

Nov.

# Political Affairs

MAY 1951 • 25 CENTS

EUGENE DENNIS

[ 1 ] The MacArthur Ouster

[ 9 ] Intensify and Broaden  
the Fight for Peace

JOHN WILLIAMSON  
and SID STEIN

[19] Labor's Living Standards  
and the Struggle for Peace

ALEXANDER GITTELMAN

[34] Where Is the "Monthly  
Review" Going?

HENRY NEWMAN

[54] The Stake of the American  
People in Philippine  
Independence

WALDECK BUCHHEIT

[69] Defense of French Agriculture  
and the Working Farmers

IRVING HISS

[78] Wages in the Society of  
Socialist Construction

WILLIAM W. PATTERSON

[89] The Epic of Peekskill  
(*Book Review*)

[93] Correspondence

# Outline Political History of the Americas

By WILLIAM Z. FOSTER

Enormous in range, this profound analysis of the economic and political development of the Western hemisphere, from the earliest Indian settlements to the present day, places the history of the United States within the total framework of hemispheric development, and sets the history of the Americas within the mainstream of world history.

Actually, this 700-page volume is three books in one. The first part tells the story of the colonial epoch, the settling of the Western hemisphere by the Spanish, English, French and Dutch, the arrival of the first African slaves, the exploitation of the Indian population, and the varied economic, political, and social conditions which developed in different parts of the hemisphere. Part II traces the course of the bourgeois-democratic revolutions which swept the entire hemisphere, the growth of capitalism, the fight against chattel slavery, and the all-important land question. The final section deals with the era of imperialism, the growing domination of U.S. imperialism, the alliance of the imperialist and semi-feudal groups, the national question, the fight against fascism, the rise of an organized working class throughout the Americas, and the formation of the Communist Parties. \$5.00

**NEW CENTURY PUBLISHERS**

**832 Broadway, New York City 3**

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

PRINTED IN U.S.A.



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

Editor: V. J. JEROME

## The MacArthur Ouster

*(A Letter to the Members of the Communist Party, U.S.A.)*

By Eugene Dennis

April 26, 1951

Dear Comrades:

The first phase of the storm over MacArthur's removal is coming to an end, with a sharper struggle in the offing. But our Party has not yet fully grasped the significance of this major political event. Only in a very few districts have our leaders and members awakened to the big new dangers that impend. And only in some places is the Party taking practical steps to utilize and shape the tremendous new opportunities for advancing the fight for peace which have now been opened up.

This is a state of affairs which we must change, and quickly. To move with full speed ahead, I wish first to review a few facts that are already clear but which should be fully understood by our membership and by all progressives.

What are some of the factors that led

to the ouster of Gen. MacArthur, the "White Emperor" who directed and executed the Truman-Dulles intervention in Korea and the aggression against China, and faithfully carried out Wall Street's program of rearming Japan?

Undoubtedly, MacArthur violated Presidential and Joint Chiefs of Staff directives and spoke "out of turn" in respect to certain military plans previously agreed upon but whose execution had been momentarily delayed by the course of military-political developments. Undoubtedly, MacArthur disagreed with the Administration about the need of taking into account, not in any decisive sense, of course, some of the views and "problems" of Washington's disgruntled allies, and aimed to forestall certain diplomatic maneuvers that were being discussed in U.N. circles.

Undoubtedly, too, the General and his cohorts—no less than Truman—helped precipitate his dismissal, calcu-

lating from a partisan viewpoint that the moment was propitious for MacArthur, Martin, Taft & Co. to force a political "showdown" with Truman, whose prestige was at an all-time low. Undoubtedly, too, Truman seized this moment to depose his pro-consul of the Pacific in order to divert attention from the dismal military outlook for the U.S. forces in Korea and to deceive "lay circles" here and abroad with a new barrage of peace demagogy.

However, after all is said and done, the decisive and major reasons for dumping MacArthur were the U.S.-Allied military failures and impasse in Korea; the sharpening differences, strains and difficulties faced by the Anglo-American imperialists and the bipartisans in their attempt to carry through their aggressive war policy in Europe as well as in Asia; and, especially, the great and growing strength of the world peace movement and the mounting peace sentiments and resistance of the American people both to the Korean war and to the preparation for new military adventures in the Far East and Europe.

In brief, the MacArthur ouster was a reflection of the acute and continuing crisis in U.S. foreign policy in the entire sphere of its operation, including the sharpening conflicts in the U.S.-dominated war alliance. *Far from resolving this crisis, l'affaire MacArthur can only further aggravate and deepen it.*

\* \* \*

What now? MacArthur and the whole wolfpack around him are now trying to take the offensive. They are openly and brazenly pressing for a

speedy extension of the war in Korea to the mainland of China. But these "Asia Firsters" care little about where, or how, their "preventive war" is unleashed. They are for World War III at any price, and at the earliest possible date. They are as eager to prevent an accord at the Paris meeting of the Deputy Foreign Ministers as to prolong and extend the slaughter in Korea. The "hero-scapegoat" and his firebrand supporters are out to stampede the country with wild promises of a "swift victory" and demagogic warnings against an "Asian Munich," and are oriented toward a new fascist alignment within the country.

