socialism in one country. In this tremendous struggle, the Bolshevik Party, led by Stalin, had to defeat the Trotskyites, Zinovievites and Bukharinists, who sought to undermine the faith of the working class and of the Soviet people in the possibility of the victory of Socialism in the Soviet Union. Without victory in this fight for the principles of Leninism, there could have been no victory of Socialism in the Soviet Union.

In successfully defending Lenin's great theory of the possibility of the victory of Socialism in one country, and thus organizing the victory of Socialism in the Soviet Union, Stalin has elaborated this theory and rendered it further concrete. As a result, the international working-class movement has received a powerful theoretical weapon creatively guiding the building of Socialism in every country where objective conditions and the readiness of the peo-

ple make this the immediate practical task.

Stalin's theoretical contributions to the upbuilding and development of the Marxist-Leninist teachings on the national and colonial questions are a monument of Marxist-Leninist theory. We learn from his biography that as far back as 1904, as a young man of 25, basing himself on his rich experience in the revolutionary struggle in multi-national Transcaucasia, Stalin gave a brilliant explanation of the Bolshevik Party's position on the national question, developing especially the proposition on the right of nations to self-determination.

Developing the theoretical and ideological foundations for the struggle against all forms of national oppression, for equality of nations, for their unqualified right to self-determination, Stalin taught the international working-class movement to fight consistently against bourgeois nationalism and chauvinism, for proletarian internationalism, for the international unity of all working people.

One of the most outstanding aspects of Stalin's contribution on this question is his lesson that in our epoch the national and colonial questions have become linked inextricably, that the fight for national and colonial liberation is a fight for the overthrow of imperialism. From this Stalin developed the conclusion that the national and colonial question is a question of the reserves and al-

lies of
tarian
the p
port t
ments
nation
mover
throw
ism.

And
Stalin
cialist
tives o
Social
develo
theory
further
oretical

Basin
the na
Union
featur
duced
and th
Soviet
theory
tions.

der th
rise o
differ
geois
the p
of nat
victor
and, s
tions
guage
nism

Th
class

lies of the proletariat in the proletarian revolution; that, consequently, the proletariat must actively support the national liberation movements of oppressed and dependent nations and ally itself with these movements in the fight for the overthrow of imperialism and capitalism.

Another outstanding aspect is the Stalin theory on bourgeois and socialist nations and on the perspectives of national developments under Socialism. This constitutes a further development of the Marxist-Leninist theory on the national question, a further development of Stalin's theoretical leadership in this field.

Basing himself on the solution of the national question in the Soviet Union and analyzing all the new features in national relations introduced by the October Revolution and the building of Socialism in the Soviet Union, Stalin establishes the theory on bourgeois and socialist nations. He analyzes the new foundations of national development under the Soviet system, showing the rise of new, socialist nations which differ basically from the old, bourgeois nations. Finally, he opens up the perspective of the development of nations in the course—first, of the victory of Socialism in one country and, secondly, of the merger of nations and national cultures and languages after the victory of Communism in the whole world.

Thus, the international working-class movement and the national lib-

eration movements have received a mighty theoretical weapon—forged by Stalin in further developing Marxism-Leninism—for the fight against national oppression, for national freedom, for the alliance of the proletarian revolution and national liberation movements against imperialism, for guiding the development of socialist nations in the building of Socialism, for proletarian internationalism against bourgeois nationalism, cosmopolitanism and chauvinism.

Of inestimable value to the international working-class movement is Stalin's further development of the theory of the Socialist state. He naturally based himself on the tremendous experiences of the Soviet Socialist state co-existing with the capitalist world for a long time. He formulated the functions and role of the Socialist state at various stages of its development and under the changing conditions, emphasizing the nature of the socialist state as the highest form of democracy. He answered the question of whether the socialist state will disappear after the socialist country enters the higher phase of Communism by demonstrating that the socialist state will have to be preserved and strengthened under Communism so long as there exists and persists a capitalist environment and encirclement.

Thus, the international working-class movement has acquired a mighty theoretical weapon, ham-

mered out by Stalin on the basis of Marxism-Leninism, in the struggle for the proletarian dictatorship and in the building of the Socialist state under varying and different conditions.

A theoretical contribution of Stalin which, like the *Foundations of Leninism* and his other theoretical works, ranks with the fundamental theoretical and philosophical works of Marx, Engels and Lenin is the *History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union*. The *History* is a fountain-head of Marxist-Leninist knowledge—theory, ideology, strategy, tactics, principles of organization. It is a guide to Marxist-Leninist action. It embodies the theoretical and programmatic positions of Marxism-Leninism.

Of particular importance in this work is Stalin's treatment of dialectical and historical materialism. It is a masterly exposition of the theoretical and philosophical positions of Marxism-Leninism, coming from a many-sided people's leader of genius—political, economic, state-building, strategic, tactical, military, organizational, theoretical, philosophical. Because of this fact, Stalin's work raises dialectical materialism to a new and high level, to the highest point of Marxist-Leninist philosophical thought.

Exceptionally fruitful are Stalin's political conclusions from the application of the Marxist-Leninist philosophy and the principles of its world outlook to the study of the

laws of social development. The reader familiar with this work will recall with pleasure and gratitude some of these political conclusions, such as: to avoid mistakes in policy, one must look forward, not backward; one must be a revolutionist, not a reformist; one must follow and practice the policy of class struggle in all fields, not of class collaboration; one must base oneself, not on "abstract principles of human reason," but on the laws of social development, on the laws of the economic development of society.

Together with Lenin, Stalin created and built the Bolshevik Party, the party of a new type. Developing further the Marxist-Leninist theory of the party, Stalin demonstrated the objective need for and the nature of the party of a new type, without which the proletariat cannot liberate itself from capitalism. In the *History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union*, Stalin writes:

The history of the Party teaches us first of all, that the victory of the proletarian revolution, the victory of the dictatorship of the proletariat, is impossible without a revolutionary party of the proletariat, a party free from opportunism, irreconcilable toward compromisers and capitulators, and revolutionary in its attitude toward the bourgeoisie and the state power (page 353).

Stalin's famous work on the Bolshevization of the Communist Parties, published in 1925, is one of the

greater
ing
this v
gle a
all bo
ing c
forms
munis
of "s
(not
ism),
contact
confus

On
the m
follow

The
that u
the ma
ens th
how t
masses
needs,
teach
masses
not be
ing th
the la
C.P.S.

The
revolu
parties
tive M
streng
and p
knowi
mocr
and al
ist inf
race s
preme

greatest contributions to Party building everywhere. Most significant in this work is the guide to the struggle against Social-Democratism and all bourgeois influences in the working class, the struggle against all forms of opportunism in the Communist parties, the dialectical unity of "supreme fidelity to principle (not to be confused with sectarianism), with maximum connection and contact with the masses (not to be confused with tailism)," etc., etc.

On the relation of the Party with the masses, Stalin formulated the following fundamental proposition:

The history of the Party teaches us that unless it has wide connections with the masses, unless it constantly strengthens these connections, unless it knows how to hearken to the voice of the masses and understand their urgent needs, unless it is prepared not only to teach the masses but to learn from the masses, a party of the working class cannot be a real mass party capable of leading the working class millions and all the laboring people (*History of the C.P.S.U.*, page 362).

The guide to the building of true, revolutionary, working-class parties, parties of the masses, practicing creative Marxism; able to maintain and strengthen the bonds with their class and people under all conditions; knowing how to fight Social-Democratism, bourgeois nationalism and all other bourgeois and imperialist influences—white chauvinism and race supremacy; able to combine supreme devotion to principle with

maximum connections with the masses; consistent and faithful to the cause of proletarian internationalism; irreconcilable to departures and deviations from Marxism-Leninism in the ranks of the Communist Parties: an ideological guide to the building of these parties of a new type—this is what Stalin means to the international working-class movement.

To the international working-class movement and to the national liberation movements, Stalin and his teachings show the way to victory over imperialism, fascism, capitalism—to peace, democracy, national equality and Socialism.

STALIN AND THE PROBLEMS OF THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

To the American people Stalin means, naturally, what he means to the world, to the international working-class movement and to the national liberation movements. Yet there are a number of aspects of Stalin's life and leadership of which masses of the American people and our progressive labor movement are especially aware and appreciative.

Here one recalls immediately the famous interview with Stalin of the first American labor delegation to the Soviet Union on September 9, 1927. It was a remarkable event in many significant respects, in its content as well as form. As to the form, this was a double interview: the American labor delegation first inter-

viewed Stalin, and then Stalin interviewed the delegation. As to content, Stalin elucidated, in reply to questions by the members of the delegation, every major problem about Leninism, the nature of the Soviet State, the possibility of peaceful relations between the Soviet Union and the capitalist countries, etc., which agitated the minds of the American masses at the time. Another portion of the content contains the questions which Stalin put to the delegation, issues which have played a tremendously creative part in the rise and growth of progressive labor developments in America in subsequent years.

The first question Stalin put to the delegation was as follows:

How do you account for the small percentage of American workers organized in trade unions? I think there are about 17 million industrial workers in America (The delegates explain that there are from 18 to 19 million industrial workers). I think that about 3 millions are organized. (Delegates explain that the American Federation of Labor has a membership approximately of 3 millions, and that besides these about a half million workers are organized in other unions, so that taken together about 3½ million workers are organized). Personally, I think that the proportion of American workers organized in trade unions is very small. In the U.S.S.R. 90 percent of all the proletarians in the country are organized in trade unions.

I would like to ask the delegation whether it regards this small percentage

of organized workers as a good thing. Does not the delegation think that this small percentage is an indication of the weakness of the American proletariat and of the weakness of its weapon in the struggle against the capitalists in the economic field?

Here Stalin raised before the American working class and its labor movement one of the major problems of that time and partly also of this time: the weakness of the trade-union movement due to the small percentage of organized workers, especially to the lack of substantial trade-union organization among the industrial proletariat in the basic industries. This had a tremendous and far-reaching effect upon the thinking and actions of honest and progressive trade unionists in the United States. And it goes without saying that these effects counted very heavily in the rise of broad mass movements for the organization of the basic industries and subsequent developments.

Then Stalin asked the following questions:

Is there a system of State insurance of workers in America?

Is there State insurance against unemployment in America?

The answer of the delegates, naturally, was that there was practically nothing by way of a general system of State insurance of workers or of unemployment insurance. What there existed at the time in some

states
for
selve

By
befor
and t

the q
unsat

sions,
old a
ment

And
had t

the t
progr
union

And
this a

the t
cans

trains
ulate

influe
strugg
Feder

insura
insura
these

strugg
tensiv
of Fed

The
questi

How
a spec
Unite
Ameri
lican
But t
mass
comra

states was insignificant and was paid for mainly by the workers themselves.

By these questions, Stalin raised before the American working class and the American people in general the question of one of the most vital unsatisfied needs of the masses: pensions, insurance against sickness and old age, health insurance, unemployment insurance most particularly. And can there be any doubt that this had the most profound effect upon the thinking of many honest and progressive trade unionists and trade union leaders in the United States? And can there be any doubt that this also had a profound effect upon the thinking of progressive Americans generally? It is clear that these trains of thought suggested and stimulated by Stalin's famous questions influenced the subsequent successful struggles for the establishment of a Federal system of unemployment insurance and other forms of social insurance. The beneficial effects of these influences are felt today in the struggles of the masses for more extensive and more adequate systems of Federal insurance in all forms.

Then there was the following question by Stalin:

How do you explain the absence of a special mass workers' party in the United States? The bourgeoisie in America have two parties, the Republican party and the Democratic party. But the American workers have no mass party of their own. Do not the comrades think that the absence of such

a mass workers' party, even if it were like the British Labor party, weakens the working class in its political fight against the capitalists? Then again, why do the leaders of the labor movement in America, Green and the others, so strongly oppose the establishment of a labor party in America?

Here Stalin raised before the American working class and the American people in general another major and fundamental weakness: the absence of independent political action by the working class, the political subordination of the working class and the people generally to the bourgeoisie and its political parties. Stalin pointed to this basic weakness of the American labor movement in the form of a question as to why there was no labor party in the United States. This was in 1927. In subsequent years, the same fundamental question—*independent working-class political action in alliance with all progressive forces of the American people—confronted American labor in various forms: in the form of the creation of a Farmer-Labor party, people's coalition parties of an anti-fascist and anti-monopoly character. But the substance of the matter—the absence of independent working-class political action in alliance with all progressives—which Stalin's question dramatized so forcefully, has been and still is, though in different form and degree, a major problem facing the American working class and its allies. It still is a central issue between*

Wall Street and the people, and between the progressive and reactionary forces in the American labor movement—the issue of creating a people's anti-monopoly and anti-fascist peace coalition and of promoting the developing third-party movement based upon this people's coalition.

These questions of Stalin have naturally had a most profound effect upon the thinking of American Communists, as well as upon all Left and progressive forces in the American labor movement. And the significant contributions of the Communists, of the Lefts and of the progressives in the organization of the unorganized and in the historic struggles for independent working-class political action during the last two decades is convincing testimony of the creative and stimulating effects of Stalin's questions.

The broad masses of the American people will recall with particular warmth the years of common struggle against Nazi-fascism and Japanese militarism. They will recall the anti-Nazi war coalition, the friendship and alliance of the United States and the U.S.S.R., the cooperative relationships between Stalin and Roosevelt. And in recalling this fateful period in the life of the world and of our own country, they will once more see Stalin's greatness, appreciate his friendship for the American people, recognize his consistent urging for friendship between the United States and the Soviet Union, upon

their mutual collaboration for world peace.

Among the masses of the Negro people in the United States, Stalin will be honored for what he means to the world in general but most particularly for what he means to the oppressed races, nations and peoples. He will be honored as the greatest living champion and leader of the struggles for national equality, freedom and independence; as the greatest living champion and leader of the struggle against imperialist oppression and chauvinism, against the white chauvinist ideology of the slave market, against the contemptible and despicable ideologies of "white supremacy" and race supremacy in general.

In the same way Stalin will be honored by the Jewish masses in the United States—for his historic contributions to the solution of the national question in general and of the Jewish question in particular, for his leadership in the fight against anti-Semitism, for outlawing anti-Semitism, for full equality of rights of the Jewish masses, for his world leadership in the fight against fascism, for his leadership in the defeat and military destruction of Nazi-fascism in the last war.

In a similar way, Stalin will be honored by masses among Mexican and Puerto Rican national minorities in the United States as well as among all national groups.

For his monumental achievements and leadership in the struggle for

the c
tions
honor
can
Ar
brate
gethe
Ame
they
guar
and
speci
sify
the t

the equality and brotherhood of nations and peoples, Stalin will be honored by the masses of the American people as a whole.

American Communists will celebrate Stalin's seventieth birthday together with large masses of the American people. And in doing so, they will remember that, as the vanguard of the American working class and people, they have additional and special tasks. These are: to intensify greatly their efforts to master the theory of Marxism-Leninism, the

teachings of Stalin; to unfold more skillfully and effectively their struggle for the masses, the policy of the united and people's front against fascism and war, for peace and democracy; to give life to the Stalinist principle of—always with the masses and at the head of them; and to strengthen the Communist Party—ideologically, politically and organizationally—and to build it as a true, mass vanguard of the American working class and of the American people.

Stalin: The Lenin of Today

[The scheduled publication by International Publishers this month of Joseph Stalin: A Political Biography, which was prepared by the Marx-Engels-Lenin Institute, marks an event of exceptional political significance. This work provides a brilliant concise outline of the enormous contributions and present world role of Joseph Stalin, the titan of our epoch.]

[The political biography of Stalin should be a source of profound study in the ranks of the Communist Party. It is a book that should become the possession of every Party member and that should be accorded wide dissemination, at least among the advanced trade unionists, Negro forces, and progressives generally.]

[On the occasion of Stalin's seventieth birthday, observed and honored throughout the world, we are pleased to publish below the concluding section of this book.]

—Editor]

MILLIONS of workers from all countries look upon Stalin as their teacher, from whose classic writings they learn how to cope with the class enemy and how to pave the way for the ultimate victory of the proletariat. Stalin's influence is the influence of the great and glorious Bolshevik Party, which workers in the capitalist countries look to as a model to follow, a model of what a working-class party should be. It was under the leadership of this party that capitalism was overthrown and the power of the Soviets, the power of the working people, established; and under its leadership that socialism was built in the U.S.S.R.

The workers of all countries know that every word pronounced by

Stalin is the word of the Soviet people, and that his every word is followed by action. The triumph of the Socialist Revolution, the building of socialism in the U.S.S.R., and the victories of the Soviet people in their Patriotic War, have convinced the laboring masses of the world of the deep and vital truth of the cause of Lenin and Stalin. And today the freedom-loving peoples look upon Stalin as a loyal and staunch champion of peace and security and of democratic liberties.

* * *

Stalin is the brilliant leader and teacher of the party, the great strategist of the Socialist Revolution, military commander and guide of the Soviet state. An implacable attitude

toward the enemies of socialism, profound fidelity to principle, a combination of clear revolutionary perspective and clarity of purpose with extraordinary firmness and persistence in the pursuit of aims, wise and practical leadership and intimate contact with the masses—such are the characteristic features of Stalin's style. After Lenin, no other leader in the world has been called upon to direct such vast masses of workers and peasants. He has a unique faculty for generalizing the constructive revolutionary experience of the masses, for seizing upon and developing their initiative, for learning from the masses as well as teaching them, and for leading them forward to victory.

Stalin's whole career is an example of profound theoretical power combined with an unusual breadth and versatility of practical experience in the revolutionary struggle.

In conjunction with the tried and tested Leninists who are his immediate associates, and at the head of the great Bolshevik Party, Stalin guides the destinies of a multi-national socialist state, a state of workers and peasants for which there is no precedent in history. His advice is taken as a guide to action in all fields of socialist construction. His work is extraordinary for its variety, his energy truly amazing. The range of question which engage his attention is immense, embracing complex problems of Marxist-Lenin-

ist theory and school textbooks; problems of Soviet foreign policy and the municipal affairs of Moscow, the proletarian capital; the development of the Great Northern Sea Route and the reclamation of the Colchian marshes; the advancement of Soviet literature and art and the editing of the model rules for collective farms; and, lastly, the solution of most intricate theoretical and practical problems in the science of warfare.

Everybody is familiar with the cogent and invincible force of Stalin's logic, the crystal clarity of his mind, his iron will, his devotion to the party, his ardent faith in the people, and love for the people. Everybody is familiar with his modesty, his simplicity of manner, his consideration for people, and his merciless severity toward enemies of the people. Everybody is familiar with his intolerance of ostentation, of phrasemongers and windbags, of whiners and alarmists. Stalin is wise and deliberate in solving complex political questions where a thorough weighing of pros and cons is required. At the same time, he is a supreme master of bold revolutionary decisions and of swift adaptations to changed conditions.

Stalin is the worthy continuer of the cause of Lenin, or, as it is said in the party: Stalin is the Lenin of today.

Replying to the congratulations of public bodies and individuals on his fiftieth birthday, in 1929, Stalin

wrote: "I set down your congratulations and greetings as addressed to the great party of the working class, which begot me and reared me in its image. . . . You need have no doubt, comrades, that I am prepared in the future, too, to devote to the cause of the working class, to the cause of the proletarian revolution and world communism, all my strength, all my faculties, and, if need be, all my blood, to the very last drop."*

* * *

In the eyes of the peoples of the U.S.S.R., Stalin is the incarnation of their heroism, their love of their country, their patriotism. "For Stalin! For our country!"—it was with this cry that the valiant Soviet army demolished its malignant and treacherous enemy, fascist Germany, and hoisted the flag of victory over Berlin.

"For Stalin! For our country!"—it was with this cry that the men of the Soviet Army and Navy demolished imperialist Japan and brought security to the frontiers of the Soviet Union in the Far East.

With the name of Stalin in their hearts, the working class of the Soviet Union performed unparalleled feats of labor in the Great Patriotic War, supplying the Red Army with first-class weapons and ammunition.

With the name of Stalin in their hearts, the collective farmers toiled

devotedly in the fields to supply the Red Army and the cities with food, and industry with raw materials.

With the name of Stalin in their hearts, the Soviet intelligentsia worked with might and main in defense of their country, perfecting the weapons of the Red Army and the technique and organization of industry, and furthering Soviet science and culture.

With the name of Stalin in their hearts, the entire Soviet people are now successfully repairing the damage caused by the war and striving for a new powerful advance of the Soviet national economy and Soviet culture.

Stalin's name is a symbol of the courage and the renown of the Soviet people, and a call to heroic deeds for their great country.

Stalin's name is cherished by the boys and girls of the socialist land, the Young Pioneers. Their dearest ambition is to be like Lenin and Stalin, to be political figures of the Lenin and Stalin type. At the call of the party and Stalin, the youth of the Soviet Union have erected giant socialist industrial plants, have reared cities in the taiga, have built splendid ships, are conquering the Arctic, are mastering new methods in industry and agriculture, are strengthening the defenses of their country, and are working creatively in the sciences and the arts. At the call of the party and Stalin, they displayed exemplary heroism and courage in the battle

* *Pravda*, No. 302, Dec. 22, 1929.

fields of the Patriotic War and exemplary devotion in the rear, working for the victory of the Red Army. Fostered by Lenin and Stalin, the Young Communist League is a true aid of the Bolshevik Party, a reliable successor to the older generation of fighters for communism.

In all their many languages the peoples of the Soviet Union compose songs to Stalin expressing their boundless devotion for their great leader, teacher, friend and military commander. In the lore and art of the people, Stalin's name is ever linked with Lenin's. "We go with Stalin as with Lenin, we talk to Stalin as to Lenin; he knows all our inmost thoughts; all his life he has cared for us," runs one of the many Russian folk tales of today.

The name of Stalin is a symbol of the moral and political unity of Soviet society. With the name of Stalin,

all progressive men and women, all the peace-loving democratic nations associate their hope for lasting peace and security.

"It is our good fortune that in the trying years of the war the Red Army and the Soviet people were led forward by the wise and tested leader of the Soviet Union—the great Stalin. With the name of Generalissimo Stalin the glorious victories of our army will go down in the history of our country and in the history of the world. Under the guidance of Stalin, the great leader and organizer, we are now proceeding to peaceful constructive labors, striving to bring the forces of Socialist society to full fruition and to justify the dearest hopes of our friends all over the world."*

* V. M. Molotov, *Speech on the Twenty-Eighth Anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution*, Russian ed., pp. 18-19, 1945.

United Front Is the Key To Victory Over Reaction

by Gus Hall

[We are happy to publish the letter written by Comrade Hall, Chairman of the Communist Party in Ohio and a member of the National Committee, in reply to a number of inquiries and letters from club chairmen and section organizers of the Ohio Party organization. This letter was written in September 1949, while Comrade Hall was serving an indeterminate prison sentence vindictively meted out by Judge Medina for protesting his high-handed gag rules in the course of the trial of the eleven Communist leaders.]

[This article, in the vital questions it raises and the answers it gives, evidences the deep thinking and correct approach which went into the elaboration of the varied aspects of the subject it discusses. This fact is further emphasized by the developments in the past three months and the lessons that the entire Party is drawing from these events—among them, the lessons of the last stage of the trial of the Eleven and the bail fight, of the expulsion policy in the C.I.O., and of the 1949 elections.—Editor]

COMRADES OF OHIO:

One of the few "blessings" of being incarcerated is the opportunity and the time it gives to think over and evaluate some of the past and present work of our Party. The first and main result of such an evaluation is, of course, an increased pride and confidence in our work, in our Party, in the leadership.

Since the Emergency Convention, our Party has re-railed its course upon the tracks of Marxism-Leninism. In a very short period of time we have repaired the main damage

inflicted on our Party by the ruinous revisionist policies of Browderism. We were able to do this because we rejected these anti-Marxist theories completely and basically. And because we did so openly, publicly, and above-board, we came through this crisis with but a handful of casualties.

FOR A BOLDER AND BROADER UNITED-FRONT POLICY

I write this letter to raise with you some thoughts on one developing weakness in our work. This weak-

ness is in the application of our united-front and people's coalition policy. I think we have permitted ourselves in our everyday practical activities to drift from the path of mobilizing the *maximum numbers* of the working class and the people into the broadest possible united-front movements and struggles. There are some indications of a narrowing-down; a lack of boldness in, and approach to, uniting with, organizing and leading broad masses in struggle; some tendencies of "drawing into our own shell."

I feel we are not daily fighting for the realization of our Party's 1948 National Convention resolution, which states: "The *central* task of the Communist Party in this period is to help forge the *broadest* people's anti-monopoly and peace coalition in which the working class must play the leading role." We have not mastered, nor are we skillfully enough applying, the tactic of the united front.