The Truman Administration's dramatic change of military command was accompanied by no change in basic policy. Despite differences within the war camp in the United States, despite the fact that the MacArthur incident sharpens the partisan conflicts, particularly in preparation for 1952, U.S. monopoly capital is basically unified in its imperialist drive for war and world domination.

Truman's differences with MacArthur were limited to questions of tactics, emphases and methods of dealing with harassed and reluctant allies. Truman and his labor lieutenants are now trying to make these secondary, although important, differences look like a conflict over principle. They are trying to make it appear that Truman desires to avert world war. They thus hope to "breach" some of the rifts in the Allied war coalition, to unfold more speedily their main global war strategy, and recoup some of their lost influence in the ranks of labor, the Negro people and the broad peace forces.

The Truman Administration continues to move in its own aggressive way and at its own pace toward a global war. The latest peace initiative and proposals of the Korean People's Republic and the Peking government have been ignored by the State Department, while Democratic bigwigs join with Republicans in paying lavish tribute to the arch war criminal who directed the wanton murder of hundreds of thousands of Korean and Chinese men, women and children.

The Truman Administration is sending more arms, more money, more military advisers to Chiang Kai-shek, and organizing a buildup for more military adventures on Taiwan (Formosa). The Truman Administration has sent John Foster Dulles—a Morgan-duPont man, a Truman-MacArthur man—back to Tokyo to complete arrangements for a separate treaty with Japan, to carry on the over-all war preparations in the Pacific, around the rearming of Japan, begun by the deposed pro-consul. At the same time the Truman Administration is rushing to implement the Schuman Plan for the restoration of western Germany's war potential, while it pursues a studied policy of sabotage of the meeting of the Deputy Foreign Ministers in Paris.

Thus, under the guise of opposing a "third world war," of waging a "limited war," the Truman Administration continues to pursue Wall Street's aggressive war policy, a criminal policy which under MacArthur has already cost more than 60,000 American casualties in Korea and which, if unchecked, can only lead to new catastrophes in the Far East and Europe—to a third world war.

A majority of the people have conflicting views about the role of Truman and the removal of MacArthur. But they favor and demand world peace. They are opposed to extending the war in Korea or elsewhere. They are war-weary and are opposed to the predatory and ravishing effects of the war economy and to Truman's Jim-Crow and police-state war program. Many are disillusioned with Truman and also are allergic to MacArthur and Taft.

These masses want peace—in Korea and the world. They want an end to "national emergencies," wartime price, wage and tax controls, and to the mounting attacks on the Negro people, trade unionists, Communists and all partisans of peace. Many of these, despite their seeming passivity, say a "plague on both houses," on both the Trumans and MacArthurs. Among these masses, the majority, who have not yet spoken out on the MacArthur affair—can be rallied to wage an active fight for peace, for halting the war in Korea, for achieving peaceful negotiations and friendly relations among the Great Powers.

A very large section of the people, which in certain areas can quickly become most powerful, heaved a great sigh of relief when the news broke. These tens of millions see the arrogant General as a Number One war-monger and pro-fascist. They do not yet understand the limited nature of his differences with Truman. This group, which includes large sections of working people, is deeply imbued with the American tradition of civilian control and alarmed by the prospect of a military man-on-horseback riding

roughshod to power. These sincere advocates of peace are inclined to read into the President's action much more than the facts warrant and still have illusions that it portends a basic change in foreign policy.

There is another grouping, by no means negligible, which has temporarily come under the MacArthur-Taft spell, and which in the coming months may be influenced by MacArthur's menacing intervention in domestic affairs. The Gallup Poll, though far from a wholly reliable guide, reveals some interesting facts about the thinking of this section of the people. This poll (taken a few days after MacArthur was removed) found that a three to two majority of Americans want the Truman Administration to seek peace terms acceptable to the Chinese People's Republic, and a similar majority condemns the government for not seeking such peace terms. Six out of every ten interviewed believe that bombing attacks on China (as advocated by MacArthur) would bring the Soviet Union into the war, and seven out of ten were convinced that a full-scale war against China would mean world war.

Thus, the Gallup Poll, in effect, reported that a majority repudiates the MacArthur policies, although 62 percent of those polled oppose the MacArthur ouster, as against the 29 percent who approve it. These tens of millions—particularly in the ranks of labor, the Negro people, the women and youth—are expressing their strong peace sentiments in a very confused and distorted way. They are also blindly hitting out at the Truman Administration, which has cynically betrayed their hopes for peace as well as violated their economic

interests and democratic liberties.

What about the more advanced sections of the growing people's peace movement, including our own Party? Here we can record far greater clarity, reflected not only in Party statements and activity, but also in such independent and united front expressions of opinion as that issued by the packing-house workers in Chicago, the maritime workers in Hawaii, the Ford workers in Detroit, the broad peace movements in Maryland, Boston, Chicago and Philadelphia, and by other non-Communist peace groups and individual fighters for peace.