In this connection, I think there are both "Left" sectarian, as well as Right-opportunist, weaknesses in our work. The results of both the "Left" and the Right weakness are the danger of isolation of our Party from the working class and people of America.

Wall Street is very conscious of the elementary fact that it cannot destroy our Party unless it is successful in the preliminary step of isolating it, of driving a wedge be-

tween us and the broad masses of common people. In this connection it is fruitful for us to recall what Lenin and Stalin wrote on the danger of isolation of the Bolshevik Party.

Lenin stated that a Party is invincible if it is able "to link itself with, to keep in close touch with, and, to a certain extent if you like, to merge with the broadest masses of toilers—primarily with the proletariat, but also with the non-proletarian toiling masses."*

In the *History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union*, Comrade Stalin wrote: "A party perishes if it shuts itself up in its narrow shell, if it severs itself from the masses. . . ." "And as long as they [the Communists] maintain connection with their mother, with the people, they have every chance of remaining invincible. That is the key to the invincibility of Bolshevik leadership."**

Comrades Lenin and Stalin are not speaking solely about physical isolation from the masses, but about political isolation. A party organization that does not organize, unite with, and lead masses in struggle is politically isolated. Our Party can be isolated by comrades who are physically isolated from the masses, as well as by comrades who are in the leadership and among the masses but who do not put forward the program and policies of the Party. The

* *History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union*, p. 362.

** *Ibid.*, pp. 362, 363.

capitalist class is very well aware that isolation is also the key to our destruction. We must safeguard our "key to victory," to "invincibility" at all times, but during periods of sharp class struggles we must redouble our vigilance and not for a moment lose sight of this "key."

The struggle for the united front is a continuous, developing process. The program, the slogans at each given stage must be based on the circumstances of that moment, on the concrete relationship of class forces.

We must center our attention on the issues that are in "everybody's mind" at that moment. The level of the activity, of the forms and methods of struggle, must correspond to the level of understanding and development of the masses at each stage.

Besides the need for finding the proper issues and slogans, and the right forms and methods, timing is of decisive importance in leadership. Putting forward programs and forms of struggle for which the groundwork has not been prepared, or, on the other hand, failing in boldness or initiative and following behind the spontaneous actions of the masses—both of these courses result in isolation for the leadership forces, for our vanguard Party.

NEW DEVELOPMENTS

We must now re-examine our approach to a number of questions. This is necessary because we are en-

tering, and in a sense have already entered, a new phase of the postwar period. Unless this new phase is fully seen, and unless we master the Leninist policies of broad united front, we shall fail to devise a line of tactics of united front that will fit the new situation.

What is new is the following:

1. There is a growing demand for the Truman Administration to make good on its promises for progressive labor legislation; for the civil rights program; for tax relief for the lower income groups, lower rents, price controls, housing projects, etc.

2. A development that throws fear into the world camp of capitalism is the beginnings of a new economic crisis—or to put it another way, the end of the postwar period of so-called economic boom. This change in economic perspectives will effect changes in all world relations (U.S.-British contradictions, for example); it is *already* having wide repercussions among the masses here at home and *must* in time affect the position and political attitudes of all classes and social strata.

Since the end of the war we have constantly alerted the people to the postwar offensive of Big Business. And what we have thus stressed has been profoundly true. What we frequently said, and especially how we said it, tended to oversimplify what in reality was a more complex process: namely, that side by side with assault there was also *concession*,

especi
sions
bou
g
sectio
a me
dome
for s
policy

But
nomin
of ev
insec
come
pet i
ready
gro
gains
midd
ever
begin
on a

If
gran
past
only
roun
—to
shall
nom
than
conc
strug
unit
gran
whe
mou
"pos
und
decl
mus

especially economic. These concessions were very important for the bourgeoisie as a means of appeasing sections of the masses, and also as a means of building illusions as to domestic "prosperity" as the price for supporting a reactionary foreign policy.

But with the beginning of the economic crisis, with the perspective of ever-growing unemployment and insecurity, wide masses are going to come smack up against some of their pet illusions of only yesterday. Already millions are jobless. The Negro workers find their economic gains fast evaporating. The lower middle class is fearful of being driven ever lower. The farmers are already beginning to face over-production on a mass scale.

If Big Business has always resisted granting economic concessions in the past and did grant wage increases only as a result of three postwar rounds of wage struggles and strikes—today, with the failure of the Marshall Plan and the maturing economic crisis, it resists more ruthlessly than ever any thought of economic concessions. If it required militant struggles and a high degree of labor unity around a fighting wage program to win inadequate concessions when the rate of profit was enormously inflated during the so-called "postwar economic boom"—today, under conditions of a more rapidly declining economy, wage increases must inevitably be fought by the em-

ployers with special ferocity.

Furthermore, with millions already unemployed and many other millions haunted by the fear of joblessness, the corporations are approaching the time when they think they can master the labor movement and whittle it down to what they think should be its postwar size and role.

All this adds up to the following: great new reserves are going to enter the fray rapidly—due, not to subjective desire, but to objective compulsion. These reserves can be ours, not in any narrow, possessive sense, but in a class sense, as common class fighters or class allies. But *only* if we see this new opportunity and act in such a way as to move the widest masses with ourselves as an integral part of them, can a new relationship of forces be effectuated in the country over a period of time.

This means that we must break through and establish firm contact with the great masses—especially the workers in basic industry—*over the heads* of their present leaders. But if this is to be done, if we are to be able to speak to these masses in a voice they can understand and respond to, we must be exceedingly careful not to give them the false impression that we are not really concerned with their welfare, but with "using" and "exploiting" certain issues for "partisan" purposes—for unseating their present leaders.

There is not a worker in America

who does not fear the economic crisis like a plague. This fear hangs over the industrial valleys and cities of Ohio like a heavy fog.

We are altogether too slow in grasping the full significance of this new development. We need to explain the causes of this periodic plague. We need to work out a program to meet this crisis on every level. We need to project boldly broad united-front movements and actions. Wherever possible, the trade unions should be the basis of such a movement. But let us not stop there. There are many other forms and methods.

Right now, the struggle for an increase in wages has top rating with the workers in many industries. They have forced the reluctant leadership formally to go along with the fight. The workers very keenly sense the new stubbornness of the capitalist class, and they also sense the wavering and hesitancy of the union leadership. They see the corporations preparing to fight and they feel the lack of preparation by the class-collaborationist leaders. Instinctively and because of past experience, workers gravitate toward the most militant section, toward the Communists, for leadership. They begin to see the need for unity of action. Our number one task in building the united front of steelworkers, auto and other mass-industry workers at this moment is to give leadership in uniting the workers in the prepa-

ration for this wage struggle. We can be successful in exposing the class-collaborationist policies of the misleaders, only if we, together with other progressives, are the leaders and fighters for a broad united front of the rank and file for this wage fight. We must call for every one to put all differences aside and join in this fight.

3. There is a growing concern and mood of militancy against the lynch attacks on the Negro people, the witch hunts, and the other steps in the direction of a police state.

4. The Truman Doctrine, the Marshall Plan, the Atlantic Pact, the "cold war," Truman's idiotic, brazen demand of world "unconditional surrender" to Wall Street, the huge military appropriations, the continuous manufacture and stockpiling of atomic bombs—all of this is beginning to spell war, a war of world conquest, to a fast-growing section of the American people.

The mass movements that killed the anti-Communist bills in Ohio, Illinois, Massachusetts, Wisconsin and forced the court reversal in Maryland, are living proof of the readiness of the people to fight for democratic rights.

The mass response to the Bill of Rights Conference, to the Conference for World Peace held in New York City, are testimony to the new possibilities for broad, united movements for peace and civil liberties. The response to the letter of the Ohio trade-

union
union
same
lower
memb
action
tions
the r
K.K.K.
cert
firm
and r
for st
lution
Protes
cative
in the
We
velop
and p
mass
tions
tions
ership
milita
find
these
conce
We
ship
cond
tende
of op
if we
tice,
sloga
REA
W
cause

union leaders calling for a trade-union peace movement shows this same readiness in the ranks of the lower officials and rank-and-file members of the trade unions. The actions and speeches at the conventions of the N.A.A.C.P. and the Elks, the mass indignation against the K.K.K. attack on the Robeson concert at Peekskill—all further confirm the new high level in militancy and readiness of the Negro masses for struggle. The speeches and resolutions of the Quakers and other Protestant Church leaders are indicative of the rising peace sentiments in the broad religious groups.

We must fully grasp these new developments, and the new avenues and possibilities they offer for broad mass movements. Many of the reactions I listed above are only reflections on top, among the present leadership, of the new, rising mood of militancy of the masses. We must find the way to make it possible for these millions to move and act in a concerted, united way.

We will be able to give leadership to broad masses under these *new conditions* only if we burn out all tendencies of narrowness, as well as of opportunism, in our work; only if we make united front a daily practice, a policy and not an abstract slogan or a phrase.

REASONS FOR WEAKNESSES

What are some of the underlying causes for the weaknesses in our

practical activities in applying our correct policies of the united front?

1. In the first place, these shortcomings flow from an incorrect estimation of the relationship of class forces in America and on a world scale.

The mistaken estimation is in the direction of "overestimating the strength of the capitalist class and underestimating the strength of the working class." In a country with the most powerful capitalist class, it is understandable why a weakness in this direction persists. The outward appearance of strength of American capitalism has led some comrades to a one-sided, unbalanced estimation of the strength of the enemy.

This is reflected in tendencies to overestimate the effects of the post-war anti-labor, anti-Communist, fascist-like campaign and drive against the working class and the people. This thinking tends in the following direction:

a. The anti-Communist hysteria has so drugged the great majority of the people, that at best only a small section will join with Communists in any kind of united action.

b. The war propaganda, the barrage of chauvinist nationalism, the demagogic arguments in support of the Marshall Plan and the Atlantic Pact, have so swept the American people in support of the imperialist war plans, that they will either remain passive or give their support

to these plans. Therefore, at best, only the Left-progressives will join in a united movement against these imperialist war plans and acts.

c. The drive toward a police state, the lynch attacks on the Negro people, the attacks on the Communist Party by the courts, Congress, the state legislatures and hoodlums, the "loyalty" oaths, the general campaign of terror and intimidation have so frightened the mass of the people that they are not in a mood to fight back.

d. The betrayal by the officials of the trade unions has left the membership in a pessimistic and hopeless mood. Therefore, at best, only the Left forces will move into struggle against the wishes of the reactionary leaders.

Are any one of the above conclusions justified? When they are put in that blunt manner, of course, everyone will readily agree—they are not. But do our actions reflect any tendencies toward the above, mistaken estimation? Then in all honesty, I think we must say that they do. I will discuss later how this is reflected.

Have we new problems because of the sharp attacks of Big Business? Yes, we are in a sharp, difficult struggle. Yes, some sections of the working class and people have been momentarily affected by Big Business propaganda. Yes, the terror has frightened some of the weaker elements. Yes, this is all true; but

these facts are not reasons for any pessimistic conclusions of non-confidence in the ability of the American working class and the people to weather this storm and come out victorious.

2. The second underlying reason for these shortcomings is to be found in some lingering mistaken conclusions flowing from the correction of revisionist policies that Browder falsely projected under the designation of "united front" and "coalition" policies. There is a continued pressure, both from within the Party and from the outside, in the direction that all coalition policies are revisionist. At Foley Square, the Prosecutor and the capitalist press all "worry" about the Party making Right-revisionist mistakes.

This pressure weakens the initiative and dampens the enthusiasm of some sections of the Party from fighting for the broadest possible united-front and people's coalition policy at all times. The policies of Browder were not united-front or coalition policies at all; they were more class collaborationist in content than anything else. They rejected the leading role of the working class—they were not directed against monopoly capitalism and its policies.

The memory of these revisionist distortions must not cut down the boldness of our Party in giving leadership and applying a broad, mass, united-front coalition policy. As long as the unity is achieved around

the struggle for peace, democratic rights, improved economic conditions and other issues of the people, we do not have to worry that the unity is too broad.

We should remind the Party about the concluding remarks of George Dimitroff at the Seventh World Congress of the Communist International. Speaking about the united-front tactic, he stated:

There are wiseacres who will sense in all this a digression from our basic position, some sort of turn to the Right of the straight line of Bolshevism. Well, in my country they say that a hungry chicken always dreams of millet. Let these political chickens think so.

3. The third undeniable reason for these weaknesses flows from our failure, because of our lack of experience, to shift our main attention, our greatest effort, to organizing a united front of the masses, the rank and file—the united front from below.

When the bulk of the trade-union leaders and of the liberals deserted to the side of reaction, some comrades tended automatically to put the rank-and-file mass followers of these misleaders into the same camp. This, of course, is wrong. The American working class and the people are not so polarized politically. The great majority of the followers of the misleaders will join united actions and movements on

specific issues. Many who follow the misleaders today will, because of changed conditions, join militant, united-front struggles tomorrow. Our united front from below cannot be approached as if the masses are in the same political subdivisions as the leadership.

When the capitalist class has difficulties in putting over its policies through its regular political parties and politicians, it always turns to the Social-Democrats for help.

We have to take special note of the role of the Social-Democrats in the ideological campaign of the employers designed to destroy all militancy and struggle. They have a special Social-Democratic sleeping pill and so must be dealt with concretely.

The old saying should be changed to "listen to the Social-Democrats and the liberals and the opposite will be the truth." For each period they have their own special tune. During this period, their tune is: "Labor is united in support of the bipartisan foreign policy; the problem is to unite capital"; "The workers are not interested in the present economic struggle, they do not support the present wage drive"; "The Negro people are slowly winning their equal rights—militant struggles will only upset the applecart"; "The Supreme Court will uphold everybody's constitutional rights—why get excited about the defense of the Communists at Foley Square?"

Let the Social-Democrats and the "liberals" sing themselves to sleep, if they are so inclined. We must lead the working class to reject these petty-bourgeois, paralyzing lullabies. We must work out specific appeals for unity with workers who support these Social-Democratic leaders.

The above are some of the basic weaknesses to which we can trace the shortcomings in our daily practical united-front activities.

HOW THE WEAKNESSES ARE EXPRESSED

How are these weaknesses reflected in our daily work?

1. First and foremost is the lack of consistent, energetic initiative and leadership for united-front movements and struggles. The activities of many Communists and Party organizations are limited to a club meeting, educational discussion, distribution of a leaflet and the press, a mass meeting or a picket line. These are all necessary activities and must be increased manifoldly. But these independent Communist activities are not enough. No matter how heroic or self-sacrificing its work, the Communist Party alone cannot successfully meet the drive of reaction.

In these Party organizations the *basic task*, that of leading and organizing united actions and movements, is missing. These organizations stew in their own juice. They have drawn themselves into a small, comfortable shell. They watch and record developments, but they are

not a part of, and do not fulfill the task of, the vanguard, the advanced section of the working class. They propagandize, criticize, but do not organize and give leadership in struggle.

2. These erroneous conclusions are reflected in many of the proposals for Left centers, Left movements, programs for the Left, etc. If one digs a little, it becomes clear that many of these Left centers are put forward either as substitutes for broader movements, or as a substitute for the Communist Party, or in some cases for both. There are occasions when the Left forces must have organizational forms. But when such centers become, in fact, substitutes for broader united-front movements or replace the Communist Party, then they become walls that isolate the Party from the masses. So many of these tendencies crop up now because of the mistaken idea that only the Left will join in struggle. The Communist Party has a very decisive task in giving leadership to the working class. We cannot and we will not take the forces of the Party, the tasks and responsibilities of the Party, and set up "business" under some other name. We have some examples of this type of Left center that have been with us for a long time. For many years there have been and still are organized Left centers among many of the nationality groups. They have been, and still are, centers that substitute both for broad united fronts

and for the Communist Party. Because of this fact, the Party is isolated from large sections of the nationality groups which are a decisive section in many of the basic industries.

How else can we explain the lack of results or effort in building a broad united front of the steel workers, except that we have been spending our time trying to build committees of the Left? How else can we explain the persistence of the idea that the rank-and-file movement must be organized *outside* the union apparatus—except that we are looking, not where the bulk of the steel workers are, in the union, but for ways of uniting small sections, the Left. The united front of the steel workers must be organized in the departments, locals, union committees; it must be based on the struggles organized for wage increases, against speed-up, against discrimination, etc.

Since the open betrayal of the working class by the Murrays, Reuthers and Currans, the struggle between the two policies and programs: one based on class collaboration, class submission, the other based on policies of class struggle, has greatly sharpened. The top leadership of the trade-union movement is sharply divided into these two camps, with the majority going over to the camp of imperialism. The lower rung of the leadership and the rank and file are not so divided. The struggle is over who is going to

win the rank and file. Each of these trends has a small section of the masses that is ideologically attached to it. But the great majority, while being influenced and momentarily swayed by one or the other trend, do not consider themselves, nor are they, a part of either trend. It is especially important for us to take note that these workers are in the steel, coal, auto, rubber, machine tool, railroad, and maritime industries — in the basic industries of America; also, that these basic workers are in the Right-led unions.

This struggle to win the working class is fought, not in the realm of the theories of these two ideological trends, but around specific issues, around policies as regards wages, speed-up, equal rights for the Negro people, foreign policy, legislation, inner-union democracy, etc. These two ideologies clash in all fields of activity. We must not try to ignore this struggle. We must sharpen our tools and master our ideological weapons and tactics. We must have confidence that we can win the entire working class to the policies and the program based on class struggle. We can do this, not in isolation, but by organizing and leading in struggle the rank and file in the *existing unions*, in the departments, shops, locals and Internationals.

3. Right opportunism feeds and hides behind these same incorrect estimations. There are cases where Communists do not fight against the

policies of class collaboration because they claim that "the mass of workers are backward and not ready to fight." Other Communist trade-union leaders lead thousands of workers in the struggle for economic gains, but do not give leadership to these same workers in the struggle for peace, for Negro rights, civil rights, etc., because of the same wrong, pessimistic estimation.

For the same reason, we have comrades who are members and leaders in Jewish organizations and movements who will not fight against Zionist nationalism, because "the Jewish masses are not prepared to fight these policies." There are examples where the Communists are not isolated, but the policies of our Party are. There are cases where members of the Party are in contact with hundreds and thousands of the workers, but outside of our policies on direct economic questions, the policies of the Communist Party are isolated from these same workers.

WORKING-CLASS UNITY

The first step for building a victorious people's coalition is a united front of the working class. Our overall objective in the united front is the unity of the whole class. As class consciousness grows, this class unity will become a reality. We must not permit difficulties to divert for a moment our sights from our objective of *class* unity. The tactic of build-

ing the united front from below can be successful *only* if it is based on the note of *unity* of the *whole* working class. There is no need to build any isolated Left centers in applying the united front from below with the rank and file of the working class in the present conditions in America. The union local, the department, is and must be the *center* of our work. All activities must be directed to making the local union, the department and the grievance apparatus the instrument, the organization of the rank and file. This is where we must give our greatest attention and effort. In each *shop, local, industry*, we must pursue the policy of *class* unity.

Whatever centralized direction on top is needed for the policies of the class - struggle, Left - progressive trend, these forms cannot be mechanically transferred in our application of the united-front policy among the broad masses. The united front from below must at all times be grounded solidly on the basic approach of confidence in winning over the *whole working class* to our program.

UNITY OF THE NEGRO PEOPLE

Wall Street directs the policies and acts of discrimination, segregation, and special suppression against the *whole* Negro people. It is true that the Negro workers and the Negro sharecroppers suffer the worst features of this brutal system of slavery.

But the whole Negro people feel the effects of the lynch system. The struggle for complete equal rights, and the struggle of the rising young Negro nation in the Black Belt of the South, is the basis for unity of the whole Negro people. Anything short of this basic approach would be sectarianism.

There is a need for organized centers for the organized Negro workers, city trade union centers, labor division of the N.A.A.C.P., etc., so that they may play the leading role in organizing the whole people in the struggle against the vicious system of "white supremacy."

Our main attention, our efforts in each city, must be to unite the whole Negro people and to weld a unity of the working class and the Negro people as a foundation for a broad coalition of Negro and white that will include as one of its cornerstones the struggle for full and equal rights for the Negro citizens. Because this is possible, the Negro people are the most important ally of the working class in building this broad people's coalition.

We must now set our sights on the 1950 elections for a Senator and congressmen. Senator Robert Taft has become the symbol of everything reactionary to the majority of labor, the Negro people and many other sections of the voters of Ohio. There is no question but that Taft can be defeated in 1950. But we must see that the broad coalition developing

for the defeat of Taft can become the base for a general electoral people's coalition for 1950 in Ohio. This coalition should include the A.F. of L., C.I.O., Railroad Brotherhood, N.A.A.C.P., the Progressive Party, Farmers' Union and the hundreds of organizations of the common people. There will be attempts to steer this movement into the usual two-party channels. We must be ready to work with sections of both old parties, but must avoid the pitfall of this movement becoming an arm of either of the two old parties. We must push forward and promote the role of labor and the Negro people in this coalition.

We must boldly join forces with the broad developing electoral coalition. While doing so, we must take issue with all waverings or reactionary moves on the part of allies in the coalition. We should work in such a fashion that when the smoke of the 1950 elections clears away, Taft will be in the political ash can, there will be some new progressive congressmen to represent Ohio, the Progressive Party will be much stronger, the Communist Party's influence greater and there will be a broad coalition, with labor as the decisive influence. This will be a hard test for our policy of building a people's coalition.

SECTARIAN APPROACHES TO BROAD ISSUES

The implications and manifestations of each development are not

immediately clear to many workers, who cannot foresee all the effects of a Taft-Hartley Law, a Mundt Bill. They do not, by themselves, foresee how the Marshall Plan and the Atlantic Pact are going to affect the issues of peace or war, their civil rights and the bread and butter on their tables. They cannot see how the trial at Foley Square is going to affect them. Broad understanding of how these developments affect each worker is a pre-condition for a broad united front on these issues. Our propaganda, our slogans, must explain this connection in simple, direct and popular terms. We must find ways to expose the fakery behind which Wall Street cloaks its moves. If we do not make this connection, we can take broad issues and in our propaganda narrow them down.

Let us take the attack on the Communist Party. Here is an issue that affects the life of every American. But some of our leaflets have the slogan "Defend the Communist Party." In some cases this is put forward without any explanation as to why the mass of Americans should defend the Communist Party. In other cases, the explanations take many things for granted. Labor and the people will defend the rights of the Communist Party *only* if they can see in doing so that they are also defending their own rights. This connection is clear to us, but this is not so with the great majority of Americans. The defense of the rights of the Commu-

nists is a broad issue affecting the rights of every American. We must handle it in its proper, broad perspective.

THE COMMUNIST PARTY AND THE UNITED FRONT

Water that stands still cannot be dammed up and utilized to generate power. So it is with human beings. Only when they are active, in motion, can they be welded and forged into a force, into a united front for peace, security, freedom, into a force for Socialism.

Our Communist Party in Ohio, on all levels, must accept the responsibility of initiating, leading and forging a united front of the working class and a coalition of the people of our state. Wherever possible, the Communist Party will join such movements as a Party; however, we do not place this as a condition for our support.

To initiate united-front movements and actions requires more than a good discussion at a club meeting, more than issuing a leaflet, more than circulation of the press, more than independent activity of the Party. All this is very important, but with all this, the united action or movement must be organized. People, masses must be brought together. Once the unity is established, then Communist initiative means to point to all the lessons at each point, raise the

understanding, deepen the class consciousness, and lead the movement to higher levels.

The Marxist-Leninist program and policies of the Party are not obstacles to our participation in coalitions and united fronts. We need to master the art of explaining our policies in a direct, simple, popular, manner. We must convince the masses of the correctness of our program. This, and not abstract attacks and name-calling, must be the basis of our criticism of other components of the coalition. The essence of our leadership in a united front must be mass political education in the process of the struggle itself.

The possibility for forging a united front of the working class increases as the workers learn and grow in political stature. Agreements and deals on top do not help the working class to deepen its understanding of the class struggle. I have in mind the worst possible example of this — Dayton, Ohio. Here agreements and deals were made with the self-seeking, class-collaborationist elements in the unions for years. The workers had nothing to do or say about these deals. This all went by the designation of "united front." We all knew it would blow up in our faces some day, and it did. These deals on top in Dayton took the place both of the broad united front of the rank and file and of our Party.

We must not try to make the united front or the coalition in our

own image either in structure or methods. We must be ready to join movements and actions initiated by others. One of the most successful coalitions, the American Youth Congress, was not initiated by the Communists.

We must not attempt to include our full program on every issue in every united movement. Movements are built around a minimum number of specific issues.

We must not try to hand over to a united coalition a tailor-made program or organization. All these detailed questions must be worked out together with other forces in the coalition.