But we must also note that as yet some sections of the more advanced and progressive sections of the people's movement are reacting too slowly and inadequately, and some are merely watching and analyzing the unprecedented events and stirrings and movement of the masses. Many have been surprised and formed a one-sided estimate of the huge MacArthur demonstrations, the organized hoopla, and the precipitation of tens of millions into a new Great Debate.

And on the part of many advanced peace forces, including Communists, there has been all too much hesitation about plunging into discussion with various sections of the people—the followers of Murray, Dubinsky and Green, the adherents of the Democrats and of the G.O.P., Catholics, Protestants and other church groups, etc.—and too little skill has been displayed in finding the approach to points of agreement around which joint action, however limited, can be organized. There has been a tendency to write off those masses who uncritically support Tru-

man's  
voice  
Arthu  
san a  
clude  
head  
are c  
war  
Arthu  
Th  
estim  
dang  
Trum  
the l  
Party  
Th  
place  
Arthu  
even  
exist  
Ame  
tion  
and  
Many  
marit  
debat  
quest  
victor  
rect:  
to the  
judg  
Chie  
both  
in th  
velop  
peace  
up is  
lines  
of ol  
no r  
camp  
W  
the t  
the t

man's action, those who momentarily voice a measure of support for MacArthur, and those who are non-partisan and seem non-committal—and conclude that only a relatively few clear-headed and organized peace advocates are capable of opposing the bipartisan war drive, whether sparked by a MacArthur or a Truman.

There has also been a serious underestimation of the gravity of the new dangers that flow from the MacArthur-Truman fracas. This is true even in the leadership and ranks of our own Party.

These new dangers arise in the first place because the Trumans and MacArthurs are desperate and may become even more adventurous. These dangers exist also because tens of millions of Americans who have been set in motion by recent events are confused and divided, or are relatively passive. Many are unclear and are divided primarily by false issues. Their heated debate is still confined chiefly to the question of a "limited war" or a "swift victory," to the question of who is correct: the Europe or the Asia "Firsters"; to the relative superiority of the military judgment of MacArthur or the Joint Chiefs of Staff, etc. Others who are both anti-Truman and anti-MacArthur in their sentiments are reluctant to develop a bold and independent fight for peace. If the Great Debate now opening up is permitted to continue along these lines, or is kept within the confines of old alignments and partisan struggle, no matter how it develops, the war camp is going to win hands down.

We have to understand and help the tens of millions to understand, that the biggest danger now facing our na-

tion and the people is that the MacArthur and Truman war instigators may adventurously move to spread the war, especially now as the Korean liberation armies and Chinese volunteer troops unfold their new counter-offensive. There are no limits or boundaries to "limited" wars of aggression. To the warmongers it is relatively unimportant whether the "gateway" to World War III is opened in Asia or Europe, in China or Yugoslavia. But to the peace forces it is supremely important whether the door to peace is locked or opened in Korea or at the Deputy Foreign Ministers Conference in Paris. The only "swift victory" which concerns the American people is a swift victory over the warmakers, a swift end to the war in Korea, a swift opening of genuine peace negotiations with the Korean People's Republic, China and the Soviet Union.

This is the central fact we must bring home to the millions who falsely see Truman as the alternative to MacArthur, to the millions who as falsely see MacArthur as the alternative to the further prolongation of the Truman-Dulles' Korean slaughter, and to the millions of peace-loving people who are discontented, nonpartisan and are beginning to seek a peaceful alternative to the Trumans, MacArthurs and Hoovers.

In this connection, we must revive the people's bitter memory of MacArthur's cruel "home by Christmas" hoax (also peddled by the Administration), and convince them that his latest promise of "swift victory" is another bloody mirage. We must remind them that the Japanese militarists chased this will o' the wisp, "swift victory," on

the Chinese mainland for 10 years, and made a desperate stab to grasp it at Pearl Harbor—with what results every American knows well. We must help the American people recognize that MacArthur's talk of "swift victory" is only a translation of Hitler's "blitzkrieg" program for national dishonor and national suicide.

We must also expose the "non-appeasement" line being peddled by both the Truman and MacArthur imperialists. The American people should remember that Munich was engineered by those who appeased Hitler and betrayed the peace front for collective security which the Soviet Union had staunchly striven to establish; by those who sold out Ethiopia, Manchuria, China, Spain and Czechoslovakia to the "anti-Komintern" imperialist marauders, by those who opposed the peaceful co-existence of the capitalist states and the land of socialism. It is those who made appeasement of Hitler and Tojo a "virtue" who now pledge themselves to a "non-appeasement" policy—against whom?—against the U.S.S.R., the People's Democracies and Liberated China!—while they rush to complete separate "peace" treaties with the former Axis enemies and woo Franco and other fascist forces.

In the language of Truman and Acheson, as in the language of MacArthur and Taft, "no appeasement" means simply no peaceful negotiations, no peace.