We must not hog the leadership. A united coalition needs a coalition also in leadership.

We must not join united movements with preconceived ideas of complete unity. A coalition, a united front, presupposes differences—differences on program, on form and methods.

We must be ready at all times to be flexible on these details. We must be ready at all times to learn from the other forces in the united front. There is much we can learn and profit from the experiences of others.

We must never be the "We told you so" wisecracs. We must never give the wrong impression of gloating over setbacks and difficulties in our efforts to expose the misleaders who are responsible for these setbacks. We must never forget our

main enemy — capitalism and the capitalist class. Let no action of ours give the false impression that our main, or perhaps even only, opponent is the individual reactionary labor leader. Two leaflets which fall into such tendencies came to my attention, one on the struggle against the Taft-Hartley Law, another on an anti-labor Supreme Court decision. The main content of both is "we told you so," "now what will Murray say?" There is not a word against the members of Congress or the Supreme Court or the employers. The workers will not understand these leaflets. These leaflets will not expose Murray and his responsibility for the setbacks.

In the final analysis, the united front is the welding together of human beings, of individuals from general political groupings, representing many trends in American life. Leaflets, papers, pamphlets, are important means that educate and prepare the ground for unity. But it takes people to agree to unite for action.

Why do I raise this seemingly simple and obvious question? Because there are tendencies to view our united-front, coalition policies in the abstract, as agreements between organizations having no bearing on the activity of each individual Communist. Each Communist must be the center of a united front, a coalition of people of a department, a block, a house, a club, union, etc.

Broader united-front movements are possible only if they are based on such a solid foundation. We must study self-critically the way each individual Communist works to unite those closest to him. If we do this we will soon see what is the general weakness in our activities in uniting and leading the working class and the people generally.

We Communists have the additional responsibility of transferring to the non-Communist forces the confidence in victory, the lasting youthful enthusiasm and militancy that we possess because of our Marxist-Leninist understanding of the class struggle.

In our proposals and calls for unity we should not hesitate to include the leadership of the organizations to which we speak. Many will join united struggle around specific minimum issues. Place the responsibility for accepting or rejecting such proposals on the doorstep of these leaders. Let them try to explain to their followers, when they refuse, why they will not join such united actions. If some insincere individuals are forced to maneuver, by joining such actions, they can be forced either to go along with the united movement or be exposed as disrupters.

Is there any contradiction between a mass united-front, coalition policy and building a strong Communist Party? There is not. One cannot be done without the other. They must never be placed one against the other.

I am afraid some comrades use the seeming contradiction as an argument against a broad united-front policy. Communists who do not see the importance and role of our Party while working in a coalition do not see it any better when the Party is not so engaged. Our Party cannot live, much less grow, in a "shell." We cannot exercise our vanguard role at a club meeting. We can grow, we can advance, only if we are in the center of a fighting united movement and struggle. We must, at all times, struggle against all underestimation of the role of the Party, but we cannot do this in a vacuum; we can best do it while leading masses.

Do we have weaknesses in the direction of underestimating the role of the Communist Party? Without question, we do. Lack of recruiting, small *Daily* and *Sunday Worker* circulation, hiding the Party's face, non-attendance at club meetings, etc., are all signs of this weakness.

But this underestimation, this lack of understanding of the role of the Communist Party, does not arise because of our broad united-front policies. It is true this opportunism often hides behind united-front activities, but the united-front policies are not the cause of it. If there is no united-front movement, opportunism finds something else for its cover.

The reason for our opportunistic weakness of not sufficiently building our Party in 1936-37-38 when we were in the leadership and in the

midst of the battle to build the mass C.I.O. unions was not because we were too busy carrying on this mass work. The reasons we did not put greater effort into building our Party during the great struggles of the unemployed, during the broad, united-front struggles to free the Scottsboro boys, was, again, not because we were too busy, or so involved in these mass movements that we forgot. Very often we hear such excuses for not building the Party at Fisher Body, among the machinists, teamsters, electrical workers, etc.; but the cause for this weakness is much more basic.

It arises from a fundamental lack of a Marxist-Leninist concept of the class struggle, from not clearly seeing the element and role of conscious leadership basing itself on the science of Marxism-Leninism. Comrades marked with such failing base their activities on the daily, spontaneous actions of the working class; they work and give leadership on the level of trade unionism. There is no need or place in such thinking for a vanguard, Marxist Party. Hence, the underestimation of the role of the Party. There are also comrades who see their role as individual Communists and do give leadership to workers in unions and shops, but who do not understand the indispensable need for many more Communists and the need for a shop club of the Communist Party. These good comrades are very busy and complain

about being over-worked, but they do very little to build a Communist Party in order to reinforce and multiply the leadership of the one Communist. This is also underestimation of the Party. It is also overestimation of the abilities and role of one's own self.

It is in this sense, too, that proposals for Left centers are sometimes made because there is not an understanding of the role of the Communist Party in general and the role of the Communist Party shop club in particular. I am afraid some comrades see the role of the shop club only as the voice for Socialism—in the abstract. They do not see the Communist Party shop club as the voice for all militant, class-struggle policies on all issues. The Communist Party

shop club must be the *center* for policies of class struggle, on economic as well as political issues. The shop club must reflect this role, through its members, leaflets, the *Daily Worker*, etc.

In conclusion, I propose that we examine the weaknesses in our work which I have discussed in this letter. I do not propose that we go into a discussion period, but rather that we take up one situation after another and work out concrete solutions. I do not propose a campaign. What we need is a continuous, systematic, united-front, coalition approach to all of our mass work. We must set out to master this Bolshevik method of leadership.

With comradely greetings,
GUS HALL

The C.I.O. Convention and the Struggle For Labor Unity

by Sid Stein

THE MEMBERSHIP and rank-and-file leadership of the C.I.O. have looked to its conventions as the annual gatherings where their most urgent needs and demands will find expression, and where the powerful industrial unions comprising the C.I.O. will unite in common strategy and struggle.

THE REAL ISSUES THAT FACED THE CONVENTION

This year's convention was held at a time when the membership of the C.I.O. faced especially grave problems, due to the increasing attacks of the employers upon all the unions and their bitter opposition to the fourth-round demands of all of labor, the growing unemployment and speed-up in the factories and the operation of the Taft-Hartley Act.

This year's convention was held at a time when the urgent need for unity within the C.I.O. and united action of all labor was being recognized by ever-growing masses of workers, as was clear from the great response of the rank and file to the proposals of John L. Lewis for joint

actions in support of the strikes in the steel and coal industries.

The membership of the C.I.O. was hoping for positive action by this convention on many legislative issues, in the first place repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act and the enactment of civil rights legislation, which the Murray-Reuther leadership, at the 1948 (Portland) Convention, had so falsely promised would be solved by the election of Truman.

In addition to these issues on which there is general unity in the ranks of the C.I.O. membership, there were a series of other issues which this convention was duty-bound to discuss and review in the light of labor's experience since the Portland Convention, and to arrive at decisions in keeping with the interests of the membership of the C.I.O.

Among these issues were the increasing attacks of reaction on the constitutional rights of labor, the Negro people and political minorities, as part of the drive toward fascism, war preparations and the "cold war" course of the Administration.

The convention was faced with the fact that the political orientation of the C.I.O. leadership, to tie the

C.I.O. to Truman and the Democratic Party, has borne none of the golden fruits promised by Philip Murray at Portland. This made a complete review of the political direction of the C.I.O. imperative.

Since the Portland Convention, the bipartisan foreign policy of the Truman Administration, which has the crusading support of the C.I.O. top leaders, has been steadily bankrupted and exposed, not only in the eyes of the peoples of the world, but also in the eyes of growing sections of the American masses. Contributing to this steady exposure of Wall Street's "cold war" policy have been the patent failure of the Marshall Plan, the utter collapse of Wall Street's policy in China and the epic advance of the Chinese people's victory, as well as the upsurging liberation struggle of the colonial peoples, the consolidation of the People's Democracies in Eastern Europe and the establishment of a people's government in Eastern Germany, the enhanced power and prestige of the Soviet Union at the head of the world's peace forces, the failure of the Marshall Planners, their labor "travelling salesmen," and the quittings to weaken the power of the Communist Parties in France and Italy. Just prior to the convention, the announcement that Wall Street no longer monopolizes the atom bomb, and that atomic energy is being used in the Soviet Union for peaceful construction, created a tremendous mass impact favorable to

peace. Growing sections of the laboring people of America were beginning to realize, furthermore, that the high promises made by Truman and his labor lieutenants as regards the economic "benefits" which the "cold war" would yield to the American people were "just promises." Despite all well-paid lies to the contrary, they see that there is a developing economic crisis in the U.S. and are already feeling the lash of growing unemployment, speed-up, wage cutting, etc.

These developments, clearly, made mandatory a review and reversal of the policy pursued by the leadership of the C.I.O.

But none of these problems and issues was seriously considered by the convention. The national leadership of the C.I.O. had an entirely different approach to the convention and its tasks. It was summed up in one phrase actually blurted out publicly by one of the leaders of the Right: "This Convention is part of the international ideological war against Communism."

In other words, the leadership of the C.I.O. had but one yardstick for the convention and that was based on the needs, not of the membership of the C.I.O., but of the propaganda mills of the State Department, and the cold-war plans of Wall Street. *This was a "command performance" called for by the State Department and organized by the C.I.O.'s Right-wing leadership.*

This fact becomes even clearer if

one asks: What did the big employers and their State Department want to see emerge from this convention? Were their fondest expectations realized? One needs but survey the editorials of *The New York Times* and *The New York Herald Tribune* and similar spokesmen for Wall Street and the State Department across the country to see how they licked their chops with unmitigated glee at the spectacle put on in Cleveland by the C.I.O. leadership.

Instead of using the convention to hammer out a program for uniting the trade unions against the employers, Murray and Reuther used the convention to split the C.I.O. in the interests of the war policies of Wall Street.

MURRAY'S ANSWER TO THE DEMAND FOR A UNITED WAGE FIGHT: EXPULSIONS

Throughout the convention, Philip Murray complained about what he called the "unjustified attacks upon the President of the C.I.O." He even referred to the Left-progressive criticism of his acceptance of the fact-finding board formula as being "the most flagrant approach to union strike-breaking." Murray unleashed this tirade against the U.E. because that union "dared" to criticize his "formula," which seriously weakened labor's whole fourth-round wage campaign, and, more specifically, had the most damaging effect on the demands of the U.E. membership for a "package" increase of \$500 per year.

Close examination of this issue will throw light on the whole proceedings of the convention. It would seem elementary to every trade unionist that one of the most decisive tasks before the C.I.O. since the Portland Convention was to prepare for an effective fourth-round wage fight. Everyone knew that this year the corporations were going to be tougher than ever, and that it was necessary for the C.I.O. to achieve the greatest unity and fighting capacity of its forces. But what happened was quite the contrary, and not by accident. Right after the Portland Convention, Emil Rieve served notice that the leadership of the Textile Workers' Union would not call for wage increases. He was followed by the leadership of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers, which took a similar position. And the "militant" Walter Reuther carried on a campaign among the auto workers to dissuade them from demanding wage increases. All proposals of such unions as the U.E., the Mine, Mill and Smelter Workers, and others, for a joint meeting with the United Steelworkers' Union and the U.A.W. to discuss a united strategy for the fourth-round fight, were turned down by Murray and Reuther.

Under pressure of the auto workers, Reuther "pledged" at the U.A.W. convention to fight for wage increases and pensions; on the basis of this pledge, he asked for, and got from the convention, a special strike assessment. Philip Murray likewise, under

pressure of the steelworkers, had finally projected the demand for a 30-cent "package" which would include a 12½-cent wage increase. But without putting up any kind of a fight, Murray gave up the wage demand and was quick to accept a Truman-appointed fact-finding board, and subsequently the recommendations of that board, which closed the door to wage increases for the steelworkers and jeopardized the wage demands of all workers. At the same time, Reuther came forward with the so-called "Ford Formula," which was even worse than the steel formula. It was so bad, in fact, that Reuther used the threat of a strike—not against the Ford Motor Co., but against the Ford workers—to bludgeon the workers into accepting the agreement. That there was great rank-and-file opposition to that plan is to be seen in the fact that even some of those who were traditionally in the Reuther caucus voiced sharp criticism of Reuther's "Ford Formula."

It would seem that here was a trade-union issue worthy of earnest discussion at the C.I.O. convention. But Murray and Reuther wanted no discussion of this issue. Had they heeded the U.E. criticism of the fact-finding board, *made prior to the steel strike*, the whole fourth-round wage fight could have been revitalized. But Murray and Reuther were not interested in revitalizing the fourth-round struggle of the unions. In fact they beheaded that struggle,

dampened the fighting mood of the workers and split the C.I.O. Even when the steelworkers were forced out on strike by the extreme arrogance of the steel companies (which was coupled with their cunning jockeying for position against the coal miners and for concessions from the government on the "basing point" issue), Murray still refused to bring about a broad, fighting front of labor against the employers. Such a front could have resulted in real wage gains, as well as in greater pension and social-security benefits, for the steelworkers and all of labor. Refusing to discuss these vital issues or to give an honest answer to the justified criticism, Murray and Reuther tried to "squirm out from under" by expelling the militant-led C.I.O. unions.

THE COMMUNISTS AND PROGRESSIVES FIGHT FOR A UNITED C.I.O.

The C.I.O. Convention had only one central theme from beginning to end—Red-baiting and anti-Communism.

Here we shall not take the space to quote from Murray's vindictive gutter-level attacks against a number of C.I.O. unions before a convention which was 50 percent packed by delegates from councils and mid-get unaffiliated local industrial unions.

To rationalize his attacks on the Left-progressive forces, Murray resorted to outright falsehood in charg-

ing that the Communist Party has been favoring a split in the C.I.O. and the formation of a third labor federation. The record of our Party on this question is open for all to see. It gives the direct lie to Murray's falsification.

Ever since Portland, and the subsequent National Executive Board meeting at which it became clear that Murray had accepted the counsel of Rieve, Reuther and the State Department to purge the C.I.O. of all militancy and all opposition to the war program of the Administration, our Party has intensified its fight for the maintenance of organic unity of the C.I.O. This position has been stated and restated publicly—at meetings, in articles in the *Daily Worker* and in *Political Affairs* and in a direct and open letter to Philip Murray published prior to the Cleveland Convention. That open letter, written by our Party's National Trade Union Secretary, John Williamson, clearly stated the position of the Communists as being against expulsions, against secessions, against dual unionism and against raiding:

We stand as uncompromising today as always for the unity of the labor movement. We are particularly firm in our stand for a united C.I.O., for a united wage fight, for a united fight to repeal Taft-Hartley. We are against splits, against secessions and against expulsions. We believe that there is room in a trade union for differences especially on political issues. And those issues can and should be openly debated.

We believe your policies are harmful to the C.I.O. members. We will try to influence workers to return the C.I.O. to its founding policies of militant trade unionism, inner democracy and autonomy, and away from class collaboration, expulsions and blind conformity. But all this can and should be realized within the framework of the C.I.O. A trade union is not a political party where people voluntarily obligate themselves to the common political line of that party. Trade unions are elementary economic organizations, uniting workers of different political beliefs. They can grow and prosper if they adopt a fighting policy in the interests of their members and never forget that their enemies are the employers, especially the big trusts, and all the political instruments of the trusts.

We urge that unity of the C.I.O. be maintained, not, as Murray falsely claims, on a basis which would force the National C.I.O. to follow the policies preferred by the membership and leadership of the Left-led unions, but on the basis of respect for the democratic rights of International unions to follow the dictates of their membership as expressed through their democratic channels, such as convention resolutions and referenda.

From these facts it is clear that neither the false charge that our Party is in favor of a third federation of labor, nor the equally false charge that our Party was for a united C.I.O. "only" if the C.I.O. would subscribe to the policies projected by our Party is correct. Neither of these wild

charges is founded on any iota of truth. Both of these charges are deliberate concoctions of Mr. Murray and his associates. Their purpose was, and is, to conceal the fact that they had decided to split the C.I.O. in the interests of the cold war against the best interests of the C.I.O. membership and the American working class. But they hoped to get away with this splitting scheme without bearing the responsibility for this act before the American working class and before history. They wanted to create conditions which would, they hoped, force the progressive-led unions to withdraw. Therefore they conjured up the myth of a "third federation," while actively organizing raiding operations and secession movements against the Left-progressive-led Internationals. Therefore they announced, even before the convention opened, that they would drive out of the C.I.O. all those who "would not conform" — in other words, all those who refused to surrender to the dictates of the State Department.

In pursuance of this aim, Murray and his associates turned this convention into a debauched orgy of Red-baiting and vile profanity, in the hope that the courageous and honest delegates representing militant, progressive-led unions would walk out in disgust.

It is to the everlasting credit of the overwhelming majority of those delegates that they refused to accommodate Murray. By their principled, dig-

nified and courageous stand at the convention, they demonstrated their devotion to the interests of the membership, their unshakable determination to fight for labor unity; they showed that the full responsibility for splitting the C.I.O. rests upon the shoulders of Philip Murray, Walter Reuther, Emil Rieve and their accomplices.

THE EXPULSION OF U.E.-F.E.

The outstanding American pioneer fighter for industrial unionism and trade-union unity, the Chairman of the Communist Party, William Z. Foster, exposed the true reasons for, and meaning of, the expulsion of U.E.-F.E., as follows:

"The expulsion of the United Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers' Union by the C.I.O. convention is an outrage without precedent in the whole history of the American labor movement. The U.E. was expelled, not because it violated any trade-union principles or obligations, but because it refused to become the slave of the Democratic Party and carry out its boss-inspired program. Never has such a thing been done before. This act aims at destroying the political independence and integrity of organized labor, and it shows to what dangerous depths the trade-union leadership in the C.I.O. has fallen in its abject servility to the war program of the monopolists and reactionary politicians.

"Philip Murray and the other Right-wing leaders who are responsible for this splitting of the labor movement declare that the issue in this case is 'Communism.' But this is a flagrant lie. Murray and his crowd worked freely with the Communists for many years. Especially when there was hard organizing work to do, as for example, in building Mr. Murray's own union, the United Steel Workers, they did not hesitate to put many Communists on their organizing staff."

The real reason for the expulsion is that the Left- and progressive-led unions have refused to go along with the Marshall Plan and the rest of the war-making foreign policy of American imperialism, and its inevitable consequences of easing up on the struggle for economic demands of the workers and cutting the heart of militancy out of the struggle of the C.I.O. Any C.I.O. union that dares to take this stand, be its leaders Communist, Progressive, or non-party, was marked for the slaughter by Reuther and Murray. From the viewpoint of winning economics gains for the membership, the I.L.W.U., led by Harry Bridges, came to the convention with the greatest economic gains of any union in this period, including a 21-cent an hour wage increase, but Bridges was singled out for sharpest attack because he didn't "conform" to the dictates of Wall Street.

It used to be that strike-breaking

and union-splitting were considered crimes against labor, even in conservative union circles. But today such disruption of the workers' ranks, on an unprecedented scale, is "all in the day's work" for the Murrays, Reuthers, Careys, Currans, and the like when it is explained as "anti-Communism." In their eagerness to ram Wall Street's bipartisan Marshall Plan down the throats of the workers, they cold-bloodedly acted as splitters during the big Italian and French strikes several years back. They also organized an international split in the World Federation of Trade Unions, and now they are openly and deliberately trying to tear the Latin-American Confederation of Labor to pieces. Why, then, need anyone be surprised that they should split the C.I.O. too? It is all work of one pattern. It is an attempt to force labor to submit to the policy of war-making Wall Street imperialism.

The workers should protest vigorously against this outrageous expulsion of the U.E. This incident marks a turning point in the life of labor. If the Murrays and Reuthers are able to get away with such a crime against the workers, then, indeed, the labor movement is in for difficult times.

But the rank and file of labor still can put a stop to the splitting of C.I.O. before the catastrophic and shameful raiding operations of Carey and Murray against the U.E. become commonplace in other indus-

tries. In the midst of negotiations between U.E. and two of the largest and most powerful industrial giants in the country—General Electric and Westinghouse—the Right-wing leaders of the C.I.O. are acting as open agents of the company when they attempt to set up a dual union in the electrical field. Every electrical worker, as well as every other conscious trade unionist, will clearly see that it is in the interests of all labor to defeat the Carey scheme of union-busting through raiding. Beating back the union-busting of Carey will not only serve to defend the interests of the electrical workers, it will also be a powerful blow against further expulsions and for re-uniting the C.I.O. Every honest and militant worker must see that the prerequisite for re-uniting the C.I.O. is to defeat the efforts of the Right-wing leaders to raid and dismember the U.E.

The issue is one that affects every worker in every union. Hence this fight is not confined to the U.E. alone, or even to those International unions that are under attack by Murray, Reuther and Carey on orders of Wall Street and its State Department. It is the concern of all workers, especially the workers in the steel, auto, textile and maritime industries, all of whom are under the hammer blows of the employers at this time. The rank and file of the unions must rise to the occasion and put a stop to such activities of their leaders—and demand a united labor

movement and a united fight in defense of the workers' interests.

THE FIGHT FOR LABOR UNITY CONTINUES

The leadership of the C.I.O. has not only expelled the U.E., but has intensified its activity to force all other International unions to "conform" on pain of expulsion.

Just as the overwhelming majority of the Left-progressive Internationals under severe attack by the Murray-Reuther forces in the convention refused to succumb to their unscrupulous provocations—but correctly stood their ground and fought in the convention on issue after issue—so now, after the convention they should also carry on the fight against expulsions and continue to champion the right of autonomy and trade-union democracy, whereby their membership will determine policy in their own interests. Part of this struggle is to give maximum support to the U.E. in clarifying and winning its membership and local unions to reject the splitters and their "new" I.U.E. and to support more unitedly than ever the real U.E., its program and leadership.

Above all, the Left-progressive forces inside and outside of the C.I.O., as well as in all other trade unions, must become the best and most consistent champions of united labor actions, and for reuniting the labor movement. *The fight of the U.E. will be more successful and effective if it will firmly pursue the*

fight for labor unity and will refuse to fall into the trap of isolating itself from the masses of workers in the trade unions under Right leadership, while at the same time fighting unitedly with all progressive-led unions.

The membership of the C.I.O. in the unions under attack as well as the unions led by the Murray-Reuther forces have yet to be heard from and will undoubtedly be heard from in an ever-increasing demand for an end to the splitting and destruction of the C.I.O. and for the reuniting of the C.I.O. on the basis of its founding principles. The need for the unity of labor is so great and its appeal so widespread among the workers that it will become an ever-increasing weapon of struggle against the splitters of labor, even if Murray should momentarily succeed in expelling all of the progressive-led unions. It is clear that this policy of expelling International unions presents the greatest danger, not only to the unions directly affected, but to the whole labor movement. In addition to the obvious fact that the split of the C.I.O. weakens its numerical strength, which in itself will substantially affect the fighting capacity of the C.I.O., it is even more damaging in that it drives out of the C.I.O. those unions and forces which over a period of years since the formation of the C.I.O. have been the initiators, organizers and most ardent champions of its past

progressive policies and deeds. More than that, Philip Murray and his Social-Democratic mentors and accomplices have hereby served notice that they are ready to purge and destroy all militancy and progressivism, and to expel all militant and progressive workers in the C.I.O. unions who dare fight for the interests of the rank and file, who stand up for a working-class political and economic policy against the officially-approved State Department policies which the leadership of the C.I.O. is attempting to pass off under the false label of "C.I.O. policy."

There is much speculation, engendered by those who are responsible for the expulsions, about the formation of a "third federation" of labor. The purpose behind this propaganda is quite obvious. It is designed to facilitate the expulsion campaign, to isolate the militant unions and the militant workers within the Right-led unions. It is designed to get these unions and workers to abdicate their rightful fight for a place in the C.I.O., which they have built and which belongs to them no less than to those who today claim exclusive "ownership" of the C.I.O., its traditions, which they have betrayed, and its future, which belongs only to the workers, and not to those leaders who are splitting the C.I.O. today.

It is to be expected that the progressive-led unions will not rely upon the tender mercies of the split-

ters or allow themselves to be attacked and weakened one by one. While rejecting ideas of establishing any Left, third federation of labor, it stands to reason that these unions will find many forms for combining their forces so as to be in a better position to fight, and that they will also have to find the forms by which the issues in this fight can be brought home to their own membership as well as to the whole membership of the C.I.O. The immediate and all-decisive task is to win the entire membership of each of these trade unions under attack to support their International union, its program and leadership, and dramatically to expose and reject the splitters.