In this situation, we Communists must, above all, help imbue the organized peace forces and the broad masses with confidence in their ability to influence events in a big way, to find a real, a peaceful alternative to both the Truman and the MacArthur war poli-

cies, and *unitedly to compel a basic change in American foreign policy.*

All of us know that our Communist Party can move millions of people and accomplish great things—when it really sets its shoulder to the wheel. But this is possible only when we have all fully grasped the new features in a new political situation, when we have organized ourselves to bring clarity to others and help them to organize and establish the broadest unity of action, and when we put first things first. In the present situation, we will not succeed in doing what the times demand and what can be done—as long as many Party leaders and members make the fight for peace point two, or point five, on a long agenda and consider it as only one of many equally important tasks.

*From here on, points one to the end of every Party agenda in every leading committee and club must be linked with and turn around various aspects of an all-out struggle and campaign against the Truman and MacArthur war policies; for the mass repudiation of MacArthur's avowed and brazen proposals to spread-the-war, and for counter-acting the pro-fascist moves, alignment and further intervention of the MacArthur gang in national politics; and for developing the most extensive and intensified mass activity to condemn and oppose Truman's limitless "limited" war and war provocations and the whole aggressive, bipartisan war policy of the Administration, and to force a change in this criminal and suicidal policy.*

These, comrades, are goals which events have now made practical and realizable. Mass peace sentiment was a factor in the removal of MacArthur.

If it is  
er cl  
join t  
peace  
defeat  
man-D  
impose  
peace  
Americ

Mas  
man  
Paris  
isters.  
the sal  
ington  
negotia  
China  
of the  
Asia.

We  
begin  
unleas  
have  
groun  
full pe  
we mu  
time.  
the th  
comm  
and m  
est un  
tions—  
the se  
of tel  
of m  
every  
sands  
bates,  
very  
life o  
vance

Th  
cludin  
Trum

If it is now organized, guided to greater clarity, and expressed in powerful joint and parallel actions—this mass peace sentiment and united activity can defeat the MacArthur-Taft and the Truman-Dulles war policies, can begin to impose the people's will for a genuine peace policy in the interests of the American and all other peoples.

Mass pressure helped force the Truman Administration to agree to the Paris meeting of Deputy Foreign Ministers. Greater mass pressure can end the sabotage of this gathering by Washington, and force it at least to begin negotiations with the Soviet Union and China for a peaceful and just settlement of the central issues in Europe and Asia.

We are not at the end, but only at the beginning of the big political struggles unleashed by the MacArthur affair. We have been slow in getting off the ground, and have not yet exerted our full potential influence on events. Now we must determine to make up for lost time. If we enter more boldly into the thick of this Great Debate on a shop, community, state and national level, and make a resolute fight for the broadest unity of action on a few vital questions—such as by helping to influence the sending of hundreds of thousands of telegrams, extending the collection of mass peace petitions and ballots everywhere, assisting to organize thousands of meetings, delegations and debates, etc.—we can help effect some very important changes in the political life of our country, we can greatly advance the cause of world peace.

The vast majority of Americans, including those who erroneously think Truman is an "apostle of peace" and

those who mistakenly believe that MacArthur is a "national hero" who got a raw deal, want peace in Korea now. They are opposed to a third world war.

Those who temporarily are swayed by the MacArthur siren-call to "swift victory," and those who have illusions that Truman is seeking "world peace with honor," can agree on a few cardinal demands: End the war in Korea! Hands Off China! Start Peaceful Negotiations! Get the main world powers together now—the U.S.A., the Soviet Union, China, Britain, France—to sit down, talk things over and negotiate until a peaceful and democratic settlement is arrived at! Let People's China take her rightful place in the U.N.! Ban the A-Bomb! For a Pact of Peace among the Five Great Powers!

The way to assure that the American people intervene effectively at this critical juncture in the life of our country is to promote their united and parallel action around such elementary and basic peace demands, as well as around a number of burning bread and butter and civil rights issues arising out of the monstrous war economy and militarization of the country.

The way to clear up the existing confusion in the minds of the tens of millions is to *organize* and center discussion and action in the factories and unions, in the neighborhoods and local people's, civic and church organizations—on those issues where there is the widest area of agreement, and in the course of developing united action around such issues, especially around the demands for peace—for peaceful negotiations *now*, as well as for a drastic reduction in armaments and in the soaring cost of living and for protect-

ing Negro rights and all democratic liberties—to explain patiently and explain again our position on all the knottier and fundamental questions to which the masses are seeking answers.

The MacArthur affair and its consequences present an historic challenge to the American people and to our Party. I am confident, comrades, that we Communists will speedily overcome the shortcomings I have noted here, and

exert the full political influence of our Party in the interests of peace, of the welfare of our country and people.

I hope that many of you will reply to this letter, sharing with our whole Party your own experiences and views.

With comradely greetings,

EUGENE DENNIS,  
General Secretary,  
Communist Party, U.S.A.

By E

A BR  
of th

Tw  
prese  
dang  
the s  
arisin  
worl  
the 1  
Preli  
Fore

A  
vant  
ned  
milit  
Kore  
teer  
to an  
lowe  
fensi  
in m  
reser  
in h  
unde  
Para  
"Op  
Tru  
exec  
spre  
bou

\* A  
the N  
on Ap

# Intensify and Broaden the Fight For Peace\*

By Eugene Dennis

A BRIEF COMMENT ON certain aspects of the international situation:

Two main features characterize the present international situation. The danger of war is increasing; but at the same time new opportunities are arising to advance the cause of world peace. Indicative of this are the latest events in Korea and the Preliminary Conference of Deputy Foreign Ministers in Paris.

A word on Korea: Taking advantage of the temporary and planned pause or lull in the offensive military operations of the North Korean armies and Chinese volunteer forces (a pause that is coming to an end and that may soon be followed by a gigantic spring offensive), and at the risk of vital losses in men and material—operative and reserve—MacArthur has succeeded in having the U.S. and other forces under his command recross the 38th Parallel in certain sectors. *This "Operation Killer," O.K.'d by the Truman Administration, has been executed as a desperate gamble to spread the war in Korea beyond the boundaries of peaceful negotiations.*

MacArthur has directed the U.S. Air Force to resume provocative raids and bombings of China's territory, simultaneously with the new political initiative taken by MacArthur and the G.O.P. chieftains Martin and Taft to involve the U.S. 7th Fleet, in conjunction with Chiang's discredited remnants in Taiwan (Formosa), in a new aggression against the Chinese mainland.

All this is taking place at a moment of further sharpening of Anglo-American contradictions and tactical differences, at the time of the advancing role of the world mass movement for peace, and on the eve of a new initiative in some U.N. circles, including India, to try to effect a cease-fire order and open diplomatic negotiations for a peaceful settlement of the war in Korea.

In order to counteract the latest moves to extend aggression in the Far East and in order to help create conditions for peaceful negotiations, it is essential that the American peace forces intervene in the situation in a *new and big way*. It is necessary that MacArthur's provocative moves to spread the war and the Administration's intent to carry on that adventurism in its own way

\* Abridged remarks at the enlarged meeting of the National Committee, Communist Party, U.S.A., on April 8, 1951.

be speedily and widely condemned as a criminal plot to embark on new war adventures, as inimical to the peace and American national interests.

It is necessary that the peoples' demand for ending the war, for withdrawing the foreign troops from Korea and recalling MacArthur, for starting peaceful negotiations with Korea, China, and the U.S.S.R., and for according China her rightful place in the U.N. be revived and reinforced everywhere in the country.

It is well that all the advanced forces who are active in the preparations for the Chicago Peace Congress are making these issues and demands a point of special concentration. It is also clear that a far broader initiative, campaign, and activity around them must and can be organized.

\* \* \*

In the forefront of considerations is the Paris Conference: It is no secret that the U.S. Government not only does not favor, but is actively opposing the calling of a Foreign Ministers' Conference. Only after an exchange of five notes did it reluctantly agree to the convening of the meeting of the Foreign Ministers' Deputies. This conference materialized because of the initiative of the Soviet Union. Its proposal for German demilitarization met with

such tremendous response in France, Italy, England, and Germany that the Deputies' Conference had to be called. The meeting of Deputies is a political event of great importance. The fact that the preliminary conference is already being held signifies a partial victory for the world peace camp.

However, during the course of the conference the United States has done everything to deadlock and undermine it. The United States has proceeded further in the re-arming of Germany and Japan and is seeking to establish Mediterranean, Latin-American, and Pacific Pacts modelled on the Atlantic Pact. The flexible determination of the Soviet Union to achieve a fruitful conference of the Foreign Ministers, in conjunction with the internal situation in France and England and the acute Anglo-French-American contradictions, has created the condition in which it is still possible to secure the convening of a Foreign Ministers' meeting, although the United States still endeavors to sabotage the meeting, since it does not want peace negotiations and a settlement.

It is clear, if the conference of the Deputy Foreign Ministers is deadlocked, or if, failing in this, the United States is successful in turning the Foreign Ministers' conference into a session to "end all conferences," that this could have grave consequences. *It would be utilized by Wall Street to step up war prepa-*

ration  
tion  
versel  
lead t  
tion,  
drive,  
ward

It i  
from  
arous  
can p  
sure t  
Minis  
such  
tion  
ings  
vided  
ment  
to th  
the  
ques  
of he

Of  
conn  
impe  
Pow  
port  
part  
bein  
wer  
Peac  
a P  
real  
can  
mar  
with  
into  
ever  
con  
sho

*rations, organize new war provocations, whip up war hysteria. Conversely, a successful conference would lead to easing the international situation, would retard and check the war drive, and would open the way toward a peaceful settlement.*

It is high time that we pass over from being mainly observers, and arouse large sections of the American people to bring powerful pressure to bear for convening a Foreign Ministers' Conference, insist that such a conference mark the resumption of the regular quarterly meetings of Foreign Ministers, as provided for in the Potsdam Agreement. We must explain why the halt to the arms race and the opening of the door to peace negotiations are questions, not of "appeasement," but of helping to avert a new world war.