Whatever form it takes, whether through mergers or unified committees, the fight will essentially maintain its present and original content for unity, for democratic trade unionism, for working-class policy. It is to be expected that every move in that direction will be seized upon by the Right-wing leadership of the C.I.O. as an occasion for shrill accusations of "dual unionism" and "third federation"—but it will be clear to all who have eyes to see that these charges are but once more an attempt by the splitters of labor to cover their own guilt.

**UNITED LABOR ACTION NOW—
TO MEET THE EMPLOYERS'
OFFENSIVE**

It is most decisive that progressive and especially Communist work-

ers do not lose sight of the main needs of the American working class at this difficult hour.

Reaction is counting upon the division and disunity in the ranks of labor to facilitate the execution of its attacks upon the living standards of all the workers, and upon all the trade unions, whether they be Left- or Right-led. Reaction is counting upon the division and disunity to facilitate the drive against civil liberties and the imposition of police-state and fascist oppression against the whole working class. Wall Street and its bipartisan representatives in Congress are in great hopes that this further splitting of the labor movement will make it possible for the monopolists to maintain the Taft-Hartley Act and to impose even greater restrictions on the trade unions. The warmongers in and out of the Administration will try to utilize the expulsions, and what they hope will be increasing disunity in the ranks of labor, to intensify war propaganda and anti-Soviet hysteria. It is therefore most decisive that the watchword of every progressive and every Communist, irrespective of their trade-union affiliation—whether they be members of A. F. of L. or C.I.O. unions, whether they be in Right- or Left-led unions—must be *united labor action*. Starting with the most elementary economic struggles, strikes or negotiations, every possible avenue must be found for achieving unity of action and solidarity support to win

these struggles. In the fight against discrimination, for the rights of the Negro people, for jobs, for upgrading, against indiscriminate firing, the broadest unity in struggle must be developed, uniting organizationally Negro and white workers from all unions on local, state and national levels into effective committees, conferences and permanent organizations which will cut across all existing artificial barriers based on federations or type of leadership in a given union.

The Labor Peace Conference which was held in Chicago on the initiative of several hundred local trade-union leaders* is an excellent example of the type of united action of labor that should not only be supported but be considered as a model for similar gatherings of the rank and file from all unions on such issues as the fight to repeal the Taft-

Hartley Act, the fight for Negro rights in the trade unions, for progressive legislation, in the battle against unemployment, for the 30-hour week, and on other burning issues confronting the American workers.

Unity of action in defense of the burning needs of the workers, if persistently pursued and effectively organized, especially among the workers in the steel, maritime, auto, rubber, textile and other unions which are now under Right-wing leadership, together with the many millions of workers in the A. F. of L., together with those in the Left-led unions and in the independent unions, can and will result in setting back and defeating the efforts of the employers to utilize the present situation to weaken the unions. It can and will result in immediate gains for all workers. In a larger sense, it will provide the road for effectively combatting the splitters of labor and for forging in the long run a unified labor movement.

* We refer the reader, in this connection, to the article, "The National Labor Conference for Peace," by Carl Ross, which was published in the November issue.—Ed.

New York's 1949 Elections

by Lillian Gates

THE NEW YORK CITY elections were of great significance as well as of great interest to the entire country. Whatever may be the saying about "As Maine goes, so goes the nation," the truth is that New York City election trends embody developing political currents far more than any other single area. The very character of the city as the most progressive in America makes the election struggles here both a test of present, and a mirror of future, political trends throughout the country.

The Mayoralty and Senatorial elections were of exceptional importance, since they were the first major electoral test since the Truman victory of 1948. Taking place in a political setting of heightened war preparations, and under the ominous shadow of the Foley Square police-state frame-up trial of the Communist leaders, the outcome was eagerly awaited as an index of the ability of the American people to check the offensive of reaction. They also were watched by all political parties as a clue to the outcome of the decisive 1950 Congressional and Senatorial elections.

Within the framework of this political setting, the generally positive

outcome for the third party and progressive forces shown in the New York City election results strengthens the cause of peace and democracy.

THE GANG-UP OF REACTION

The conclusion that the election outcome had overall positive results is strengthened by an examination of the results against a background of the line-up and objectives of the reactionary camp and those of the democratic forces.

The leadership of the Democratic and Republican Parties, fully in the grip of Wall Street and aided by the Dubinsky-controlled Liberal Party, sought to increase their influence among the people and, above all, to destroy the American Labor Party. To this end, early in the campaign they were counselled by Wall Street's spokesmen, the *New York Times* and the *New York Herald Tribune*, to select candidates with "liberal reputations." Newbold Morris, despite shaky support among conservative Republican circles, thus won the Republican-Liberal-Fusion nomination, while Mayor O'Dwyer, after many strange gyrations, became the Democratic candidate. Even then the

Democrats felt so uncertain that the scheme of having Senator Wagner resign so that former Governor Lehman could bolster the Democratic ticket was deliberately concocted.

As an additional factor, which in itself proves the growing trend away from the old-line political machines, new use was made of the Social-Democratic-dominated Liberal Party.

Simultaneously, an unholy alliance was formed to defeat Benjamin J. Davis, which became a national concentration point of reaction. Democrats, Republicans, Liberals and Fusion ganged up against him and conducted a campaign of confusion, lies and distortions, with the Foley Square frame-up as the center of this concentrated attack.

CARROT AND CLUB

It might be said that the electoral tactic employed by Wall Street and its political machines was an application in the political field of the "carrot and club" policy. Extravagant promises and sugar-coated candidates were offered, while the club of political repression, Peekskill violence against Negroes, Jews and progressives, growing anti-Semitism, the splitting, Red-baiting of the C.I.O. Convention and within the labor movement generally, was not only in plain sight but was being used daily. And New York City was the actual

scene of the Foley Square trial of the Communist leaders, coinciding with the entire election period. This created an atmosphere of witchhunting far exceeding that of any previous campaign.

A.L.P. COUNTER-ATTACK

The third party camp led a powerful counter-offensive behind the candidacies of Vito Marcantonio and the A.L.P. ticket, and around the candidacy of Benjamin J. Davis, regarded by all as being of major importance. It sought to increase the third party vote as the most effective foundation for strengthening the peace camp. As the basis for achieving this, it set out to make a real turn in developing roots among the Negro people and to extend its ties with the working-class areas. The Communist Party, the only party of Socialism in our country, supported the general aims of this broad coalition, while maintaining its own advanced position. This support added to the fighting capacity of the third party movement. The endorsement of Benjamin J. Davis by the A.L.P. served both to strengthen the A.L.P. among the Negro people and to enhance its ability to defeat divisive Red-baiting.

ELECTION OUTCOME POSITIVE

1. *The people of New York City and in key areas throughout the state reaffirmed their desires for peace,*

social progress and democracy. This is the meaning of the defeat of John Foster Dulles, whose defeat reflected the hatred of the people for the open, pro-fascist program projected by him. Despite the fact that this vote continued within the framework of support to the Democratic Party, which is a dangerous misdirection of the people's progressive desires, it has important political meaning. It indicates that the majority of the people of New York State can be won for united action for progressive legislation and for specific points of a genuine peace program, such as opposition to rearming of Germany, etc.

2. *The major objective of the political machines to destroy the American Labor Party was defeated.*

The A.L.P. not only held its own proportionately, by comparison with the 1948 vote, but increased its vote percentage-wise (from 13.1% to about 13.8%).

3. *Although the defeat of Benjamin J. Davis is a serious loss to the people, the vote won by him reflected a major break-through among the Negro people.* This vote far exceeded that ever achieved among the Negro people in the Harlem area. Davis' stature as a national spokesman for the Negro people has been heightened and his influence extended.

4. *The true measure of the A.L.P. vote cannot be determined by its overall vote alone. The new inroads among key sections of the working people, especially the Italian and the*

Puerto Rican people, in addition to the historic break-through among the Negro people, have special meaning for building and strengthening the third party.

As declared in the statement of the New York State Communist Party:

These new ties can be consolidated and made permanent, while the losses suffered by the A.L.P. in some working class and practically all of the middle class Jewish areas can be transitory. Such consolidation of the A.L.P. among the new sections of the working people and recouping its traditional base among the Jewish people would place the A.L.P. in a most favorable situation for the 1950 elections.

5. *Of national significance also is the greater strength registered by Vito Marcantonio in his own Congressional District, where he received a vote both proportionately and numerically higher throughout the area.*

6. *These positive factors are all the more important coming after the ebb following the 1948 elections. They reaffirm basically the validity as well as the possibilities of building the third party as the core of the people's coalition which can and will defeat reaction.*

These positive results prove that many of these major objectives of the third party and progressive forces were achieved, while certain major objectives of reaction and its political machines were defeated,

THE DAVIS CAMPAIGN

The splendid campaign for the reelection of Benjamin J. Davis in the 21st Senatorial District merits a special article. Within the confines of this overall review, let it be said that the stirring struggles around issues, especially on police brutality, and the mass activity including parades, movies, open-air meetings of great size and enthusiasm, elicited the grudging admiration of practically the entire New York press.

And when Councilman Davis himself was released four days before Election Day, to be greeted by a great outpouring of the people of Harlem, it is no wonder that the spirit of victory ran high, even in face of the insurmountable obstacle of the tri-partisan gang-up and the campaign of confusion.

This pre-election spirit of victory, and the loss to the people suffered by the electoral defeat of Ben Davis, naturally caused a temporary underestimation of the gains registered. This temporary difficulty should not outweigh what was essentially correct—the projection and mounting of a winning campaign for Comrade Davis which laid the basis for the results achieved.

The break-through among the Negro people in Harlem, which was reflected in the gains made throughout the city, centered in the 11th Assembly District, heart of the Davis campaign and of Harlem. Here 46 per-

cent of the voters supported Davis. The A.L.P. became the first party in this assembly district. The contribution of the Davis campaign was also reflected in the entire Harlem area, where the A.L.P. garnered over 30 percent of the votes, becoming a major political force in that key community. The Davis campaign was greatly aided by the effective campaign and record of Marcantonio among the Negro people, and the assistance given by Ewart Guinier, Negro trade unionist, candidate for Borough President on the A.L.P. ticket. The widespread naming of Negro candidates for posts throughout the city and state also aided. The improved fight of the A.L.P., the Communist Party and many progressive organizations in the fight for Negro rights had laid the foundation for this historic turn.

This development marks a complete change from the decline suffered by the A.L.P. among the Negro people in 1948. It lays the basis for the third party to make even more rapid strides as a major political party. It helps to weld the unity of the mighty Negro people's movement with labor—the prerequisite for defeating war and fascism and for furthering social progress in America.

These gains must be extended by improving the fight for Negro rights and building stronger the unity of the Negro and white people. More stress should be placed on develop-

ing Negro-Jewish unity.

The history of the removal of Benjamin Davis from the City Council is in itself a lesson in the high price of anti-Communism. To defeat Davis required the elimination of the democratic system of P.R. and has brought about the return of the discredited Tammany monopoly in the New York City government. The names of Benjamin J. Davis and the late Peter V. Cacchione are inseparably bound with the gains made by the people under P.R. And even the political machines in their unholy alliance against Ben Davis were forced to adhere to the principle of Negro representation!

The excellent campaign among the people would have been aided by more consistency in developing ties with various community and other political leaders in the Harlem area. This weakness can be overcome in the course of united action around specific needs in the period ahead.

A.L.P. CAMPAIGN

Led by a peerless campaigner, the people's Congressman, Vito Marcantonio, the A.L.P. campaign engendered great enthusiasm and a contagious victory spirit.

Marcantonio's stature as a beloved champion of the Puerto Rican people, as well as the growing militancy of the Puerto Ricans around the issues of national independence and

their local needs, were both strikingly revealed in this campaign.

The same strength was revealed, though unevenly, throughout the city among the Italian-Americans. Morris tried hard to hide behind the mantle of LaGuardia, but Marcantonio was hailed increasingly as LaGuardia's true political heir.

Marcantonio, with the excellent aid of his running mates, Paul L. Ross and Mineola Ingersoll, conducted a very effective campaign based on the local issues of rent control, housing, relief standards, taxation, the five-cent fare, schools, discrimination, conditions of city employees, etc. He hammered home the sell-out on Taft-Hartley, especially to the workers. He linked these issues with the fight for peace, although even more emphasis on the link with the cold war, and especially on such specific aspects of that policy such as re-nazification of Germany, would have strengthened the campaign.

The increased A.L.P. vote among the Negro, Italian, Puerto Rican and other sections of the working people was due to Marcantonio's progressive record in Congress, the character of the campaign conducted by him and the A.L.P., and the correct policy of concentration in key areas. The vote varied in proportion to the amount of work done.

These new ties of the A.L.P. with the working people strengthen its main base as well as add to its fight-

ing capacity. A.L.P. leaders speak with determination and enthusiasm of maintaining and expanding these ties. Another healthy sign is the emphasis being placed on building and broadening the A.L.P. and improving its day-to-day and year-round functioning in fighting for the needs of the workers and the people in the communities.

UPSTATE RESULTS

The upstate results showed a general trend to the Democratic Party, combined with a dangerously large vote for Dulles. The A.L.P. vote declined sharply, but this was expected and unavoidable under the conditions of the Senatorial contest. These conditions required concentration on the New York City mayoralty race, as the most effective way of rolling up maximum third party strength. It might be added that greater flexibility in the number and character of candidates proposed for office would probably have helped: in areas where the third party is weak, contests should be limited to those posts around which the best possibilities for success exist, rather than projecting candidates for many posts.

The results upstate show the need greatly to strengthen the A.L.P. while at the same time seeking varied forms for the expression of progressive political aims in keeping with local conditions.

SHORTCOMINGS

One of the objectives of Wall Street was partially achieved in the increased vote of the Liberal Party, which for the first time topped the A.L.P. vote. These gains have temporarily given the Social-Democratic forces a certain mass base. But it is one which even the Dubinsky clique does not hail with complete enthusiasm. The defeat of the Morris ticket was a blow to Dubinsky's fondest hopes and has created new rifts within both the Liberal Party and the Americans for Democratic Action around the continued Dubinsky-Berle alliance with Dewey.

The major factor in the Liberal Party gains was the electoral alliances handed to it, with the aid of Big Business. The combination of Lehman and Morris on the City ticket was exploited around the slogan. "A vote for one elects both." Many Jewish people, disgruntled with the flagrant anti-Semitism, machine corruption of the O'Dwyer administration, and Cardinal Spellman's rebuke to Mrs. Roosevelt, voted on the Liberal Party line. In Brooklyn, the candidacy of Abe Stark, well-known Jewish merchant and leader, for Borough President cut even more heavily into the A.L.P. vote.

This vote certainly does not represent an endorsement of the Dubinsky-Berle Red-baiting cold war policies. The Liberal Party election material hid its true program and featured

appeals to "Good Government" and for the "Fair Deal" program.

The need now is to develop widespread united action with those who mistakenly supported the Liberal Party, believing they were voting for independent progressive political action. Such united activity with the rank and file of the Liberal Party is all the more urgent because the Social-Democrats, knowing full well the flimsy foundations of their gains, are stepping up activities around many local issues.

In addition, much more must be done to expose the truly reactionary character and program of the leadership of the Liberal Party and their basic support of the bi-partisan policies of war and betrayal. Failure to do this sufficiently and systematically was a major shortcoming of the Communist and progressive forces in this campaign.

LOSS AMONG THE JEWISH VOTERS

This drift toward the Liberal Party could have been checked by more effective work among the Jewish people. The A.L.P. loss among the Jewish voters was widespread, with some important exceptions. This loss has its roots in the long period of neglect by the Communist Party and the progressive movement of struggle on issues affecting the Jewish people, particularly during the last year and a half. Remember that in February

1948 the Isacson victory symbolized the fighting policy of the third party and the Communist Party for the establishment of Israel, and was an important factor in launching the Progressive Party.

While a full explanation of the reasons for this neglect cannot be given here, undoubtedly there has been a withdrawal of attention to Israel, lack of sensitivity on the mounting anti-Semitism, serious failure to dispel the confusion created by the concerted and false charges of anti-Semitism in the Soviet Union, and a weakening of activity in key Jewish organizations. It is also true that among the middle class Jewish groups, the campaign of the *New York Post* boosting Tito's stock has not been without effect.

But the bulk of the A.L.P. vote still comes from the Jewish voters, both working class and middle class. And it is significant that where ties with the Jewish people have been maintained, especially in key areas such as the East Side, and parts of the 24th Congressional District, the A.L.P. held its own. Leo Isacson's vote for Borough President of the Bronx was higher than that for the A.L.P. ticket as a whole, reflecting the ties and activities developed in the past.

A drastic change in overcoming these shortcomings, combined with a more consistent application of correct united-front policy, can and will recoup these losses.

THE DULLES-LEHMAN
CONTEST

Another key factor in the loss among the Jewish voters, which also prevented a greater vote for the A.L.P. among the working people generally, were certain errors made in relation to the Dulles-Lehman senatorial contest. This contest in many respects set the tone for the entire campaign and became a dominant factor in determining the outcome of the elections.

From the very beginning, it was recognized that Lehman's candidacy, as opposed to that of Dulles, notorious apologist for fascism and chief architect of the cold-war policy, created serious problems for the progressive coalition. The widespread belief among the people that Lehman still stands for the progressive policies of Roosevelt made it necessary to adopt a tactic which would not alienate voters from support of the A.L.P. At the same time, it was generally recognized by the progressive coalition that Lehman basically upheld the Truman-Dulles bi-partisan foreign policy, would uphold Truman's betrayal, and thus could not be supported.

The A.L.P. correctly decided not to name a candidate. As stated in our Communist Party analysis, "it thus helped to build a united anti-Dulles front without taking any political responsibility for Lehman's surrender to Dulles on fundamental

questions of policy (arms to Greece, Marshall Plan, Red-baiting, etc.) or for fostering any illusions in Lehman."

This tactic became even more necessary after the notorious upstate speech of Dulles, openly appealing to racial and religious bigotry and prejudice, a speech followed by an attack on social-welfare legislation and projecting a 1949 version of Hooverism.

But from the outset, there was considerable confusion both in the Communist Party and among progressives generally about the application of this tactic. There was a reluctance to apply it in such a way as to build a united front with all the anti-Dulles voters, which would have made it easier to persuade these voters to vote for the A.L.P. even while supporting Lehman. There was thus a hesitancy to vigorously denounce Dulles in the labor unions, the A.L.P. and other progressive organizations.

There was insufficient understanding of the third party tactic, a tactic which took into account the level of understanding and moods of the people without falling into a "lesser evil" trap. It was thus a correct and principled tactic.

The starting point of establishing contact with the mass of voters should have been the sharpest attack on Dulles, to make unmistakably clear the opposition of the progressive coalition to his program. Thus, the main burden of the arguments in

applying the tactic should have been to convince Lehman voters to vote also for the A.L.P., rather than the "plague on both their houses" approach taken by some in the third party camp. Within the framework of this approach, it would have been possible and necessary to be critical of Lehman and urge that an A.L.P. vote was the only *guarantee* of the *democratic* aspirations of Lehman voters. The vote received by Lehman in New York City revealed that at least 150,000 Marcantonio supporters also voted for Lehman. A more correct application of the tactic would have brought more Lehman supporters to the A.L.P. line, which was its purpose.

While the hesitation in applying this tactic boldly to build a bridge to Lehman voters was the main problem, there was also incorrect thinking in the other direction. There were those who prosposed endorsement of Lehman. But this position did not take into account the basic agreement between Lehman and Dulles on foreign policy noted early in the campaign by Walter Lippmann and others. Endorsement of Lehman would have been both unprincipled and a serious blow to the entire program and basis of existence of the third party.

There are invaluable lessons here for 1950 which have validity for the entire country, although the tactic must not be viewed as simply one of not naming a candidate for a given

post. Of prime importance is to get the ear of the people by understanding their moods and desires, and making this the *starting* point of winning their support for the people's coalition and the third party movement.*

POLITICAL TRENDS

The election results showed a stronger vote for the Democratic Party than in 1948. The Democrats gained 6 percent in New York City, while the Republicans registered a very sharp drop of 12 percent in the mayoralty contest. Thanks to the abolition of P.R., they now control 24 out of 25 City Council seats—with one lone Republican, the outstanding liberal, Stanley Isaacs.

This increased Democratic vote was due to a number of factors, and was aided greatly by the character of the John Foster Dulles campaign. The Democrats, and especially O'Dwyer, at first pitched their campaign on a theme of local accomplishments. But as the campaign got under way, and especially under the impact of Marcantonio's devastating exposure of O'Dwyer's record, they shifted to a general defense of Truman's "Fair Deal," called for "return to the Roosevelt tradition" and attacked the "special interests" and Republican reaction. Lehman's campaign centered around upholding the

* Valuable insight on this highly important point may be gained from a restudy of Lenin's and Stalin's teachings as compiled in *Strategy and Tactics*, pp. 42-44 and 48-50.

"welfar
"statis

Obvi
bined v
man, l
and N
ernor c
with th
action,
ing th

But
the De
demag
that d
tain s
growi
litical
bined
the A
man's
yet ru
the p
Adm
Party
with

WI
lief?
doub
hand
ment
crisis
mass
the I
as th
On
nom
emp

* T
A.L.P.
which
velt i

"welfare state" against Dulles' cry of "statism."

Obviously this demagoguery, combined with the greater appeal of Lehman, long associated with Roosevelt and New Deal reforms as the Governor of New York State, contrasted with the Republican call for open reaction, did have an effect in increasing the Democratic vote.

But it would be wrong to attribute the Democratic increase to campaign demagoguery alone. The results show that despite A.L.P. gains among certain sections of the people, and the growing desire for independent political action expressed in the combined vote for the Liberal Party and the A.L.P.*, the illusions in Truman's "Fair Deal" program have not yet run their course. The majority of the people still feel that the Truman Administration and the Democratic Party are a lesser evil as compared with Republican reaction.

Why this stubbornly-rooted belief? Economic conditions were undoubtedly a major factor. On the one hand, the slight upturn in employment and the fact that the developing crisis has not yet reached the stage of mass unemployment were used by the Democrats to portray themselves as the providers of lasting prosperity. On the other hand, fear of the economic crisis, coupled with mass unemployment in certain upstate cities

and the violent Dulles attack on the "welfare state" were also used by the Democrats to lay claim to opposing Hooverism. Only where the economically hard-hit people had actual experience with Democratic betrayal and had seen a fight for their needs by the A.L.P. and progressive labor unions (as among the Negro and Puerto Rican people in New York City) did they vote for the third party as the genuine answer to these problems.

While the ability of the Democrats to play both sides of the street will be lessened as the economic crisis reaches mass proportions, signs already point to an even greater use of demagoguery around the "welfare state" to retard the development of a mass breakaway. Here the change in tactics of the Republican Party as indicated in the New York elections must be more fully evaluated. Eisenhower has now joined Dewey and Dulles in an attack on "statism," and while it is too early to say that this attack will be the main Republican theme of the 1950 elections, there are indications that Big Business seeks mass support for an openly reactionary program of placing the burdens of the developing crisis on the people. This helps the Democrats pose as "progressives" by contrast. It demands that more attention be given by the progressive forces to the economic needs of the workers, both employed and unemployed, combined with a more vigorous fight to

* The total vote of the Liberal Party and the A.L.P. for the mayoralty contest was 737,000, which exceeded their combined vote for Roosevelt in 1944 numerically and proportionately.

retard the economic crisis by increased public housing, trade with the People's Democracies, etc.

Along with this, it is also clear that the masses of the people still do not understand the reactionary character of the Truman bi-partisan foreign policy. Not only Lehman, but also Dulles, repeated his devotion to the cause of international peace in this campaign. There was no discussion of the issues of foreign policy and the relationship between the cold-war military budget and the pressing needs of the people for schools, hospitals, etc., by the machine parties and their helpmates, the Liberal Party. Only the A.L.P. and the Communist Party injected this note, which could have been strengthened without weakening the excellent campaign based on local issues, too long neglected in the past.

Here, too, the peace sentiment of the people goes far beyond that registered on the third party line. This peace sentiment can be rallied around many specific points such as outlawing the atom bomb, curtailing Marshall Plan expenditures and other issues in the coming session of Congress.

Even with all this, there is no doubt that the growing uneasiness of the people would have been reflected in a larger A.L.P. vote, had it not been for the unprecedented activities of the top reactionary labor leadership. The Railroad Brotherhoods, the A.F. of L., some of the

I.L.G.W.U. forces, the state and city C.I.O., all joined hands to conduct a campaign exceeding in scope any of those for Roosevelt. Instead of criticizing the Truman betrayal on Taft-Hartley, they brought Alben W. Barkley to New York City solemnly to promise its repeal "next year"!

These activities account for the Lehman-O'Dwyer victory, especially in view of O'Dwyer's lack of any other electoral alliances.