Of particular importance in this connection is the need to explain the imperative necessity for a Five Power Peace Pact and to win support for it. We should by all means participate in the actions that are being undertaken by the forces that were associated with the American Peace Crusade, such as the ballot for a Peace Pact. But we must also realize that much broader forces can and should be won for the demand that the United States enter with the other four major powers into a Peace Pact. Every meeting, every gathering, every conference or convention is a place where support should be given to all peace forces

who raise and fight for this issue. The advanced forces in the struggle for peace should strive to bring this issue of a Peace Pact into the trade unions, the C.I.O.-P.A.C., the A. F. of L. and its political organizations, the Negro people's organizations, and among the Quakers and other church groups. Recent statements by such prominent figures as Warburg, Hutchins, even Weir, etc., can also be utilized to further the fight for peaceful negotiations.

\* \* \*

Next I would like briefly to deal with some questions regarding the present status and tactical aspects of the peace movement.

Why is it that while our Party has a sound policy and has registered progress in promoting the fight for peace, our peace activity generally does not yet measure up to the gravity of the situation and is not commensurate with existing possibilities, with the strong and rising peace sentiments and currents? Why is unity of action for peace not yet developed on a really broad and powerful basis? Why is the crystallization of an organized nation-wide peace movement proceeding so slowly?

Undoubtedly, the ferocious and large-scale attacks on the peace and progressive movements, especially on our Party, by the State Department, F.B.I., employers, and Right-wing trade-union leaders, is one fac-

tor holding back the developing peace movement. Undoubtedly, too, the Administration, the bi-partisans with their colossal war propaganda and anti-Soviet incitements, with their gigantic war mobilization, constant war provocations and aggressions, have succeeded in instilling among considerable sections of the population the idea that war is inevitable, the idea that the Soviet Union is an "imperialist aggressor," the idea that the disastrous arms race and war preparations are essential for national security.

And unquestionably, the anti-Communist and anti-Soviet role of the reactionary labor officialdom, of the Social-Democratic and liberal leaders and their divisive and demagogic activities, is another factor—to date the major factor—in obstructing the organization of the broadest peace front and the forging of a united labor front and people's unity generally.

But these factors in themselves cannot explain away the unsatisfactory, in fact, dangerously inadequate level of organization of the peace movement, its restricted coordination and spotty fighting power. For, the facts are that, particularly since the military defeats in Korea in November and December, the peace sentiments and strivings of the American people have become more pronounced and articulate. The facts are that the war against Korea, together with the aggression against

China, has become the most unpopular war in American history. The facts are that the people's resistance to the effects of the war economy and to the militarization of the country is increasing both in and out of the labor movement.

The facts are that the crisis in United States foreign policy is deepening; the contradictions in the war economy are becoming more apparent; and the rising peace sentiment and the readiness of the workers to struggle on the economic front, despite Taft-Hartley and the National Emergency Decrees, are growing.

The facts are that while most people still are unclear regarding the responsibility for aggression in Korea and the source of the war danger and while many are unsure whether a third world war can be averted, *the majority of the people do not want atomic warfare, the majority of the people do not want war with China or the Soviet Union. The people want peaceful negotiations and a peaceful settlement of conflicts and differences, they want peace.*

All this is making the position of the government and of the Democratic Party, especially in respect to maintaining its base and popular support, more difficult and insecure. It is also creating unprecedented difficulties — and a crisis — for Right-wing trade-union leaders. It is creating more, not fewer, opportunities for organizing a broader, more

active  
peace  
portu  
sive p  
It r  
tion,  
will  
long,  
ment  
strug  
demo  
more  
Fo  
zatic  
of a  
then  
and  
pera  
will  
the  
mist  
to  
and  
enc  
of f  
is g  
P  
for  
and  
ano  
tak  
sub  
qu  
we  
pe

th

active, and politically more effective peace movement, as well as new opportunities for promoting progressive political realignments.

It must also be said that this situation, these favorable opportunities, will not continue indefinitely, or for long, if the mounting peace sentiment is not organized, if unity of struggle for peace, security and democratic liberties is not developed more rapidly and on a bigger scale.

For in the absence of mass organization and struggle, of broader unity of action, the Administration will then be able to proceed unchecked and engage in new and more desperate adventures. Also the G.O.P. will capitalize on the situation, and the trade-union and other reformist misleaders will be able more easily to carry through new maneuvers and recoup some of their lost influence. In this situation the danger of fascist alignments and movements is great.

Further, to determine the reason for the lag in the peace movement and what must be done to broaden and win the fight for peace, *we must take into account some other factors, subjective factors: particularly the question of how we and those whom we influence work and fight for peace.*

\* \* \*

Without in any way minimizing the many positive achievements in

our work, I would like to refer in passing to three unsolved problems and weaknesses which serve as a brake on the Party's mass work, and hence on the unfolding of the peace movement.