Marcantonio and the A.L.P. did make new contacts with the labor movement and the workers. Many of the progressive-led unions improved upon their political activity over 1948. Many new shops and some trade-union locals endorsed the A.L.P. ticket for the first time. However, the impact of the divisive, Red-baiting activities of the C.I.O. Convention did slow down the all-out rallying of the progressive-led unions. More activity especially in the shops around the A.L.P. ticket, which had very strong labor appeal, would have helped combat these divisive influences in the C.I.O. and added even more to the third party vote.

LESSONS FOR 1950

In view of trends revealed by the election results, it is clear that the third party camp could have been more successful had it been able to make even clearer that it was the champion of the *unity* of the people against reaction. This necessitated

not only a sharper anti-Dulles struggle, with a greater degree of identification with the anti-fascist, anti-Dulles moods of the people, but a harder fight for increased electoral alliances around a minimum program.

In fact, a correct policy of seeking such agreements was projected by the A.L.P., but in practice this was weakened by two elements: (1) the gang-up policy of the major parties, which were determined to freeze out the A.L.P.; and (2) some narrow, go-it-alone policies which occasionally manifested themselves in the progressive movement. Nonetheless, a number of such electoral alliances were achieved in some of the upstate cities, especially around Negro candidates, and in Brooklyn, where a broad, mass struggle around the issue of police brutality led to an election coalition with the Republican candidate for the office of District Attorney. These election coalitions were bitterly attacked by leaders of both machine parties. Most of them held firm. Use of the courts against the Brooklyn coalition does not destroy its importance.

At the beginning of the campaign, there was a tendency to make complete agreement on progressive foreign policy a pre-condition for such election coalitions. This position was rejected as not being helpful to the aims of the consistent peace forces who seek to win the majority of the American people to a rejection of the

bi-partisan war program instigated by Wall Street. The building of the third party is the foundation for this movement of the American people, and must, of course, be based on the fight for a progressive peace policy. But it was also pointed out that the support of candidates on the lower levels of the two old parties is not in contradiction to, but is a necessary part of, the tactic of building the third party as the core of the people's coalition against war and fascism in our country. For the aim of such an election coalition is to strengthen the ties of the third party with voters not yet ready to break with the two-party system, around a minimum democratic program, including endorsement or support of candidates.

Such support must always be given on the basis of the specific conditions in each area and the type of campaign being conducted. In the municipal election campaigns which took place throughout the state, there were local candidates with a generally progressive record on many vital issues. They did not take a position on foreign affairs generally, even though when they did, some supported one or another aspect of the bi-partisan foreign policy. To have made full agreement on *all* questions, including foreign policy, in a mechanical way a precondition for election agreements, would have meant adherence to a maximum program. In practice, it would mean

rejection of any type of support, even qualified support, to such candidates, despite their generally progressive records. This would lessen the possibilities of strengthening the contact of the third party with voters who support these candidates. Such a policy would not, therefore, advance the cause of peace and democracy.

This flexible approach, did not, of course, include support of candidates fully associated with the bipartisan war program. Nor did it preclude the need to criticize candidates who mistakenly supported one or another aspect of this program, even while supporting them on the basis of a minimum progressive program.

The correct application of this policy for 1950 will undoubtedly be the key to building the third party and to strengthening the people's movement against war and fascism, and for peace and for progressive legislation.

This policy is, of course, based on a two-sided tactic which must be firmly grounded in strengthening the conscious third party forces while simultaneously seeking to build alliances with other sections of the people. *And, side by side with election coalitions limited to one or another, or several issues, there will rise an even greater need for more independent political activity by the most consistent peace forces, especially by the Communist Party. This inde-*

pendent activity, pressing for an overall anti-fascist, anti-imperialist program, is the only guarantee that, in the course of limited struggles, new sections of the people will learn the need for a break-away from the old-line parties and will join the ranks of the convinced third party supporters.

The foundation for such election coalitions will be laid in developing united action with the millions of voters who have once again reaffirmed their desire for peace, social progress and democracy. The danger of fascist reaction has not been lessened. It has increased. The large vote for Dulles in New York City as well as in the upstate areas reveals a dangerous mass base for an openly reactionary program. The coming sessions of Congress, the State Legislature, and City Councils will be the arenas in which the battle for the unity of the people in struggle for their needs will be fought out.

Announcement by the N.A.A.C.P. of mass movements on civil rights at the time of the opening of Congress is an indication of the direction in which this activity is being developed.

Such movements require flexibility and unity based on specific issues with Truman and Lehman voters who do not yet understand the Democratic Party betrayal of the people's needs. To make rejection of Truman a precondition for such unity will

be to
ments.
of suc
gains c
the Tr

ROLE

The
Party
campai
of the
through
the Pa
election
an imp
the rel
leaders
Ther
ing ou
paign
come u
buildin
our pr
during
dent a
buildin

be to narrow down such movements. It is within the framework of such united struggle that actual gains can be won for the people, and the Truman demagoguery exposed.

ROLE OF THE PARTY

The members of the Communist Party performed heroically in this campaign. During the entire course of the campaign, they also carried through gigantic tasks in defense of the Party. The very course of the election struggles helped achieve an important democratic victory in the release of the eleven Communist leaders on bail.

There was some slowness in rallying our Party for the election campaign and this was not fully overcome until the last weeks. However, building the Communist Party and our press continued to be neglected during the campaign. More independent activity and greater attention to building the Communist Party and

the circulation of our press are called for if the people's coalition is to be built and its fighting capacity enhanced.

Our perspectives for future activity are:

1. To build the Communist Party and the press as the basis for strengthening the people's coalition.

2. To help build and broaden the American Labor Party, as the foundation of the people's coalition, capable of defeating the drive to war and reaction.

3. To help build the unity of the 400,000 A.L.P. voters with the millions who have reaffirmed their progressive desires around specific issues. Preparations for the 1950 State Legislature and the second session of the 81st Congress, and renewed attention to the New York City Council, should lay the foundation for this united activity. Along with this, preparations for the 1950 elections should begin without delay.

Despotism and Deportation

by Beatrice Siskind

THE HISTORY of the class struggle in the United States testifies to the fact that intensified persecution of the foreign-born has invariably accompanied reactionary attacks against the working class and the people as a whole. It is basic to note, however, that the present deportation mania is not the ordinary administration hounding of the foreign-born. This is demonstrated by the extent of the current drive, the kind of individuals under attack and the brutality and arbitrariness of the procedure.

The current deportation drive must be seen as part and parcel of the monopolies' drive to fascism at home in order to prepare the internal basis for realizing the Wall Street program of world domination and war. It is part of the deliberate attempt by Administration lickspittles of U.S. imperialism to behead the developing peace movement; to cripple the trade unions; and to divert the people's just anger—through anti-Red hysteria and the deliberate intensification of racism, chauvinist nationalism and anti-Semitism—from those who would take away our liberties, destroy our standards of living and foist on our necks the burden of crisis and the devastation of atomic war.

The present deportation delirium

is calculated to increase the anti-Communist hysteria, under cover of which the attack on the Bill of Rights and the preparations for atomic war may move steadily forward.

The deportation drive is aimed to instill in the people a storm-troop hysteria on the pattern of Peekskill and, more recently, of the Nazi-like terror against Negroes and Jews in the streets of Chicago—the attacks in both cases being openly aided and abetted by the police forces. This hysteria and terror is directed against everything progressive in American life and is designed to foment venomous hatred of the Soviet Union and the New Democracies. The basic aim is to enable the economic royalists and their Truman Administration to prevent effective resistance by the people, to put the heat on the cold war, to strengthen their grip on the Marshallized countries, to implement the war-inciting Atlantic Pact, and to build the military budget up to new, fantastic heights.

The deportation drive is a potent weapon in reaction's hands in its attempts to outlaw the Communist Party, the vanguard fighter against war and fascism; to weaken the progressive trade unions, and hence the labor movement as a whole; to attempt to separate further

the working people from the progressive forces by branding the latter as "Soviet agents," "aliens" and "un-Americans"; to bludgeon into frightened acquiescence the millions of foreign-born.

Hence, if the deportation drive is to be checked and defeated, the struggle against it must not be left, as has been the general tendency, in the hands of those whom the Truman Administration is attempting to deport, or in the hands of the selfless handful of workers in the American Committee for Protection of Foreign-Born. It must be viewed not only as a matter of life or death—which it is—for many threatened with deportation to fascist countries, but fundamentally, as part of today's broader life-or-death question—the question of war or peace, the question of American imperialism's plot to drag humanity into the fiery hell of a new world war and a Wall Street-edition of Hitler slavery.

Above all, it is into the trade unions that the struggle to rally the workers against the deportation drive must be brought, not only because so many of the deportees are trade unionists, but because the deportation drive is an integral part of the Taft-Hartley attack on the very existence of the trade unions.

The first condition for broadening the scope of the struggle against the deportation drive is for every progressive, and particularly every Communist, to acquaint himself

more concretely with the actual extent of the drive, the character of the attack, the nature of the persecution involved and the place of the foreign-born in American life. In turn, this knowledge must be made the property of the American people, to arouse them to the dangers to their security and liberties which the deportation drive signifies.

SCOPE AND CHARACTER OF THE DRIVE

The deportation drive, conducted by the Department of Justice, was initiated by the recent Attorney-General, Tom Clark, just rewarded by Truman for his high services to reaction, by appointment to the bench of the U.S. Supreme Court.

Who are the victims of what the late Supreme Court Justice, Frank Murphy, once characterized as "the practices of despotism in dealing with deportations"?

Throughout the United States, more than 130 individuals, residing in 17 states, have been arrested and are now being held as "undesirable aliens"; 3,000 other non-citizens are likewise threatened with deportation and 238 naturalized citizens face revocation of citizenship, according to Clark's own admission.

Included in the 130 already arrested are more than 30 leaders and members of trade unions; more than 20 women; two leaders of the Negro people; numerous prominent leaders of foreign groups; and long-stand-

ing leaders and members of the Communist Party of the U.S.A.

Of the 130 arrested, close to 70 have been in the United States from 30 to 40 years; 33 have been in this country from 20 to 30 years. Only 18 have been here less than 15 years. Forty-three had applications for citizenship pending at the time of their arrest. Most of the others have been prevented from becoming citizens because of their alleged membership in the Communist Party, or for their devoted work in the American trade-union and progressive movements.

What is immediately apparent here is *the political character of the deportation drive*. Singled out for persecution are leaders and active fighters in the cause of peace, resolute anti-fascist defenders of the Bill of Rights, militant leaders of the struggle to unify, defend and strengthen the trade-union movement and put it on a progressive course — all ardent battlers against reaction's program of fascism and war, against loading the burden of the crisis on the people.

As an integral part of reaction's attack against the Communist Party, whose national leaders were framed-up and railroaded at Foley Square, non-citizens are being subjected to deportation arrests and hearings and to threats of deportation to fascist countries and/or incarceration in concentration camps in the United States. A few of the leading Communists under this special persecu-

tion are John Williamson, Jack Stachel, Irving Potash, Alexander Bittelman, Betty Gannett, George Siskind, Claudia Jones, Dora Lipsitz, George Spector, and others.

What is the Department of Justice pretext for arresting and holding the anti-fascists it has chosen for attack? The only answer given by Truman's agency is: the political beliefs of the victims—that is, the F.B.I.-Gestapo version of their political beliefs.

By every standard of decency, all those being held have fully earned their right to citizenship. Their long residence in this country; their lifelong toil and privation in helping build America's industry and wealth; their family ties with American-born or naturalized husbands or wives and children; their sacrifice and contributions—through American trade unions, the progressive movement or the Communist Party—to the welfare of the American working class and the whole American people: all qualify them for honored citizenship.

Taxed while disfranchised, and subject to the same laws and penalties affecting citizens, they have been denied elementary American rights. The very fact that they are not citizens today is in itself an act of arbitrary political discrimination.

But it is not the fact of the deportation drive alone that stamps this drive as part of the systematic destruction of the Bill of Rights. It is the high-handed, illegal manner in

which
that
as pa
ment
Not
their
in ex
The
swoop
krieg
work
or sh
the s
Justice
tracts
by re
warr
bail,
bond
done.
Georg
Smith
to sub
of rep
Depart
ing th
more
of the
would
aliens
theless
tive a
other
out th
The
drive
meth
migr
vice
tice).

which the drive is being conducted that also determines its character as part of the frightening development toward fascism in this country.

Non-citizens have been seized in their homes and held without bail or in excessive bail (as high as \$25,000). The Immigration Service agents swoop down on their victims in blitzkrieg fashion. Homes are invaded; workers are interfered with in offices or shops; others are picked up on the street in hold-up style. The Justice Department violates bail contracts and virtually kidnaps aliens by re-arresting them without proper warrant and holding them without bail, even though the original bail bond was never forfeited (as was done in the case of this writer, George Pirinsky, and Ferdinand Smith last July 7). Others are forced to submit to the police-state practice of reporting weekly to the Justice Department. While Congress, fearing the people's wrath, delays to a more favorable moment the passage of the despicable Hobbs Bill which would set up concentration camps for aliens, the Justice Department nevertheless makes the Hobbs Bill operative as "law" at Ellis Island and in other deportation centers throughout the United States.

The fascist-like character of the drive can be seen further in the method of operation of the U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service (under the Department of Justice). That agency has arrogated to

itself the Gestapo-like power to investigate how an alien thinks, how he lives, his moral character, his intimate personal life, his friends and associates, as well as his political beliefs and affiliations.*

Such arbitrary actions set dangerous patterns for other departments of government — patterns characteristic of the fascist police-state.

THE SMITH ACT

Whereas non-citizens threatened with deportation are charged with violation of the 1918 Immigration Law, the springboard for the present attacks on the foreign-born is the Alien Registration Act of 1940. This is the same unconstitutional and thought-control Smith Act under which the eleven members of the National Committee of the Communist Party have been railroaded to jail.

Contrary to general belief, the Alien Registration Act is no more limited to the registration of aliens than was the Espionage Act of 1917 limited to prosecution of "spying." Just as in 1917, when an intolerable "sedition" law was foisted upon the American people on the pretext of protecting national security in wartime, so in 1940 a peace-time "sedition" law was clamped upon the American people.

* This whole procedure was long ago succinctly characterized in his book *The Deportation Delirium*, by Louis F. Post, Assistant Secretary of Labor during the period of the Palmer Raids: ". . . the whole proceeding is . . . substantially in the control of one of the inspectors, who acts in it as informer, arresting officer, inquisitor and judge."

The fascist-like trial of the Communist leaders at Foley Square demonstrates that the Smith Act is directed against both citizens and non-citizens. The 1940 Act has, however, resulted in special harassment of three million foreign-born.

The Department of Justice, in its report on results achieved under the 1940 Alien Registration Act, boasts of the fact that information obtained under the law has "drastically altered our policy toward aliens by providing the means of obtaining current background information about each registered alien in the country."

In other words, the Alien Registration Act has provided a more efficient means of spying upon, harassing and terrorizing non-citizens, of compiling a Gestapo file of millions.

Hobbs, author of the bill (H.R. 10) to set up Buchenwalds and Dachaus in the United States, said of the registration act that it was: "... the most important bill that has ever been presented to this body."

Figures obtained from the 1940 registration of aliens confirm, as do the acts regarding the more than 100 now facing deportation cited previously, that we are not dealing with recent immigrants but with people having deep roots in this country.

Seventy percent of the 3,000,000 registered non-citizens in 1940 have lived in the United States since 1924. More than 900,000 came here prior to 1906.

Of these non-citizens, 87.6 percent are located in the 14 states—including New York, New Jersey, Rhode Island, California, Pennsylvania, Massachusetts, Illinois, Michigan, Texas, Ohio, Connecticut, Washington, Minnesota and Wisconsin—in which are located the country's basic industries. More than 25 percent are employed in coal, iron, steel, maritime and other basic industries.

Of these non-citizens, 61 percent have American-born children and grandchildren. To attempt to sort out these non-citizens, to isolate them from their families, to harass and threaten them with deportation to lands that are now strange to them, is to persecute a broad segment of American life, is to attack the American people as a whole.

President Roosevelt once described our country as "a nation of immigrants and revolutionaries." The three million non-citizens, the eleven million naturalized citizens (also threatened by provisions of the Hobbs Bill) are truly America.

ATTACKS ON THE FOREIGN-BORN IN THE PAST

It would be incorrect, in describing the present attacks on the foreign-born, to assume that we are dealing with something completely new in the policies of the ruling class. What is new is that the present attacks are taking place in a setting of growing fascism, and precisely for that reason are developing with a scope

and brutality unparalleled in American history. But "Alien and Sedition Laws" and attacks on the foreign-born have been in the past, as they are today, an integral part of the governmental system, of the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie in this country. In all critical periods in the past, when the democratic façade of the bourgeois state has interfered with the desires and aims of the ruling class, the attack on the foreign-born has served as forerunner to all-out attacks on labor and the rights of the people.

Using French and Irish immigrants as scapegoats, American Tories, after the War of Independence, pushed through the onerous Alien and Sedition Acts of 1798.

The real purpose of that infamous legislation was the destruction of political opposition through curbing free press, free speech and free assembly. In implementing the traditional divide-and-rule policies, the American capitalist class has fostered and maintained systematic cultural oppression, erected a "caste system" in which the Negro is denied human rights and the foreign-born despised; and created the myth of an Anglo-Saxon "superiority," which has kept the immigrant apart from American life.

In the large cities of our country, the foreign-born are virtually segregated into ghetto-like, separate communities for people of different national origins. In the smaller in-

dustrial towns, especially in such states as Pennsylvania, Michigan, Indiana, etc., the foreign-born are forced into social seclusion, into a life of their own, apart from the community. In the large industries, the foreign-born have been systematically kept down to semi-skilled and unskilled occupations, while the so-called "Nordics," native-born Americans and those of British, German, and Scandinavian descent are generally the skilled workers and foremen.

Such has been the traditional pattern of American bourgeois life, designed to foster the divide-and-rule strategy, to exploit and oppress all workers by using the lower status of the foreign-born Americans as a whip to pull down the standards of the native-born proletariat.

Historically, the rulers of industry have stirred up hatred and friction between native and foreign-born workers for strike-breaking and union-busting purposes. With the organization of the masses of unskilled and semi-skilled (predominantly foreign-born) and the growth of unity between native and foreign-born in resisting the monopolies, the retaliation of the ruling class is directed with special brutality against the foreign-born.

Thus, when Irish immigrant workers predominated in heavy industry and constituted the militant section of the American working class, the ruling class unleashed a wave of anti-

Irish hysteria and persecution, lynching and "legal" frame-up murder against Irish workers. During that period, the vile racist chauvinism of the "Know-Nothing" movement and the anti-Catholic agitation of the K.K.K. were key instruments of the emerging monopolists directed against the labor movement. The martyrdom of the Molly Maguires constitutes a bloody chapter in the history of national oppression and persecution of the foreign-born as ruling-class weapons in the class struggle.

Fear of the rising trade-union movement, in which the working class came to grips with a capitalist class fattened and made arrogant by the imperialist World War I, prompted the Palmer Raids of the 1920's. Mass deportation of foreign-born radicals was the announced aim of the U.S. Department of Justice, headed by Attorney-General Palmer. Slav workers, among the most militant trade-union fighters in the basic industries, were particularly sought out, beaten, arrested and jailed by J. Edgar Hoover's minions. Radical Italian workers became the special target of fiendish ruling-class brutality. The vicious campaign of deportations, persecutions and brutality unleashed against Italian-born workers was climaxed by the outrage that shocked the world—the legal murder of Sacco and Vanzetti. Political deportations in that period alone exceeded 1,000. On the heels of this

vicious attack came the union-smashing, open-shop drive of the 'twenties, rule by injunction, company unionism, yellow-dog contracts and the open shop. The aftermath of the reactionary offensive, begun with the deportation delirium, was the smashing of some big unions and reduction of the A.F. of L. to a mere skeleton.

The devastating economic crisis of the 1930's saw Secretary of Labor Doak repeat the shame of the '20's in a series of "Red" raids. Here again, Slav workers were among the chief victims.

The tremendous stepping-up of the deportation hysteria is shown in the increase in deportations as weighed against immigrants admitted.

From 1892 to 1917, 16,500,000 immigrants were admitted and more than 33,000 deported; the ratio was one to 500.

From 1933 to 1947, some 4,000,000 were admitted and about 250,000 deported; the ratio rose sharply to one to 16.

During the crisis years of 1932-33, 60,000 were admitted, 40,000 were deported—a ratio of two to three! Foreign-born workers were forced, then as now, to bear the brunt of the crisis. When they no longer could be exploited profitably, they were driven out.

DEPORTATIONS— CHAUVINISM—RACISM

In viewing historically the attacks on the foreign-born, what also stands

but
cha
pani

It
of ra
the f
Orie
turn,
passa
tion

Th
expli
powe
port
natio
tion
in o
who
State

W
pre
lenc
73 a
lenc
pino
man
iforn

In
migr
perio
lynch
Pres
reco
Con
in t
has
Italy
Itali
T
pers

out as a central feature is the vile chauvinism and racism which accompanied them.

It was the reaction-inspired wave of race hatred which made possible the first immigration bars (the 1882 Oriental Exclusion Act) which, in turn, gave an entering wedge to the passage in 1891 of the first deportation law.

The Exclusion Act of 1882 made explicit the immigration service's power, not only to exclude, but to deport persons on the basis of their national origin. The 1891 deportation law authorized deportation within one year of entry of "any alien who shall come into the United States in violation of law."

With "Anglo-Saxon, white supremacy" marched force and violence. Between 1885 and 1910, some 73 aliens were lynched. Acts of violence against Chinese, Japanese, Filipinos, Hindus, etc., took place in many mining towns throughout California.

In New Orleans, nine Italian immigrants were lynched in the same period. This followed a wave of lynchings of such proportions that President McKinley was forced to recognize it in his 1899 message to Congress: ". . . for the fourth time in the present decade the question has arisen with the government of Italy in regard to the lynching of Italian subjects."

Traditionally accompanying the persecution of the foreign-born is the

intensification of anti-Semitism. Anti-Semitism is a particularly pernicious ruling-class instrument because reaction has constantly striven to inoculate with its poison, not only the masses at large, but important sections of the foreign-born themselves, with the aim of providing a "scapegoat" à la Hitler—a scapegoat for the "safe" and highly useful channeling and diversion of the protest and struggles of the foreign-born against the oppression to which Big Business subjects them. The present ultra-reactionary offensive of Wall Street against the working class, the Negro people, the foreign-born and the whole progressive movement is thus accompanied by the new wave of anti-Semitic outrages.

The special persecution of the foreign-born bears a close relationship to the status of the country of national origin of the immigrant, particularly during the epoch of imperialism. Thus, while supposedly enjoying the rights of citizenship automatically, hundreds of thousands of Puerto Ricans find that the brutal colonial oppression of their homeland by Wall Street imperialism follows them to the shores of the United States. Herded into the worst slum ghettos, suffering discrimination in employment and subject to the constant lash of police brutality, Puerto Rican immigrants in the United States are forced into a status approximating that of the Negro people. The divide-and-rule policy of

American imperialism has, of course, most brutally and cynically manifested itself in the special oppression—economic, social and political—of the Negro people. This oppression is given its major rationalization in the racist ideology of "white supremacy." Today, with the heightened campaign of chauvinist nationalism on the part of Wall Street bent on world domination, the struggle against this anti-human, white chauvinist ideology must be waged mercilessly as an inseparable part of the fight against the war-and-fascism policy of the monopolists.

THE VILE ATTACKS ON MEXICAN-AMERICANS

No discussion of the chauvinism associated with the attacks on the foreign-born can omit extended treatment of the vile persecution of the Mexican-Americans, whose plight and problems have been too often overlooked and neglected.

In the West and Southwest, the immigration service has been for some time pursuing a terroristic drive aimed at the deportation of 250,000 Mexican-Americans.

Homes and shops are raided periodically; victims are held in stockades or in U.S. military "detention centers" and shipped by bus loads to be dumped at the border.

Fascist-like indignities, including the shaving of deportees' heads in V's or on one side only, are common practices of immigration officers. In

one U.S. Immigration Service detention camp in El Centro, a San Diego citizens' committee found children, including one 14-year-old, who had been brought here on promise of a job, only to be picked up and held with the threat that his head would be shaved if he voiced protest.

Collusion between immigration officers and big farmers in forcing Mexicans into virtual peonage is open and shameless. One immigration officer reportedly operated a ranch entirely with "illegals,"—the "legal" term for slave labor.

Mass importation of Mexican workers by growers' agents with connivance of immigration authorities during harvest is an accepted practice. It is also a standard practice of authorities to accept growers' "passes," complete with photograph and fingerprints, as "official" to cover the movements of Mexican workers. Deportation is held as a perpetual threat over any imported laborer who may protest extremely low wages, vile food or bad living quarters.