First, as the reports make clear, we still have to make peace, the struggle for unity of action for peace, the center of all of our work and activity. The fact that nine months after Korea, we have actually to pose the question in this way is a danger signal. Without further delay, this means to reorganize our work in such a way as to give major time, resources and personnel to developing the peace movement. This means to place the fight for peace in the center of the political thinking and practical activity in all fields and to extend the fight for peace on all fronts: the fight for a foreign policy of peace; the struggle against the armament race and the effects of the war economy; the struggle against militarization of the country, against the suppression of trade-union rights, civil rights, and democratic liberties; the combatting of war propaganda and hysteria; and the ideological offensive against the war-mongers.

Secondly, *we must develop a more consistent, audacious, and effective application of the working-class united front and the people's front policies.* The situation demands a more determined effort to organize the peace movement everywhere on

the broadest and most active basis, with the objective of winning decisive sections of the people—the working class in coalition with all who strive for peace—actively to wage and win the fight for peace. In this connection we need to give maximum attention to such problems as the following:

A) We must overcome all opportunism (Right and “Left”), all hesitancy and reluctance to organize united front peace actions with Catholic and Social-Democratic workers, and with masses who are under the influence of the Hoovers and Tafts.

This requires a more rapid and imaginative reaction to, and utilization of, issues and events that deeply interest, agitate, or move broad masses. It involves the question of how to be alert to developments and of how to intervene at such key moments so as to move millions, tens of millions, in regard to events and issues such as the demand to bring the boys home from Korea, the “Great Debate,” the sending of troops to Europe, the chafing of the people at the growing tax burden, the workers’ resistance to the oppressive war economy, which forced the resignation of top labor officials from the War Mobilization Board, Stalin’s declarations for peace, the growing popular incensement of the peoples against the rabid warmongers, including the advocates of “preventive war” now, the role of Nehru in

peace negotiations, etc., etc. We do react politically and editorially and sometimes organizationally. But very frequently we do not find suitable forms of activity and organization that the masses in great numbers are prepared to accept and act upon. Moreover, the progressive peace forces too often tend to by-pass existing mass organizations and do not help develop effective work within them, so as to stimulate these organizations to initiate polls, petitions, debates, delegations, and similar forms and methods of large-scale activity for peace.

This general task requires, too, far greater participation and leadership of mass movements for increased wages, against speed-up, for price rollbacks, for tax reductions, for Negro rights, against screening workers, against corporation “loyalty” oaths, etc. To be effective, this means, for instance, to infuse the wage movement and the struggle for Negro rights with clearer and more definite peace consciousness and specific peace objectives and demands.

B) Simultaneously, we must work more steadfastly to overcome all sectarianism, deep-rooted sectarian practices in applying the united front policy, especially in organizing united peace actions and movements. For one thing, we must put an end to a situation where our peace activity is frequently distorted into creating so-called united front peace organizations and campaigns in our

own image, with an advanced program, the immediate program of our Party; with forms of organization and activity that involve at best only a narrow circle of workers and progressives already under the Party's influence; and where incorrect methods of work and sectarian attitudes toward non-Communist participants in the united front hinder the common work for peace.

This is an obstacle to the fight for peace. Likewise, we must put an end to the practice of making gestures, formal approaches in appealing for united front actions. Here I refer to certain statements issued by the Party and to certain statements issued by Left trade unionists. Some of these statements, though essentially sound, are often issued as an end in themselves, and become a substitute for serious and patient activity among the masses. Of course, we will continue to issue united front appeals, knowing in advance that many will not yield immediate united front actions with the organizations to whom they are addressed. Yet when we do so, it is not for the record, or for posterity, or for historical research—but as a means of reaching the rank and file, to organize discussions among the masses and to draw them into activity.

\* \* \*

Further, we need greater clarity on the type, the character of the

peace movement that the most conscious and active peace forces are striving to unfold. Whether it is American Peace Crusade, or a loose and temporary coalition on single issues, the prime objective should be to organize the broadest peace coalition and mass movement. In so far as we Communists are concerned, we are trying to organize unity of action of all persons and groups who want peace, who want to avert a third world war, regardless of their views on Communism, the source of the war danger, etc. Reserving and exercising the right to express our point of view on all questions, and granting this right to others, we will join hands with Catholic and Social-Democratic workers, with pacifists, churchmen, and followers of isolationism, in concrete endeavors and mass actions to end the war in Korea, to prevent the spread of aggression, to reduce armaments, to prevent the rearmament of Germany and Japan, to promote peaceful negotiations and a democratic settlement of all international disputes and conflicts, to achieve a Pact of Peace of the Five Powers.