Not only are young workers and peasants, who are sought by growers as skilled, though cheap labor, victimized in this way. Long-time residents, including those who have been citizens too long to have proof of birth or date of entry, stand in terror of deportation, though they have lived here for years, established American homes and reared American-born families.

These Mexican workers, in the

fields
roads
the v
mon
deser
sham
tally

To
virul
grow
with
ous n
spells
peopl
lutely
move

THE

It
labor
mean
and s
An i
ous e
and t
leade
tice.

C.I.O.
who
policy
State
hardl
Imm
ment
and
ists.
passi
is rap
pers

fields and factories and on the railroads, have created a large share of the vast wealth of the West's big monopoly farmers. They, if anybody, deserve citizenship. Instead, they are shamefully exploited and most brutally oppressed.

Today, the deportation drive, in virulent fashion, is stimulating the growth of racism, which, coupled with the growth of its most dangerous manifestation, white chauvinism, spells disaster for the liberties of the people, unless it is combatted resolutely, in the first place by the labor movement.

THE SHAME OF AMERICA

It may be asked: why has not the labor movement grasped the true meaning of the deportation drive and set itself the task of defeating it? An important reason is the poisonous effect of the "Big Lie" technique and the collaboration of some labor leaders with the Department of Justice. It should be apparent that the C.I.O. and A.F. of L. top leaders, who increasingly mold their every policy and deed to the needs of the State Department's cold war, would hardly refuse to "cooperate" with the Immigration Service of the Department of Justice in its drive to harass and deport progressive trade unionists. The Murray leadership, in its passivity on the deportation delirium, is rapidly sliding into the old Gompers policy of openly supporting alien

exclusion laws and outright betrayal of the foreign-born.

Arrests, deportations, indictments against labor leaders, trade unionists, Communist leaders, anti-fascists and progressives generally have been presented to the American people as measures designed to preserve the "American way of life" and to safeguard the national security.

The hypocrisy of this propaganada is apparent.

Carol King, noted New York lawyer, a recognized expert in the field of immigration law, and general counsel for the American Committee for Protection of Foreign-Born, fully exposes former Attorney-General Clark's "career by disregard of the law." Mrs. King has cited from the record a whole number of practices of Mr. Truman's Justice Department which prove conclusively that the threat to the "democratic way of life" and to the "national security" comes, not from the political deportees, but from the Department of Justice.

The attempt to establish American concentration camps and hold foreign-born without bail culminated in the heroic hunger strike conducted by John Williamson, Irving Potash, Gerhart Eisler, Ferdinand Smith and Charles Doyle. These heroic inmates of Mr. Clark's concentration camp at Ellis Island dramatically brought this shame to the attention of the country and forced the courts to admit the five to bail.

Nevertheless, a year later, and

despite the decision of the court in the cases of the five hunger strikers, the Attorney-General was responsible for the re-arrest and detention of George Pirinsky, Secretary of the American Slav Congress, and Beatrice Siskind (author of this article)—again without bail. I was held without bail for 50 days before the Department agreed to release me on the exorbitant bail of \$10,000 with a provision forcing me to report to the Island twice monthly. George Pirinsky, torn from his family and his work, was held in solitary confinement for three months until the Court of Appeals compelled a reversal and bail was granted.

A particularly pernicious police-state practice of the Attorney-General is the procedure of forcing deportees, pending hearing, to report regularly to the Department of Justice. Here, too, in spite of five court decisions declaring such requirements illegal, the Department still continues to compel a number of deportees, under threat of revocation of bail and arrest, to report to it.

Still another practice has been the bribing of "witnesses" by giving them jobs in the Immigration Service, and the use of paid informers to testify in all political cases.

Testifying at the Senate Committee hearing on Tom Clark's nomination as Supreme Court justice, Mrs. King accused the Attorney-General of taking it upon himself to put into effect the provisions of the Hobbs

Bill before it becomes law. She stated:

Despite a United States Supreme Court decision that an alien could not constitutionally be punished for illegal entry by detention at hard labor after a hearing by an administrative agency, Clark has shown no concern regarding the constitutionality of the proposed Hobbs (concentration camp) Bill. Rather he, acting outside the law, while Attorney-General, put into effect the essential provisions of this obnoxious bill. His request to Congress to authorize his actions in the absence of a statute and in the presence of a clear statement of law by the Supreme Court shows that he fully recognized the illegality of his position. He continued these practices even after Congress, as he himself admitted, "failed to act."

Insufficient attention has been given to the fascist-like Hobbs Bill (H.R. 10), which has been before Congress for several years. Every effort must be made to defeat this vicious proposal, which provides in part: (1) the indefinite detention of non-citizens whose deportation cannot be effected (in effect, concentration-camp imprisonment without the right to trial); (2) the holding of non-citizens without bail; (3) empowerment of the Attorney-General to send non-citizens to any country that will accept them, which may mean to fascist countries.

This bill violates every accepted constitutional procedure and the Bill of Rights, which was designed

to prot
eign-bo
reaction
to enact
gress r
struggle
become
ing an
worker
tive- an

A spe
portatio
pation
in hara
refusal
to atten
tions in
become
prolong
tion of
leader,
the U.S.
smashing

Of
held, n
trade u
few of
being
the Ho
A.F. o
Schnei
C.I.O.;
men's
merly
C.I.O.;
Packin
Warho
Wood
and L
Food,

to protect both American- and foreign-born. There is no doubt that reaction will strive with all its might to enact this bill into law when Congress reconvenes in January. The struggle to defeat this scheme must become an important issue for rallying and uniting all progressives, workers, the Negro people, and native- and foreign-born.

A special feature of the current deportation hysteria is the direct participation of the Immigration Service in harassment of labor unions. The refusal to allow Canadian delegations to attend International union conventions in the States has by this time become an international scandal. The prolonged and shameful persecution of the C.I.O. longshoremen's leader, Harry Bridges, is symbolic of the U.S. Justice Department's union-smashing, strike-breaking policies.

Of the more than 130 being held, more than one-third are active trade unionists. To mention just a few of the trade-union leaders now being held: Michael Obermeier of the Hotel and Restaurant Workers, A.F. of L.; Irving Potash and Jack Schneider of the Fur Workers, C.I.O.; Ferdinand Smith, Negro seamen's leader; Charles Doyle, formerly of the Chemical Workers, C.I.O.; Refugio Roman Martinez, Packinghouse Workers, C.I.O.; Peter Warhol, International Union of Woodworkers; Ernesto Mangaoang and Louisa Mariano Bemis of the Food, Tobacco and Agricultural

Workers, C.I.O. and Esther Sazer of the United Office and Professional Workers, C.I.O.

Ferdinand Smith, former N.M.U. leader, in a statement issued to the press at the time of his release from Ellis Island, branded the proceedings against him as a direct deal between Boss Ryan of the International Longshoremen's Union and the Department of Justice designed to remove him from the struggle being waged by the Negro longshoremen of the New York waterfront. It is obvious, furthermore, that the immigration authorities timed the re-opening of the Bridges case with the heroic Honolulu longshoremen's strike and with Murray's treacherous expulsion policy in the C.I.O. Thus, the deportation instrument is used to intervene directly in the trade unions in order to weed out the militants and cripple the trade-union movement. The deportation technique is an illegal union-busting arm of the Taft-Hartley Act, directed against all labor.

CONCLUSION

It is the boast of Truman's Justice Department that during the four-year tenure of Tom Clark its Immigration and Naturalization Service has deported 830,000 aliens. By contrast, the whole recorded number expelled in the 50 years prior to Clark's 1945 appointment, was 575,000.

In stark contrast to the unparalleled deportation of seamen and other

workers, anti-fascists, trade unionists and Communists, the Department of Justice is consciously extending a hand of welcome to the political scum and refuse of Europe. While Ellis Island is being converted into a veritable concentration camp for anti-fascists, it serves as a hotel for White-Guard Russians from Europe and Asia, Polish ex-nobility, Nazi storm troopers and spies, Estonian ex-landowners, Hungarian ex-capitalists, anti-Semitic bandits of General Anders' army, fascist Ukrainians and Lithuanians who murdered hundreds of thousands of Jews at Hitler's orders, etc. All of these and picked spies and assassins in the pay of Allan Dulles' project X, from every part of Europe, are waiting for special acts of Congress to admit them into this country. This opening up of our country as a haven for counter-revolutionary and fascist enemies of democracy is part of the "cold war" hysteria and the monopolists' drive to fascism.

Even such fake liberals as the members of the Truman Civil Rights Committee had to admit two years ago that the country was in a state of "near-hysteria." *The New York Times*, only a year ago, admitted that "a kind of vague fear permeates the country now. It poisons our capacity to think clearly."

This "fear," this "near-hysteria," has been fanned to new flames (with the help of the *New York Times*) by the recent conviction and savage sen-

tences imposed upon the leaders of the Communist Party in the farcical trial at Foley Square. In reference to this monstrous frame-up, William Z. Foster has correctly stated:

Only a country which is beginning to be infected with the deadly virus of fascism could stage such a trial, reminiscent of the "dangerous thoughts" trials of Imperial Japan and Hitler Germany. Already the trial has accelerated a wave of fascist violence throughout the nation, winked at and encouraged by government authorities of both major parties, reaching its climax in the Peekskill events, with increasing incitement against the Negro people, the Jewish people, the foreign-born and against the whole labor movement.

The monstrous deportation drive and persecution of the foreign-born are a high point in the rising "wave of fascist violence throughout the nation." To stop this wave and haul it back is the immediate task and grave responsibility of the working class and of all Americans who cherish our traditional freedoms and desire peace.

The struggle for the right to bail for the leaders of the Communist Party proved that the American people will react when clarity is brought to them on the nature of the issues involved. By winning the fight for bail and forcing the government to admit that there are substantial constitutional questions involved in the Smith Act, the possibilities of a continued drive to defeat the conspira-

of re
The
the 19
ed by
civise
ple m
ture
thoug
the lo
dent,
teria
ment
Amer
anti-f
libert
but o
A
in all
build
attac
Th
ions
Presi
partn
union
born
have
more
have
sive
the
to c
drive
and
Th
away
Th
drive
the i
neys

of reaction are stronger than ever.

The deportation drive, based on the 1918 Immigration Act, as amended by the Smith Act, can also be decisively defeated. The American people must be enlightened on the nature of the drive, its relation to the thought-control trial of the Eleven, the loyalty oaths, the Peekskill incident, Taft-Hartley anti-union hysteria in and outside the labor movement. We must make clear to the American people to what extent the anti-foreign-born drive menaces the liberties, not only of the foreign-born, but of all the American people.

A sustained drive must be started in all national-group organizations to build a mass movement against the attack on the foreign-born.

The progressives in the trade unions must defeat the conspiracy of President Truman's "Justice" Department and the reactionary trade-union leaders to persecute foreign-born militants. At this writing, we have received information that six more trade unionists and anti-fascists have been arrested and held on excessive bail. It is abundantly clear that the Department of Justice intends to continue this anti-foreign-born drive as a club over the head of labor and the whole American people.

They must not be allowed to get away with it!

The fight against the deportation drive has too long been limited to the individuals involved, their attorneys and the American Committee

for Protection of Foreign-Born. The drive is not yet understood, throughout the Party and the progressive and labor movements, as an attack which hits at the very heart of the American family—inasmuch as foreign-born parents have lived in this country for large parts of their lives and have raised families in this country. But the drive strikes at all Americans, native-born and foreign-born alike, in yet another way. This fascist-inspired drive is part of the divide-and-conquer strategy of the monopolists and can be and is being used as a weapon to intensify the attacks against the civil rights and living standards of the native-born as well as the foreign-born.

The fight against the deportation drive, therefore, can and must rally the broadest sections of the people. It must become the vital concern of the labor and progressive movements as an integral part of the larger struggle for civil rights, economic security and peace. This orientation is long overdue, and in view of the continued drive has become urgent.

The demand must be raised for the quashing of the deportation cases, for immediate naturalization of those who have been denied citizenship for political reasons.

Foley Square and Ellis Island are two fronts of the same battle. That battle can be won; the fascist-like persecution of thought and the deportation delirium can and must be stopped.

Against Reformist Tendencies in Works On Imperialism*

by Eugene Varga

As is well known, my book *Changes in the Economy of Capitalism Resulting From World War II*, as well as a number of other works issued since the end of the war by the former Institute of World Economy and World Politics, for which I bear responsibility as the head of the Institute, have been subjected to severe criticism both in the Party press and in scientific discussions. *This criticism was necessary and correct. My mistake lies in the fact that I did not immediately recognize the correctness of the criticism*, as other comrades did. But better late than never.

The harm consisted not simply in the fact that mistakes were to be found in my book, but in the character of these mistakes. It is difficult to avoid mistakes in a book which for the first time attempts an independent study of such a complex problem as the influence of World War II on the economy of capitalism. The harm resides in the fact, as was correctly pointed out by the critics, that *these errors constitute a*

chain of mistakes tending toward reformism, which in their sum total denote a definite departure from the Leninist-Stalinist evaluation of modern imperialism.

Obviously, mistakes in the direction of reformism denote also mistakes in the direction of cosmopolitanism, since they depict capitalism in a favorable light.

Any mistake of a reformist character, any infringement on the purity of the Marxist-Leninist teachings, is especially dangerous in the present historical conditions.

As a result of the deepening of the general crisis of capitalism, the bourgeoisie, in its struggle against the laboring masses, against Communism and its citadel, the Soviet Union, leans ever more definitely on the reformists. In all bourgeois countries there is close collaboration between the bourgeoisie and the reformist traitors. Not a day passes by without the reformists rendering some service to the bourgeoisie and betraying the interests of the toilers (witness the attempts to split the World Federation of Trade Unions, the agitation in favor of the Marshall Plan

* Translated from *Voprosi Ekonomiki (Problems of Economics)*, Moscow, No. 3, 1949.

and th
sland
etc.).

In s
Britain
Austra
power.
geoisie
tecting

represe
rectly i
of the
of othe
coalitio
the bo
laborat
the wo

With
worker
when t
the bo
ment o
they w
peacefu
tion. T

lutiona
and lic
fense o
trine o
bourge
the gov
geois o

All
acter o
which
in my
wish),
the co
decept
thereby
The

and the North Atlantic Pact, the slanders against the Soviet Union, etc.).

In some countries, as in Great Britain, the Scandinavian countries, Australia, the reformists are "in power." This means that the bourgeoisie has entrusted the task of protecting its class domination and of representing its class interests directly into the hands of the betrayers of the working class. (In a number of other countries they participate in coalition governments alongside of the bourgeois parties, and even collaborate with fascist hangmen of the workers, as in Greece.)

With the purpose of deceiving the workers the reformists declare that when they are in power they convert the bourgeois State into an instrument of the working class, and that they will achieve socialism through peaceful reforms, without revolution. This dangerous, counter-revolutionary deception can be exposed and liquidated by the consistent defense of the Marxist-Leninist doctrine of the class character of the bourgeois State, regardless of whether the government is headed by a bourgeois or a "Socialist" prime minister.

All mistakes of a reformist character concerning the bourgeois State, which unfortunately are to be found in my book (despite the author's wish), undoubtedly *render support to the counter-revolutionary, reformist deception of the working class and thereby support to the bourgeoisie.*

The mistakes of a reformist char-

acter in my works are, at the present time, especially dangerous not only for the toilers of the capitalist countries, but for the toilers of the People's Democracies as well. Hundreds of thousands of Social-Democratic workers and hundreds of Left Social-Democratic leaders have joined the Communist parties individually or through collective merger with the Communist parties, with an honest desire to become genuinely revolutionary Communists. But this requires that they rid themselves completely of the reformist ideology in which they have been educated, it requires their basic re-education, their education in the principles of Marxism-Leninism. This is a difficult task for people who have been educated for decades in reformist ideology, and in view of this there remains for some time the danger of relapses into reformism. Our brother parties are in need of and expect assistance from the scientific workers of the Soviet Union in the struggle against reformist ideology. When mistakes of a reformist character creep into our works (as happened in my case), then we not only do not render assistance to our brother parties but we hinder them in their important task of re-educating their new members, the former Social-Democrats.

In this connection, I wish to emphasize also the following: Openly reformist books are less harmful in this respect, and their effects can be more easily overcome, than such books as mine, in which mistakes of

a reformist nature are more or less concealed and are therefore more difficult to reveal and correct.*

The mistakes uncovered by the critics of my book are all the more important since they deal mainly with the question of the evaluation of the role and character of the bourgeois State at the present time or in the recent past.

It is generally known that the question of the evaluation of the bourgeois State has been for more than half a century one of the principal points of difference between the revolutionary Marxists, the Bolsheviks, and the counter-revolutionary reformists. Marx and Engels have always emphasized — in the *Critique of the Gotha Program*, in their analysis of the Paris Commune, in the *Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State*, in *Anti-Dühring*, etc., as well in their letters—the character of the bourgeois State as an instrument of capitalist class domination, as a weapon for the oppression of the toilers. The reformists conceal or distort the views expressed by Marx and Engels on the question of the State.

Lenin devoted one of his most brilliant works, *The State and Revolution*, to the struggle against reformism. He wrote in the preface:

First of all we examine Marx's and

* It is worth noting that after my book had been published in the Hungarian language a critical article concerning it appeared in the central theoretical organ of the Hungarian Workers' Party, the contents of which in the main coincided with the contents of the critical articles in our Party press.

Engels' doctrine of the State and deal in particular detail with those aspects of their doctrine which have been forgotten or have been opportunistically distorted.*

Proceeding from the numerous statements of Marx and Engels, Lenin and Stalin have elaborated the doctrine concerning the State. They especially emphasized that in the epoch of imperialism the State, in imperialist countries, is the instrument of the financial oligarchy for plundering all of the toilers.

How could it have happened that a number of mistakes of a reformist character crept into my book, on the question of the role of the State in wartime economy, contrary to the only correct theory of the State as elaborated by Lenin and Stalin and well known to all Marxists?

The basis, the starting point of these mistakes was, as my critics have correctly established, *the methodologically incorrect separation of economics from politics*, the attempt to present the changes in the economy of capitalism from a "purely economic" aspect, unrelated to politics.

The departure from the Marxist-Leninist dialectical method, which demands an all-sided examination of the given phenomena in their interrelations, was bound unavoidably to lead to mistakes of a reformist character.

Economics means class relationships. The basic content of politics is

* V. I. Lenin, *Selected Works*, International Publishers, New York, Vol. VII, p. 6.—Ed.

any class society is the class struggle. Politics is concentrated economics. And if an attempt is made (as it was, by myself as well as by a number of other authors of the former Institute of World Economy and World Politics) to analyze the capitalist economy "apart from politics," then this departure from the Marxist-Leninist method must unavoidably lead, despite the author's wish, to mistakes of a reformist character.

The methodologically wrong exclusion of politics and of an analysis of the class relations and class struggle inevitably resulted in an incorrect evaluation of the role of the State in the wartime economy, in the erroneous affirmation of "the decisive role of the State" in the wartime economy. If one views the role of the State in the capitalist wartime economy from a "purely economic" standpoint, as I incorrectly did, then one arrives at the erroneous conclusion that in a "State" not subjected to an analysis from the point of view of class relations the dominant financial oligarchy does not play the decisive role. On the basis of such a superficial, "purely economic" examination, instead of a Marxist-Leninist, class analysis, one inevitably arrives at the erroneous conclusion that the State, in the interests of prosecuting the war, acts against the interests of individual monopolies.

In my book, I wrote with reference to the bourgeois State:

Its effort to utilize most expediently

all the resources of the country for war purposes constantly clashed with the private interests of individual capitalist enterprises, with their interest in extracting the highest possible profit (page 10).

In the discussion, my critics justly pointed out that such assertions give support to the conception of the supra-class character of the bourgeois State. It goes without saying that I had no intention of denying the class character of the bourgeois State. But I unquestionably committed a mistake when I characterized the contemporary State as "the organization of the bourgeoisie as a whole" instead of, as I should have done, as the State of the financial oligarchy.

The methodology which was incorrect in principle led to mistakes of a reformist character, notwithstanding that the actual facts were set forth correctly. I specifically pointed out (on pp. 30-31) that both in the United States and in Great Britain representatives of the big monopolies everywhere held the highest posts in the military-economic administrative organs. I wrote: "Even during the war the big monopolies retained decisive influence on the economic policy of the State in general and in particular on the activity of the military-economic organizations, in the leading bodies of which they played a decisive part and at the head of which were their representatives" (p. 37).

But correctly stated facts are of little value if they are cited without applying to them the Marxist-Lenin-

ist method, if they are divorced from their correct, dialectical interrelation, and if no general theoretical conclusion is drawn from them. These and similar facts should be presented on the basis of the Marxist-Leninist theory of the State as evidence of the further intensification of the process of merging the State apparatus with the financial oligarchy during the war, which insured to the big monopolies their super-profits in wartime as well as in peacetime.

My critics have correctly pointed out another mistake of a reformist character contained in my book on the question of the State. On page 318 I wrote: "The role of the State will remain greater in the future than it was before the war. The issue of a greater or lesser share in administering the State will form the main content of the political struggle between the two basic classes of capitalist society, the bourgeoisie and the proletariat. The ever increasing polarization in bourgeois society, its division into two basic opposing classes, will increase the specific gravity of the proletariat."

Any reformist would approve of these lines. They were written under the influence of the fact that immediately after the termination of the war in 1945 the Communists participated in the governments of most European countries, not only in the People's Democracies, but also in such countries as France, Italy, Finland, etc. They were inspired by the hope that the Communists of the respec-

tive countries, who were the main-spring of the resistance movements against the fascist occupation forces, would be able, by utilizing their influence on the masses, to retain their positions in the government, to extend these positions and to win the State power in the struggle against the bourgeoisie.

This reasoning left out of account the decisive fact—that the State apparatus remained bourgeois, that the apparatus of force (the army, the police, the gendarmerie) was unchanged. And when the Communists who participated in the governments of the bourgeois states attempted a resolute defense of the interests of the proletariat against the bourgeoisie, when they attempted to change the class character of the State, they were dislodged from all these bourgeois governments. This was possible despite the fact that the Communists had the mass support of the toiling population; because the Anglo-American occupation authorities, anticipating such battles, had disarmed the forces of the resistance movements in France, Italy, etc. which were under Communist leadership, had dissolved their fighting formations, and with their armed forces supported reaction in its struggle against the Communists.

A reverse process took place in the People's Democracies. There, the toiling masses, enjoying the support of the Soviet Union, retained their arms and power in the State, and the representatives of the possessing

class
the r
gov

The
rope
of th
Leni
ing t
pow
class
throu
Un
form
also
1947
anni
Social

I v

Th
place
nizes
in n
impo
as t
bran
the c
omy.

Th
All
boun
lack
ties,
worl
part
more
espe
lip s
form
direc

classes, as they lost support among the people, were expelled from the governments.

The postwar developments in Europe serve as new and clear proof of the correctness of the Marxist-Leninist theory of the State, according to which the question of State power is a question of the relation of class forces and can be settled only through class struggle.

Unfortunately, mistakes of a reformist character are to be found also in one of my articles written in 1947, on the occasion of the 30th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution.

I wrote in this article:

The bourgeoisie of Europe, the birthplace of capitalism, now itself recognizes that the capitalist social order is in need of radical reforms, that it is impossible to avoid such measures as the nationalization of important branches of industry, State control of the economy, "planning of the economy."

This thesis is, of course, incorrect. All this is being said by a part of the bourgeoisie and in particular by its lackeys, the reformists of all varieties, only in order to deceive the workers, to combat the Communist parties and Communist ideas. The more clever European capitalists and especially their reformist lackeys pay lip service to the need of "radical reform" of capitalism in a socialist direction. This is understandable.

During one generation, the capitalist economic system plunged Europe into two world wars which cost the lives of millions of toilers, left behind them hundreds of thousands of blind, maimed and orphaned, and led to famine and epidemics, while the war contractors piled up fabulous wealth. The debit of the capitalist system includes fascist barbarity, concentration camps, race hatred and the annihilation of millions of innocent people. This social system demonstrates to the masses from day to day with ever greater clarity that it has outlived its usefulness, that it is thoroughly decayed and historically doomed. It has led to mass unemployment and chronic below-capacity production. At the end of my book I formulated this as follows:

Unchanged is the ghastly fact that during the last quarter of a century, the period of the world war was the only period when those who were seeking work in the capitalist countries actually found work. Only when millions of people were slaughtering each other and other millions were producing for this purpose the implements of murder, only then was capitalist society able to provide work for all workers.

Unchanged, also, remains the other ghastly fact that those years in the last quarter of a century when the means of production of the capitalist world were utilized to full capacity were the years of the most terrible suffering of mankind (p. 319).

Naturally, under such conditions a capitalist or an apologist of capitalism now very seldom speaks up frankly in favor of preserving without a change the social system which is detested by the laboring masses. Such a defense of the capitalist system would only bring the workers more quickly into the camp of Communism. Hence the lip service to radical reforms of capitalism, while, in deeds, all means are used to preserve unchanged the existing system of capitalist exploitation.*

Not to have said all this in connection with the statement in my book which was cited by my critics was unquestionably an important omission which was a service to reformism. As Lenin pointed out in the preface to *The State and Revolution*, "The struggle for the emancipation of the masses of the toilers from the influence of the bourgeoisie in general, and of the imperialist bourgeoisie in particular, is impossible without a struggle against opportunist prejudices about the 'state'."***

My incorrect characterization of nationalization in Great Britain was an error in the same direction. Obviously, nationalization of important branches of the economy signifies the further strengthening of state capitalism. It was therefore incorrect to

* In this connection, we may recall that the fascists, too, indulged in "anti-capitalist" demagoguery and peddled the nonsense about "German socialism." In general, it is difficult today to distinguish reformists (such as, for instance, Jules Moch) from fascists.

** V. I. Lenin, *op. cit.*, Vol. VII, pp. 5-6.

write that "bourgeois nationalization also denotes progress in the direction of democracy of a new type" (*World Economy and World Politics*, No. 3, 1947, p. 5).

Here, too, the mistake stems from ignoring the essential difference in the nature of the State in Great Britain, headed by a Labor Party government, from the nature of the People's Democracies. *The State in Great Britain*, where the Laborites are at the helm of the government, is a *bourgeois State*, a State of monopoly capital, the main function of which is to ensure the class domination of the big bourgeoisie. To be sure, Shinwell and Laski are permitted now and then to deliver demagogic speeches, in order to hold the workers in the reformist camp; but the army, the State's apparatus of force, is in hands trustworthy to the bourgeoisie and is used against the toilers. Moreover, the bourgeoisie hands out to the labor aristocracy crumbs from its monopolistic superprofits, buys off the labor bureaucrats serving in the government apparatus with high salaries* and, as was shown in a recent trial of some

* A similar picture can be observed in the United States. The big capitalist newspaper *New Züricher Zeitung*, in the issue of January 21, 1949, published a report from its United States correspondent under the characteristic title, "The New Masters," which reads in part:

"In recent years one often meets in the lobbies of the White House and in the reception rooms of cabinet members in Washington a new type of visitor, the trade-union leader. In appearance he differs in no way from the average American businessman. . . .

"The income of trade-union leaders is apparently on the level of the income of the average businessman. This is true also of their mode of

bureau
gifts.
tried a
ish bou

In t
the con
of the
tion of
in the
against
army
these c
worthy
against

With
the St
Britain
in the
new ty
ies of
the eco
former
lists.
they fi
their n
other b
pense c
that is,
try.

The

living.

The
alien to
ground,
Their th
tasks wh
are not l
can trade
tent that
industry

This o
of the A
workers
geoisie.

bureaucrats, bribes them with petty gifts. All of this is in line with the tried and tested policy of the British bourgeoisie.

In the Peoples' Democracies, on the contrary, the State is in the hands of the toilers and fulfills the function of the proletarian dictatorship in the interests of all toilers and against the exploiting classes. The army and the State apparatus in these countries are in hands trustworthy for the toilers and are used against the exploiters.

With the present class character of the State, nationalization in Great Britain does not denote "progress in the direction of democracy of a new type." The administrative bodies of the nationalized branches of the economy are still headed by the former owners, the biggest monopolists. There can be no doubt that they find ways and means to favor their non-nationalized enterprises in other branches of industry at the expense of the nationalized industries, that is, at the expense of the country.

The generous compensation not

only assures to the owners of the nationalized enterprises their former income; they are insured against the consequences of the economic crisis which will shake Great Britain in the not far off future. They have no reason to fear the crisis. Their income is secured at the expense of the taxpayers, that is, of the toilers, even in the event that the nationalized industries would operate with a large deficit and the crisis would result in many privately-owned enterprises going bankrupt.

The failure to apply consistently the Marxist-Leninist theory of the State led to mistakes and ambiguous statements in my analysis of the colonial question, in particular to an incorrect evaluation of the change in the relations between Great Britain and India.

The transformation of India into two dominions is the result of a compromise between the dominant classes of Great Britain and India. The Indian bourgeoisie, in close alliance with the feudal landlords, betrayed the cause of the national liberation of India in order to maintain its class domination over the multi-million masses of workers and peasants in India within the framework of the British empire. The British bourgeoisie gave up its direct rule over India, with the aid of occupation forces, in order to retain its capital investments and other economic positions in India, in order to continue to share in the exploitation of the Indian toilers.

living. . . .
 "The ideology of the class struggle remains alien to them. They stand with both feet on the ground, and their heads are not in the clouds. Their thoughts are directed to the immediate tasks which they are called upon to solve, and are not lost in dreams of the future. The American trade-union leader feels to an increasing extent that he is responsible for the welfare of 'his' industry and 'his' economy."

This description shows clearly the alienation of the American trade-union leaders from the workers and their identification with the bourgeoisie. . . .

In my book I gave an incorrect evaluation of the financial relations of Great Britain and India. I wrote:

The transformation of India from debtor to creditor of Great Britain marks a very serious change in the economic relationship of the two countries, a change in favor of India. This new financial position of India was paid for with heavy sacrifices of its toiling population, whose living standard has sharply declined; in some provinces, as for instance, in Bengal, the population was literally starving (p. 222).

Has India really become a creditor of Great Britain? If this question is approached mechanically, in the manner of an accountant, the answer is certainly in the affirmative. Great Britain's debt to India exceeds the official estimates of her capital investments in India. But if we pose the question as to which of the two countries exploits the other, it becomes clear that India does not receive surplus value produced in Great Britain, but, on the contrary, despite the fact that India is in the position of a creditor, continues to pay to Great Britain considerable sums every year. This is easy to understand: India's (and Pakistan's) claims against Great Britain consist principally of non-interest bearing government assets, while British capital invested in India consists principally of direct investments, which, in view of the exceedingly high rate of exploitation, bring profits that are

far above the average. In the total owed, India is a creditor of Great Britain; but as far as income on capital is concerned, *Great Britain is still the exploiter of India.* Obviously, the British capital investments in India assure to Great Britain a very strong economic and political position, the more so as it is the British government which determines when, in what amounts, and on what conditions it pays its debts to India. Some British politicians have proposed that India shall not be repaid at all, on the pretext that the debts were incurred in connection with India's defense. Of course, India cannot *force* Great Britain to pay the debts, she cannot send her Navy to bombard British ports, as Britain has often done in cases where her debtors defaulted on their payments. And if Great Britain promises to make annual remittances to India on account of her debts, she does this principally because an open refusal to pay would lead to a dangerous acceleration of the penetration of American capital and enhancement of its influence in India.*

While admitting this mistake of mine, I wish to point out at the same time that it is wrong to assert that there has been "absolutely no change" in the relationship between India and Great Britain. No matter how serious an evaluation we place on the economic, military and political posi-

* Indian economic magazines are full of complaints that British industry does not deliver machinery and implements of production ordered by Indian capitalists, which were to be paid for from India's current account in London.

tions.
in In
prefer
and t
the st
that l
pied l
Britis
colon
native
trayin
to its
ants'
comp
ism,
The
positi
Britai
to ut
Britis
In
gerati
forma
into a
less v
the c
the d
tion
unfol
comp
which
the I
its c
in th
India
of th
* B
lodged
The la
Ruhr,
of "ai
at inc
in the
first of

tions which Great Britain still holds in India (Britain still enjoys Empire preferences in India and Pakistan, and these two countries are still in the sterling bloc), the fact remains that India, formerly a colony occupied by British troops and ruled by British officials, has become a semi-colony, a Dominion, in which the native bourgeoisie, as a result of betraying the liberation struggle, due to its fear of the workers' and peasants' movement, and arriving at a compromise with British imperialism, has its own apparatus of force. The native bourgeoisie is now in a position to maneuver between Great Britain and the United States and to utilize the differences between British and American imperialism.

In short, while in no way exaggerating the significance of the transformation of India from a colony into a Dominion, we must nevertheless view this change as a *link* in the chain of the historical process of the decline and not far off disintegration of the British empire, which is unfolding before our eyes.* The complete independence of India, which was shamefully betrayed by the Indian bourgeoisie actuated by its class interests, will be achieved in the near historical future by the Indian toilers, under the leadership of the working class, who will put

* British imperialism is everywhere being dislodged more and more by American imperialism. The latter has virtually forced Britain out of the Ruhr, Palestine, Greece, etc. The American plan of "aid to underdeveloped regions" is also aimed at increasing the penetration of American capital in the colonies of the European imperialists, and first of all into the British colonies.

an end to the domination of the Indian landlords and bourgeoisie as well as of their British patrons.

* * *

The methodologically incorrect divorcement in my book of the analysis of the economy from politics, the undialectical division of the examination of the role of the bourgeois State in the war economy into two chapters (moreover, I examined government regulation *per se* in the first chapter, and divorced from this the examination of the planlessness and anarchy of production, extant despite regulation, in the second chapter), and the omission of an analysis of the political aspect of the question, gave the impression that I denied the operation of the elemental economic laws of capitalist development in the war economy and asserted the existence of planned economy under capitalist relationship during the war. This was by no means my intention. On page 35 of the book I wrote: "... to characterize the wartime regulation of the economy as 'planned economy' . . . is of course absolutely incorrect." But my presentation of the question as a whole lacks the necessary Marxist clarity.

As usually happens when one attempts to defend his mistakes, I went from *bad to worse* in the discussion by asserting that *after* the war "something in the nature of a peculiar 'Gosplan' emerged in some capitalist countries." I must admit

that all my assertions dealing with the question of "planning" under capitalism are a big backward step from my correct position in 1935, in my speech at the Seventh Congress of the Communist International, in which I explained the essence of the demagogic, bourgeois propaganda of the reformists for "planning under capitalism" as follows:

The main reasons [for this propaganda] are: (1) the impossibility of solving the problem of markets; (2) the desire to mask the plundering of the government treasury by the financial oligarchy; (3) the desire to mask the adjustment of the economy to the requirements of war; (4) the desire to check the process of the revolutionization of the masses of the working class.

There can be no doubt that an even more firm struggle is necessary against the false propaganda of a "planned economy" under capitalism which is at the present time carried on by the reformists and which is connected with the propaganda for the Marshall Plan.*

* * *

It was absolutely wrong to consider the emergence of the People's Democracies as only political formations, and to put off an analysis of the People's Democracies to the contemplated second, political, part of my work. The breaking away of

* The American monopolists, who in the United States preach "free enterprise," demand that the countries of Western Europe "plan" their economy in the interests of the American finance oligarchy.

these countries from the system of imperialism was unquestionably one of the most important consequences of World War II and signified the deepening of the general crisis of capitalism.

The one-sided, "purely economic" approach in my study led to the incorrect evaluation of the significance and character of this group of countries, to an evaluation which resulted in the assertion that:

Important and significant as is the emergence in these countries of a new type of economy which cannot be defined as capitalism in the old sense, the weight of these countries in the capitalist world economy as a whole is relatively small, and in the main they do not for the present change the general perspective of the development of capitalism as a whole (p. 291).

This evaluation is unsound and incorrect. It is incorrect to view these countries as capitalist, even if not "in the old sense," since they are undoubtedly in the process of rapidly turning onto the path of Socialism. It was incorrect to assert (as I have already admitted in the discussion) that State capitalism predominates in these countries, and it was especially incorrect to evaluate their significance, solely on the basis of statistical-economic considerations, as "relatively small." The emergence of the People's Democracies, the thriving of their economy and their rapid Socialist development—based on the experience of, and many-sided

assistan
—unde
func
ship,
the vie
dialect
proach
forgot
we sho
that v
turne
correc
and
Demo
The
politic
mistak
of the
time
factor
to the
ing t
system
that t
withi
the w
of the
in th
not
mista
Ver
ing to
my st
book
of th
This
to th
not h
gener
cour
tions

assistance given by, the Soviet Union—under a regime which fulfills the functions of the proletarian dictatorship, is of great significance from the viewpoint of principle. The undialectical, purely “economic” approach in my study, the fact that I forgot Comrade Stalin’s advice that we should base our orientation upon that which is new and growing, turned me away from the path of a correct evaluation of the character and significance of the People’s Democracies.

The separation of economics from politics resulted also in various other mistakes: in a one-sided examination of the role of the workers in the wartime economy solely as one of the factors in production and unrelated to the class struggle; in disregarding the struggle between the two systems and asserting incorrectly that this struggle was “suspended” within the democratic camp during the war; in the incorrect evaluation of the effects of the agrarian reform in the People’s Democracies. I cannot dwell here at length on these mistakes.

Very important is the fact that, owing to the incorrect method used in my study, I failed to consider in my book the question of the deepening of the general crisis of capitalism. This could only give the impression to the reader that the world war did not have the effect of deepening the general crisis of capitalism. Of course one cannot examine all questions in one book. But *to have failed*

to touch upon the question of the general crisis of capitalism is a serious omission.

* * *

The prolonged delay on my part to admit the mistakes exposed by my critics was undoubtedly harmful, causing our economists to return to questions that have been long ago solved correctly by Marxism-Leninism. But even worse than that was the fact that it gave an opportunity to the war instigators in the imperialist camp to spread false rumors that I had “a Western orientation.” If that were true, it would have meant that I was a counter-revolutionist, a traitor to the working class.

To admit honestly the mistakes that have been committed and to analyze their causes thoroughly in order to avoid such mistakes in the future—this is exactly what Lenin considered the only correct way both for the Communist Parties and individual comrades.

In his theoretically profound work, *“Left-Wing” Communism, an Infantile Disorder*, Lenin wrote as follows:

What is said of individuals is applicable—with necessary modifications—to politics and parties. It is not the one who makes no mistakes who is wise. There are no such men, nor can there be. He is wise who makes not very important mistakes and knows how to rectify them easily and quickly.*

* V. I. Lenin, *op. cit.*, Vol. X, p. 74 n.

There is no doubt that in this respect I acted unwisely.

* * *

The mistakes uncovered in the other studies of the former Institute of World Economy and World Politics which were written during the war are in principle of a similar character. Their authors worked under my guidance, and I therefore bear full responsibility for these errors.

Obviously, I must draw lessons from these mistakes for the future. A study of the political problems as I originally contemplated it, as simply a continuation of my book, as its second volume, is now impracticable. It would also be methodologically incorrect to write a new book on the politics of present-day imperialism which would not take as its basis the economic changes that have

occurred during and after the war.

In his article, "Imperialism and the Split in Socialism," Lenin wrote with reference to Kautsky:

Kautsky's definition is thoroughly false from the theoretical standpoint. . . . Kautsky divorces imperialist politics from imperialist economics, he divorces monopoly in politics from monopoly in economics in order to pave the way for his vulgar bourgeois reformism. . . .*

In short: instead of a second volume of my work as I had planned, a new, original book should be written on the postwar economic and political problems of imperialism, without the reformist errors which are contained in my book, *Changes in the Economy of Capitalism Resulting from the Second World War*.

* V. I. Lenin, *op. cit.*, Vol. XI. p. 750.

THE
THE

by Zo

László
fore
1949

The
tered
referen
count
struct
and v

"It
to as
woul
classe
capita
at th
wher
vious
could
direc
temp
cont
ic m
disce
nom
wrec
man
bran
pron
inter
part
gle.

Book Review

THE TITO-RAJK CONSPIRACY AGAINST THE CAMP OF PEACE AND DEMOCRACY

by Zoltan Deak

László Rajk and His Accomplices Before the People's Court, Budapest, 1949, 319 pp.

The famous warning of Stalin, uttered more than two decades ago, in reference to the obstacles faced by the country engaged in the peaceful construction of Socialism, is more timely and valid now than ever before:

"It would be the height of stupidity to assume that international capital would leave us alone. . . . There are classes and there is an international capital and it cannot look on calmly at the development of the country where socialism is being built. Previously, international capital thought it could overthrow the Soviet power by direct military intervention. This attempt failed. Now it is trying and will continue to try to weaken our economic might by imperceptible, not always discernible but fairly formidable economic intervention, by organizing wrecking activities, by engineering all manner of crises in one or another branch of industry and in this way promoting the possibility of military intervention in the future. All this is part of the pattern of the class struggle. . . ."

The conspiracy of Rajk was more than a plot to overthrow the government of democratic Hungary; it was more than a plot to break up the People's Democracies in Eastern Europe. The role of that fascist police agent and imperialist spy who succeeded in worming his way into the highest ranks of the Hungarian Communist Party and into the government of the Hungarian People's Democracy, was part and parcel of a gigantic conspiracy against world peace, democracy and Socialism. In uncovering and defeating this conspiracy and exposing the main instigators behind it—Wall Street imperialism and its Yugoslav Tito-ite henchmen — the Hungarian People's Democracy, led by its great Workers' Party and its able leader, Mathias Rakosi, struck an effective blow for the defense of peace and democracy throughout the world.

One can hardly evaluate fully the significance of the Rajk conspiracy or really understand what is going on in Yugoslavia without carefully reading *László Rajk and His Accomplices Before the People's Court*, a collection of documents relating to the Rajk trial recently published by the Hungarian government. The publication of this material is in itself a substantial con-

tribution to the struggle against the warmongering machinations of imperialist agents within and outside the working-class movement.

The book contains all the important documents in the case: the text of the indictment; the confessions of the principals — Rajk, Palfy, Brankov, Szonyi, Szalai, Ognjenjovich, Korondy, Justus; the statements of the major witnesses (of whom 19 were called by the court); the prosecutor's speech; and the verdict.

It is to be hoped that this book will get into the hands of tens of thousands of Americans. Among many other things, the record of the Rajk trial blows sky-high the myth propagated by reaction in the United States that the trial of the 11 American Communist leaders was "more democratic" than was the Rajk trial in Hungary. Whereas the trial of the American Communist leaders took place under the lying, frame-up charge that they "conspired to teach and advocate force and violence," the Hungarian government tried Rajk and his co-defendants and secured their conviction on the basis of *proven overt acts* of treason, sabotage, murder and war provocation. Whereas the American Communist leaders were railroaded at Foley Square by a prejudiced judge and a rigged jury system, were deliberately prevented from telling the complete and true story of their lives, struggles, and teachings, and emphatically refuted the lying testimony of the prosecution's stoolpigeon "witnesses"—Rajk and his co-conspirators were given a full opportunity to testify concerning their lives and deeds, and, when confronted by the evidence, confessed their guilt as treasonous, anti-democratic agents of Anglo-American

imperialism acting under the orders of the Tito-fascist regime. And, whereas the American Communist leaders were indicted and "tried" by reaction because they were in the forefront of the struggle for civil rights, economic security and peace, because they championed the true interests of the American working class, the Negro people, and all democratic, peace-loving Americans against Wall Street's war-and-fascism offensive — Rajk and his co-plotters were justly indicted, tried and convicted for carrying out a whole series of treasonous and murderous measures on behalf of Wall Street imperialism and its Tito gauleiters as part of a plot for the counter-revolutionary overthrow of the Hungarian People's Democracy.

* * *

In the words of Mathias Rakosi, the strategy of Wall Street imperialism in Eastern Europe has taken the form of trying to "detach all the People's Democracies from the peace front led by the Soviet Union and place them into the camp of the imperialists."

This strategy, of course, is not of recent origin. As early as November 1943, Churchill was conspiring to cheat the peoples of Southeastern Europe of their national independence, which was then gradually becoming a reality as the great Soviet armies began to drive the Germans out of the Soviet Union. During the Teheran Conference, President Roosevelt told his son Elliott—according to the latter's memoirs:

"Whenever the Prime Minister [Churchill] argued for our invasion through the Balkans, it was quite obvious to everyone what he really meant. That he was above all else anxious to knife up into Central Europe, in order

to keep
and P
sible."

The
forces,
and n
Roosev
realizi
Church
periali
region
With
Truma
into o
new
this w
of hos
and ot
can in
Tito's
Brank
connec

The
Yugos
in the
govern
consti
traitor
was re
ments
prima

As
cist po
1937
Comm
of libe
to Fr
camps
he car
presen
as Bel
whom
Rajk

to keep the Red Army out of Austria and Rumania, even Hungary, if possible."

The rapid advance of the Soviet forces, as well as the sound political and military judgment of President Roosevelt, prevented Churchill from realizing his plan at that time. But Churchill's plan for Anglo-Saxon imperialism to maintain a foothold in that region of Europe was not shelved. With the emergence of the postwar Truman Doctrine, the plan was put into operation in accordance with the new situation. The groundwork for this was laid down during the period of hostilities by the son of Churchill and other agents of British and American imperialism who were assigned to Tito's headquarters. The confession of Brankov contains revealing data in this connection on page 116.

The pivotal point of this strategy was Yugoslavia. As was conclusively proved in the course of the Rajk trial, the government of Yugoslavia as presently constituted is nothing but a gang of traitors, spies and Gestapo agents. This was revealed in the course of the statements of several of the accused and primarily by Rajk.

As an agent of the Hungarian fascist police, Rajk was sent to Spain in 1937 to report back on the Hungarian Communists participating in the war of liberation. After the war he escaped to France, where, in the internment camps of St. Cyprien Gur, and Vernet, he came in contact with many of the present-day leaders of Yugoslavia, such as Bebler, Maslarich, Mrazofich, all of whom were Yugoslav Trotskyites. Rajk stated at the trial:

"The officer of the Deuxième Bureau [French Intelligence Service] told me that he knew about the activities of this group, and further, that they did some things with his approval. . . .

"In the spring of 1941 a German Commission arrived which recruited workers for various building and other works in Germany. . . . He [a German Gestapo major who questioned Rajk] told me that . . . Peter Hain, the head of the political department of the Hungarian police, had asked him to help me to get home to Hungary. . . . During this conversation, the Gestapo . . . major took out a list and asked after certain Yugoslavs. . . . [This] was the same list as the one the leading officer of the Deuxième Bureau had been looking at, when I was reporting to him on the activities of the Yugoslav Trotskyist group. . . . I told him what I knew about the activities of the Yugoslav Trotskyist group. The Gestapo major gladly learned of their Trotskyist activities, and told me that he would fulfill their request and, in fact, he would help them return home to Yugoslavia" (pp. 40-41).

Rajk revealed further:

". . . I personally convinced myself that the persons who fill the key positions in the Yugoslavia of today had been active agents of the Deuxième Bureau and arrived home with the help of the Gestapo." (p. 49).

The trial exposed the special role assigned to Yugoslavia by the masterminds of the cold war, which was, in essence, that of "strategic reserve" in the struggle against the People's De-

mocracies. This was described by Rajk as follows:

"Rankovich [Tito's Minister of Interior, with whom Rajk had several secret meetings] said to me that after the liberation, in 1945 and 1946, the situation was such that Yugoslavia could well afford to stay in the background, pretending to a seemingly revolutionary character before the Soviet Union and the People's Democracies. He, or rather Yugoslavia, did not have to undertake unpleasant tasks against the Soviet Union . . . for in each country that had set out on the path of the people's democratic development, the old reactionary political forces were relatively so large that it was possible to count upon their victory and . . . on the establishment of bourgeois-democratic regimes in these countries. . . ."

Then he said: "The situation has, however, changed to such an extent that Yugoslavia must relinquish her background role and Yugoslavia herself must step into the foreground; Yugoslavia must be the organizer and guide of the rest of the people's democratic regimes in the overthrow of the people's democratic regimes and in the establishment of a confederation . . . which stands on bourgeois-democratic principles and relies on the United States, as a military bloc against the Soviet Union" (p. 63).

No one who has followed the course of events in Yugoslavia can have the slightest doubt that Tito and his traitorous clique carried out their share of the plan.

What was the role assigned to Rajk and his gang of conspirators in this plan?

In his last secret meeting with Ran-

kovich, Rajk received instructions to organize and carry out an armed putsch against the legal, democratic government of Hungary. This is how Rajk related these instructions:

"Rankovich emphasized: it is Tito's most definite view that after the [Communist] Information Bureau resolution there can no longer be a question of taking over power in a peaceful way, but the people's democratic system has to be overthrown and state power must be captured by a violent armed coup d'etat. He emphasized in this connection that I should turn my attention to the activity which the Western Powers are also carrying out in preparation for these events. [Operation "X"—Z.D.]

". . . He [Rankovich] especially drew my attention to the fact that Tito was absolutely determined that at the time of the coup d'etat the Hungarian government would have to be arrested and three of its members, Rakosi, Gero and Farkas would immediately have to be killed during the first action.

". . . Prime Minister Tito also took other armed forces into consideration when working out his plan, notably the former Horthyist and Szalastist military police and gendarmerie fascist units in the West, in the Anglo-American zone [of Germany]" (pp. 71-73).

Of course, both Rajk and his fellow conspirators fully realized that in case their plot succeeded, the resulting new government would not have been bourgeois-democratic, but the most brutal fascist regime. The "theoretician" of the conspirators, Dr. Szonyi, described the probable course of events as follows:

". . . I am quite aware now that it

its co-
opme
been
that
some
a blo
or sin
blood
owne
ories
their
Hung
been
made
Demo

Du
on th
the V

"R
stress
that t
I was
was o
the
sharp
than
that
basis
convic
had t
preve
ist d
cratic
that
tion
cessful
in p

* In
villag
peasa
the lo
the g
them,
which
the so
was k

its consequences and its further development, in the end it would not have been a bourgeois-democratic republic that would have come about but some new form of the fascist regime, of a bloody rule with practically identical, or similar, consequences as in the past bloody fascist dictatorship. The factory owners would have got back their factories, the estate owners, on the whole, their estates . . . in other words, the Hungarian working people would have been deprived of all the achievements made accessible to them in the People's Democracy" (p. 162).

During the trial, new light was shed on the specific role of Mindszenty and the Vatican.

"Rankovich — said Rajk — especially stressed that I should watch, already at that time, that is in October 1948, when I was speaking to him, that Mindszenty was conducting a political attack against the government which was much sharper and more openly conducted than anything before. Rankovich said that this was not happening on the basis of Mindszenty's own head and convictions. All the force of the Vatican had to be thrown into the fight for the prevention of further democratic, socialist development in the people's democratic countries. Rankovich also said that in connection with the nationalization of the schools Mindszenty was successful in starting a small peasant rising in Pócspetri* against the government

measures; at the suggestion of various circles among the Great Powers, at the suggestion of the Vatican, Mindszenty would now follow a policy determined to do anything, so that by the end of January and February 1949 [Rajk's conversation with Rankovich took place in October 1948, before Mindszenty was arrested and brought to trial—Z.D.] events will have reached a stage where there would be not one Pócspetri, but in all counties, towns, districts and villages similar risings would break out against the central democratic government" (pp. 71-72).

* * *

On the basis of the documentary evidence contained in the book under review, there emerges before the objective reader a monstrous, but clear pattern of the cold war as applied against Eastern Europe. There emerges, first of all, the strategy of Wall Street imperialism aiming at the detaching of the People's Democracies of Eastern Europe from the camp of peace and democracy headed by the Soviet Union. The main agency for this purpose is Tito and his Trotskyite clique, who now stand revealed as agents of British and American imperialism with agent-provocateur activities dating as far back as 1943. Through them, an underground railroad was established for the purpose of smuggling spies and agents-provocateurs into the People's Democracies; this is how Rajk's fellow conspirator, Szonyi, was smuggled into Hungary.

To complement the material contained in the volume in reference to the role of Tito and his clique as British agents, we should recall some significant statements of Churchill uttered in the House of Commons (May 1944),

* In the summer of 1948, in the Hungarian village of Pócspetri, a crowd of backward peasants, whipped to a religious frenzy by the local Catholic priest, who told them that the government "wants to steal Christ from them," attacked the local school board, which was discussing the nationalization of the schools. In the ensuing riot a policeman was killed.

which, in the light of the Budapest trial, assume special significance:

"Marshall Tito has largely sunk his Communistic aspect in his character as a Yugoslav patriotic leader. He has repeatedly proclaimed that he has no intention of reversing the property and social system which prevail in Serbia" (my emphasis—Z.D.).

Let us keep this statement of Churchill in mind when we read this part of Rajk's confession:

"Summing up the political parts of what Rankovich told me there [at a secret meeting in the village of Kelebia—Z.D.], I can tell you the following: We have to strive to overthrow the people's democratic regimes of the people's democratic countries which came into being after the Liberation, to prevent their socialist development . . . to separate them from the side of the Soviet Union. . . . Instead of developments toward Socialism, capitalism must be restored.

"I told him that I did not quite understand how Yugoslavia, Tito's government, wanted to carry out this policy; for there were certain contradictions, at least on the surface. . . .

"In answer to this Rankovich told me the following: First of all, I should realize—he said—that neither Tito, nor the rest of the members of the Yugoslav government wanted a people's democratic regime even after the Liberation, and through it the building of Socialism in Yugoslavia. If they as a government were still compelled to take such revolutionary measures which in essence and de facto began to lead toward the liquidation of capitalism, this

was not because they wanted to carry out this program in earnest, but because they were compelled to do so under pressure from the Yugoslav working masses. . . . Rankovich emphasized very strongly that they were compelled to take them and pointed out immediately that at the same time, right from the very beginning, they took good care that true revolutionary, socialist elements should not gain power in Yugoslavia and that the state power should remain centralized in Tito's hands and in their hands. . . . This is why they had organized the People's Front on nationalist principles in Yugoslavia; why they did not ensure and did not allow an independent role to the Communist Party, but amalgamated it into the People's Front precisely in order to prevent the existence of an independent party in Yugoslavia which would crystallize and mobilize the revolutionary forces" (pp. 61-63, my emphasis—Z.D.).

Such is the path Rajk and his gang wanted to take under the instigation of the Yugoslav traitors. Such was the path Tito, Rankovich and their clique of agents-provocateurs have taken—the events of the last 18 months prove

* * *

What are the conclusions that the forces of progress must draw from the exposure and defeat of the Rajk conspiracy?

Politically, the main conclusion is the identification of the real organizers of the conspiracy to overthrow the Hungarian People's Democracy: the agents of Wall Street imperialism, operating through the Tito clique. These, in turn, were proved to be primarily spies, agents-provocateurs, Trotskyites, etc.

to Yu
The ai
kovich
—and
Roman
the p
Union
when
in pro
that le
Rajk
directe
peace
tack a
ress o
part at
macy
The
agents
tensifi
gressiv
especia
They
aid of
Using
demag
ized th
slavia
to spli
other
at wor
Effe
mands
offensi
equip
advan
sives.
meet t
about
periali
Union
tenet
nation
refute
cialism

to Yugoslavia from France in 1941. The aim of Rajk and of the Tito-Rankovich clique was to detach Hungary—and then Poland, Czechoslovakia, Romania, Bulgaria and Albania—from the peace camp led by the Soviet Union. This plot was originally hatched when the Second World War was still in progress and was masterminded by that leading warmonger, Churchill.

Rajk's conspiracy with the Tito gang, directed against the whole camp of peace and democracy, was also an attack against the peace and social progress of the American people. It was part and parcel of the "cold war" diplomacy of Wall Street.

There are many indications that the agents of Tito are carrying on an intensified campaign to corrode the progressive camp in the United States and especially the working-class movement. They do this unquestionably with the aid of the Wall Street warmongers. Using the same despicable Trotskyite demagoguery with which they disorganized the workers and peasants of Yugoslavia and with which they attempted to split the working-class parties in the other People's Democracies, they are at work in our country, too.

Effective struggle against them demands of us a heightened ideological offensive for which our Party must equip the membership, as well as the advanced workers and the progressives. Only thus shall we be able to meet their despicable, lying propaganda about the Soviet Union being an "imperialist" country, about the Soviet Union "violating" the basic Leninist tenet of fighting for the equality of nations. Only thus shall we be able to refute the Titoite allegations that "Socialism is now being built" in Yugo-

slavia. Only thus shall we be able clearly to expose the course of Tito's treachery, beginning with the undermining of the role and function of the Yugoslav Communist Party. We shall thus be able to show the ideological link of Browder-revisionism with Tito's counter-revolutionary, warmongering role as an open agent of Wall Street imperialism. Dr. Szonyi, Rajk's fellow-conspirator, had this to say during the trial about the role of Browder's revisionism: ". . . the theory of Browder, then leader of the Communist Party in the U.S.A. played a great part [in the propaganda of Yugoslav agents in Switzerland with whom Szonyi collaborated]. Printed copies of Browder's books in French and German were distributed in great numbers by Lompar and Field, both in Switzerland and in France, on behalf of the American secret services."

As Mathias Rakosi stated on September 30, in his report on the liquidation of the Rajk conspiracy:

"One who is not equipped with the necessary Socialist theory cannot be vigilant enough because he will not recognize when the enemy utilizes the weapons of nationalism, race supremacy, chauvinism and anti-Semitism; when the enemy tries to influence the working people by appealing to the anti-Socialist impulse, to individual profit seeking, to selfishness, and comfort."

If we consider that it is precisely the ideology of nationalism, now embellished by the spokesmen of Wall Street imperialism into a tenet of American "world leadership" and "world responsibility," which forms one of the most potent instruments in the hands of American monopoly capi-

tal for tying the people to the two-party system and to the support of the Administration's imperialist policies, then the need for the most intense ideological clarification of the issue becomes evident.

The question of vigilance affects our movement in the U.S. as well as those in the People's Democracies. The class enemy is quite aware of the role and significance of the Communist parties. This is why he sends his cleverest, most talented agents into the vanguard Party of the working class. Whether the Party guides the government, as is the case in Hungary, or whether it is a small, minority party, as is the case in the United States, monopoly capital tries to undermine it by infiltration.

These tactics of the class enemy were partly revealed during the trial of the eleven American Communist leaders in New York. To the extent that we master the lessons of the Rajk trial, we shall be able to minimize and counteract the infiltration of enemy agents into our ranks. In this connection, it is significant to note that none of the members of the Rajk gang was of working-class origin. Our Party, in arming itself with Marxist-Leninist theory, must, ever more consciously and systematically, strengthen its ties with the working class.

These are some of the main conclusions that we in the United States must draw from the defeat of the Rajk conspiracy.

Aptheker
Natic
88-95
Bachrach
Janu
Bakerfel
is a
Berry, A
coln
Bierut, J
Unit
58-71
Bittelman
Econ
July
ty's
1-13
Deve
vers
the
cal
His
Blake,
Peo
85-9
ple
68-7
Carpent
Lea
ploj
Clark,
Feb
and
Commun
mit
Geo
Mer
Aug
Commun
C.P.S.U.
Tril
Commun
Res
Mer
tion
Am
Commun
tee
Wit
rua
Vic
Ga
Me
lut
and
ber
Davis,
mo
Deak,
Mi
Ro
Pe
Ac
De

Subject Index, 1949

(Political Affairs, Volume XXVIII, January-December, 1949)

- Aptheker, Herbert—Consciousness of Negro Nationality: An Historical Survey, June, 88-95.
- Bachrach, Marion—"This Obvious Violence," January, 16-22.
- Bakerfield, Jack—The Soviet Foreign Policy is a Peace Policy, November, 10-24.
- Berry, Abner W.—The Struggle for the Lincoln Heritage, February, 37-46.
- Bierut, Boleslaw—Ideological Basis of the United Workers' Party of Poland, March, 58-71.
- Bittelman, Alexander—The Beginning of the Economic Crisis in the United States, July, 22-32, and August, 22-34; Our Party's Thirtieth Anniversary, September, 1-13; Wall Street "Optimism" and the Developing Crisis, October, 26-32; Reverse Wall Street's Verdict and Prevent the Outlawing of a Working-Class Political Party!, November, 1-9; Stalin: On His 70th Birthday, Dec., 1-13.
- Blake, George—(with Al Terestman) The People Win With Marcantonio, January, 85-94; (with Herbert Wheeloid) The People Organize to Re-Elect Ben Davis, 68-78.
- Carpenter, David—The Communist Party—Leader of the Struggle of the Unemployed, September, 82-96.
- Clark, Joseph—The Peace Can Be Won!, February, 20-27; The Atom Bomb: Myth and Truth, April, 61-66.
- Communist Party of Bulgaria, Central Committee—Statement on the Demise of Georgi Dimitrov Addressed to the Party Membership and the Bulgarian People, August, 3-4.
- Communist Party of the Soviet Union — C.P.S.U. Co-Workers of Georgi Dimitrov Pay Tribute to His Memory, August, 4-6.
- Communist Party, U.S.A., 14th Convention—Resolution on Party Work Among the Mexican-American People, and Resolution on the Condition of the Mexican-American People, May, 71-73.
- Communist Party, U.S.A., National Committee—Labor Must Take the Offensive to Win Substantial Wage Increases!, February, 1-4; Salute to the Chinese People's Victories, May 1-2; A Momentous Youth Gathering, July, 85-87; Honor to the Memory of Dimitrov, August, 1-2; Resolution on the Question of Negro Rights and Self-Determination (adopted December 1946), September, 49-53.
- Davis, Benjamin J.—From the Court Testimony, September, 38-44.
- Deak, Zoltan—Treason in Clerical Garb: The Mindszenty Case, May, 39-53; The Tito-Rajk Conspiracy Against the Camp of Peace (review of *Laszlo Rajk and His Accomplices Before the People's Court*), Dec., 87-94.
- The Defense Prosecutes (From the Legal Brief Challenging the Discriminatory Method of Selecting Juries), February, 5-19.
- Dennis, Eugene—(with William Z. Foster) Is the Advocacy of Peace Treason?, April, 1-4; From the Opening Address to the Jury, September, 25-29.
- Editorial Article—World Labor Unity for Peace and Democracy, May, 3-15.
- Engels, Frederick—A Fair Day's Wage for a Fair Day's Work, April, 89-91; The Wages System, April, 91-93.
- Fast, Howard—Cultural Forces Rally Against the Warmakers, May, 29-38.
- Field, Frederick V.—The Meaning of the Chinese Revolutionary Victories, January, 60-74.
- Fine, Fred—Tasks Before the Peace Camp, October, 1-18.
- Flynn, Elizabeth Gurley—Remembering Sacco and Vanzetti, August, 50-56.
- For a Lasting Peace, For a People's Democracy!** — Right Socialists: Enemies of Peace and Democracy, April, 67-71.
- Ford, James W.—The 1948 Elections in Bedford-Stuyvesant, February, 70-81; The Communist Party: Champion Fighter for Negro Rights, June, 38-50.
- Foster, William Z.—The Two Major Variants of Keynesism, January, 45-59; (with Eugene Dennis) Is the Advocacy of Peace Treason?, April, 1-4; Cannon, Lovestone, and Browder, September, 14-24.
- Frankfeld, Philip—A United Democratic Front Defeated the Ober Law, October, 85-94.
- Gannett, Betty—Organization for Struggle, October, 47-58.
- Gates, John—From the Court Testimony, September, 30-33.
- Gates, Lillian—New York's 1949 Elections, Dec., 46-59.
- Gordon, Max—Popular Mandate vs. Monopoly Policy in the New Congress, January, 75-84.
- Green, Gilbert—From the Court Testimony, September, 34-38; The Browderite Conception of History, October, 65-84; Browder's "Coalition"—With Monopoly Capital, November, 48-57.
- Hall, Gus—Improve the Marxist-Leninist Content and Methods in Party Activity, April, 35-47; Thirty Years of Struggle for a Steelworkers' Union and a Working-Class Ideology, September, 54-70; United Front Is the Key to Victory Over Reaction, Dec., 18-34.
- Harris, Lem—Toward a Democratic Land Program for the South, March, 87-96.
- Hood, Robert—Facts That Arm the Workers (review of *Labor Fact Book 9*), November, 93-96.

- Hudson, Roy—The I.L.W.U. Convention—A Victory for All Labor, July, 45-57.
- Jerome, V. J.—Lenin and Opportunism in the American Labor Movement, January, 1-15; In the Spirit of Dimitrov, August, 7-21.
- Johnson, Arnold—The Politics of the Truman Administration, March, 1-14; The North Atlantic Pact for Aggression, May, 16-28; The Bill of Rights and the Twelve, July, 10-21.
- Jones, Claudia—An End to the Neglect of the Problems of the Negro Woman!, June, 51-57.
- Kuzminov, I.—The Crisis Character of the Economic Development of the U.S. in the Postwar Period, May, 54-70.
- Kuznetsov, Vassil—The Struggle to Fulfill the Tasks of the W.F.T.U., March, 29-33.
- Labor Youth League, National Organizing Conference—A Draft of Principles for the New Youth Organization, July, 87-89.
- Laptev, L.—The Triumph of Mitchurin Biological Science, February, 47-61.
- Leontyev, A.—Cosmopolitanism and Internationalism, July, 58-66.
- Liu Shao-Chi—Internationalism and Nationalism, August, 57-76.
- Longuet, Dr. Edgar—Some Aspects of the Family Life of Karl Marx, July, 67-74.
- Magil, A. B.—Class Forces in Israel's Fight for Independence, March, 72-86.
- Marinello, Dr. Juan—The Situation in Puerto Rico, May, 81-93.
- Martin, J.—Communication (on Philosophy), February, 93-96.
- Marx, Karl—On the Struggle for the Shorter Working Day, May, 84-96.
- The Mexican-Americans — Their Plight and Struggles, May, 74-80, and July, 75-84.
- Mine, Hillary—What Is National Income?, February, 62-69.
- Morris, George—The Vatican's "Labor Philosophy," April, 18-34.
- Newman, Henry—Myths and Realities of U.S.-China Policy, August, 77-91.
- North, Joseph—The Land Where People Come First (review of **People Come First**, by Jessica Smith), July, 90-95.
- Perry, Pettis—Destroy the Virus of White Chauvinism, June, 1-13; Next Stage in the Struggle for Negro Rights, October, 33-46.
- Phillips, George—The Chinese People's Victories and the Warmaker's Dilemma, April, 48-60.
- Poland, Council of Ministers of the People's Democratic Republic of—Decree Guaranteeing Freedom of Conscience and Religion, October, 95-96.
- Prago, Albert (with George Siskind)—Productive and Non-Productive Labor Under Capitalism, November, 81-92.
- Reiss, Marvin—The Struggle for Peace, April, 5-17; Socialism Means Peace, November, 25-39.
- Roberts, Joseph—Twenty-Five Years of the **Daily Worker**, April, 72-79.
- Roca, Blas—The Truman Plan for Development of Backward Areas, November, 58-63.
- Rosa, Carl—The National Labor Conference For Peace, November, 40-47.
- Ross, Nat.—The Dixiecrat Fascist Menace, July, 33-44.
- Ross, Norman—The Struggle for the Negro-Labor Alliance, June, 79-87.
- Salerno, Michael—Communication (on Genetics), August, 92-95.
- Schneiderman, William—The Defense of the Party, October, 19-25.
- Seisam, Howard (with Harry K. Wells)—The Philosophy of John Maynard Keynes, February, 82-92.
- Siskind, Beatrice—Despotism and Deportation, Dec., 60-73.
- Siskind, George—How "Historicus" Caricatures History, February, 23-36; "Life Will Assert Itself," March, 15-19; (with Albert Frago) Productive and Non-Productive Labor Under Capitalism, November, 81-92.
- Slansky, Rudolf—The Titoites—Servants of Imperialism, October, 59-64.
- Stalin: The Lenin of Today, Dec., 14-17.
- Starobin, Joseph—The Meeting of the Council of Foreign Ministers—A Step Forward, July, 1-9.
- Stein, Sid—As the C.I.O. Convention Near, August, 35-49; The C.I.O. Convention and the Struggle for Labor Unity, Dec., 35-45.
- Sutton, Olive—The Struggle for Peace, Liberty and Bread in Greece, November, 69-80.
- Tembaga, Badji—Indonesia: the Struggle for Independence, March, 46-57.
- Terestman, Al (with George Blake)—The People Win With Marcontonio, January, 85-94.
- Thompson, Robert—Strengthen the Struggle Against White Chauvinism, June, 16-25; From the Court Testimony, September, 44-48.
- Varga, Eugene—Against Reformist Tendencies in Works on Imperialism, Dec., 78-86.
- Weinstone, William—An Important Chapter in the Party's History of Industrial Concentration, September, 71-81.
- Wells, Harry K.—(with Howard Seisam) The Philosophy of John Maynard Keynes, February, 82-92; A Philosopher Exposes Wall Street's Myths About the Marxists (review of **Humanism as a Philosophy**, by Corliss Lamont), April, 53-58.
- Wheeldin, Herbert (with George Blake)—The People Organize to Re-Elect Ben Davis, June, 68-78.
- Williamson, John—Two Conventions of Labor: The Situation in the Trade Union Movement, January, 23-44; Defend and Extend the Rights of Negro Workers, June, 28-37.
- Wofsy, Leon—Fighting for the Needs of the Young Workers, March, 34-45.
- World Federation of Trade Unions, Executive Bureau—To the Working Men and Women of the World, April, 80-82.

STATEMENT OF THE OWNERSHIP, MANAGEMENT, CIRCULATION, ETC., REQUIRED BY THE ACT OF CONGRESS OF AUGUST 24, 1912, AS AMENDED BY THE ACTS OF MARCH 3, 1933, AND JULY 2, 1946

Of Political Affairs, published monthly at New York, N. Y., for October 1, 1949.

State of New York }
County of New York } ss.

Before me, a notary public in and for the State and county aforesaid, personally appeared Joseph Felshin, who, having been duly sworn according to law, deposes and says that he is the Business Manager of Political Affairs and that the following is, to the best of his knowledge and belief, a true statement of the ownership, management (and if a daily, weekly, semiweekly or triweekly newspaper, the circulation) etc., of the aforesaid publication for the date shown in the above caption, required by the act of August 24, 1912, as amended by the acts of March 3, 1933, and July 2, 1946 (section 537, Postal Laws and Regulations), printed on the reverse of this form, to wit:

1. That the names and addresses of the publisher, editor, managing editor, and business managers are:

Publisher, New Century Publishers, Inc., 832 Broadway, New York 3, N. Y.; Editor, V. J. Jerome, 35 E. 12th St., New York 3, N. Y.; Managing Editor, none; Business Manager, Joseph Felshin, 832 Broadway, New York 3, N. Y.

2. That the owner is: (If owned by a corporation, its name and address must be stated and also immediately thereunder the names and addresses of stockholders owning or holding one percent or more of total amount of stock. If not owned by a corporation, the names and addresses of the individual owners must be given. If owned by a firm, company, or other unincorporated concern, its name and address, as well as those of each individual member, must be given.)

New Century Publishers, Inc., 832 Broadway, New York 3, N. Y.

Joseph Felshin, 832 Broadway, New York 3, N. Y.

3. That the known bondholders, mortgagees, and other security holders owning or holding 1 percent or more of total amount of bonds, mortgages, or other securities are: (If there are none, so state.) None.

4. That the two paragraphs next above, giving the names of the owners, stockholders, and security holders, if any, contain not only the list of stockholders and security holders as they appear upon the books of the company but also, in cases where the stockholder or security holder appears upon the books of the company as trustee or in any other fiduciary relation, the name of the person or corporation for whom such trustee is acting, is given; also that the said two paragraphs contain statements embracing affiant's full knowledge and belief as to the circumstances and conditions under which stockholders and security holders who do not appear upon the books of the company as trustees hold stock and securities in a capacity other than that of a bona fide owner; and this affiant has no reason to believe that any other person, association, or corporation has any interest direct or indirect in the said stock, bonds, or other securities than as so stated by him.

5. That the average number of copies of each issue of this publication sold or distributed, through the mails or otherwise, to paid subscribers during the twelve months preceding the date shown above is..... (This information is required from daily, weekly, semiweekly, and triweekly newspapers only.)

JOSEPH FELSHIN, Business Manager.

Sworn to and subscribed before me this 26th day of September, 1949.

MANUEL LICHTENSTEIN

(My commission expires March 30, 1951)

[SEAL]

Just Published!

JOSEPH STALIN

A POLITICAL BIOGRAPHY

This long-awaited, authorized biography of Stalin appears at a time when working people throughout the world are celebrating the occasion of the seventieth birthday, December 21, 1949, of the revered leader of the U.S.S.R., Lenin's closest co-worker, and the architect of victorious socialism.

Prepared by the Marx-Engels-Lenin Institute, *Joseph Stalin: A Political Biography* is being published in a number of countries in enormous editions. The first printing by International Publishers is 25,000.

THE CONTENTS: I. Early Years in Georgia; II. The Period of the First Russian Revolution; III. The Years of Reaction; IV. Formation of the Bolshevik Party; V. The February and October Revolutions; VI. Counter-Revolution and Civil War; VII. Reconstruction. The Death of Lenin; VIII. Industrialization and Collectivization; IX. Industrialization and Collectivization (continued); X. The New Soviet Constitution; XI. The War Against Nazi Germany. Post-War Reconstruction.

Get a copy from your organization
or bookseller today

NEW CENTURY PUBLISHERS

832 BROADWAY, NEW YORK 3

N

ars
ele-
21,
co-

in:
un-
nal

iod
on;
nd
ar;
on
on
ar