This means that the peace movement should not be limited or restricted to the organization and activity of anti-imperialists, but should embrace the broadest peace forces, should effect an alliance with the broadest anti-war mass movements. This does not mean minimizing the role of the Left and other anti-impe-

rialist elements. On the contrary, to help crystallize and influence broader movements, means simultaneously to help enhance the organization, activity, influence, and leadership of the anti-imperialist forces. This is why, for example, we join with all sincere fighters for peace in supporting all democratic mass peace movements as the American Peace Crusade and the Chicago Peace Congress which is developing chiefly as a coalition of Left-progressive forces. For this is indispensable at the present stage of the peace movement—both to coordinate and expand the influence and activity of Left-progressives and to help influence the development of the peace movement in all directions.

But here too it is to be hoped that the Chicago Peace Congress will be built on a genuinely united front basis, as a broad organization and movement which will help initiate wide united front actions on single issues and establish friendly and cooperative relations with diverse peace forces and groupings, especially with the established mass organizations of labor, the Negro people, and the churches.

In connection with the Chicago Peace Congress, it is to be hoped too, that it will lay emphasis, not only on numbers of delegates, but above all on the mass support they represent. Likewise, we must bear in mind that the American Peace Crusade, while very important, is not the sum

and substance of progressive peace activity; not *the* peace movement, not a substitute for reaching, involving in united action the decisive majority of organized workers and great masses in churches, Negro, farm, youth and women's organizations.

One other word on this point: In raising the cardinal question of forging the broadest peace front, the widest unity of action of all peace forces, some comrades see only one aspect of this question: namely, the important task of rallying non-labor sections of the population, *i.e.*, middle-class people, urban and rural, churchmen, professionals, etc. But there is another aspect involved—a fundamental one: namely, the urgent need of reaching and drawing into united front activity the big and decisive sections of workers, organized and unorganized, who are influenced by and follow pacifists, isolationists, Social-Democrats, Democrats, and Republicans.

Thus, the effort to build the broadest unity of action for peace must be viewed as an essential means to facilitate and strengthen united labor action no less than it is to influence and mobilize the decisive majority of all democratic forces for common action to win the fight for peace.

\* \* \*

A third question I wish to touch on is the supreme necessity for our

Party  
comb  
solu  
and p  
amon  
them  
our P

I re  
circul  
World  
spread  
facilit  
aids  
design  
war.  
done  
of p  
this  
ment

Th  
that  
of w  
war  
situa  
mas  
aim  
Stre  
to s  
is c  
and  
unle  
sho  
peo  
esp  
tion  
icar  
tha  
the  
a t  
thi

Party and those we can influence to combat more energetically and resolutely certain moods of fatalism and pessimism that have penetrated among the people, and that manifest themselves even within the ranks of our Party.

I refer in the first place to the idea circulated by the warmongers that World War III is inevitable. The spread of this defeatist outlook facilitates the preparations for war, aids and abets Wall Street, and is designed to drag the people into war. Much, much more has to be done by our Party, by all advocates of peace, to unmask and counteract this pernicious propaganda and mentality.

This, of course, does not mean that we should minimize the danger of war. Not at all. We must soberly warn the people of the gravity of the situation, and more convincingly unmask the adventurist, aggressive war aims, plottings, and moves of Wall Street. We have to do much more to show that Wall Street wants and is organizing for World War III, and that if it is able to do so, will unleash it. Also, above all, we must show the role and responsibility of peoples in regard to war and peace, especially in the present grave situation, the responsibility of the American people. We must demonstrate that the people have the power, if they are united and fight, to avert a third world war. We must prove this, not only theoretically, but

through the actual experience of the people in the postwar situation.

Connected with the idea of the inevitability of war is the conception of the inevitability of fascism and the impossibility of checking the advance of fascization which is taking place, and the impossibility of nullifying the fascist laws that were enacted, as well as the view that in the event of an adverse Supreme Court decision on the "II," all democratic liberties in the country would be automatically wiped out and all avenues of democratic expression and mass action foreclosed.

It is not my intention to deal with these questions here. But these harmful and erroneous conceptions must be clearly answered and decisively fought. I would, however, like to make one or two comments on a related school of thought, *a fatalistic point of view that under present conditions it is impossible for the people to influence, let alone change, the foreign policy of the Administration. It is clear, of course, that the Administration's foreign policy was, is, and will remain Wall Street's policy—a reactionary, aggressive, warmaking, imperialist policy. But it is also clear that what Wall Street and the Administration want and what they are able to do are not one and the same thing, and can become even less so tomorrow.*

Comrades, today we can say with increased confidence that the out-

look and the possibilities are definitely improving for the masses, the democratic forces, by their struggle and unity of action, to resist more effectively, to check the Administration's war policy, and to create the conditions for changing it. We can say this and hold out such a fighting perspective for the coming period, not only in terms of the ultimate course of history and the invincible strength of the world camp of peace and Socialism, but also and connected with this, because there is a deep and growing crisis in United States foreign policy; because all the contradictions of American imperialism are sharpening and multiplying and creating new difficulties for Wall Street; because the peace movement internationally is developing on a new and more favorable basis, with a new balance in the relations between the peoples which is advantageous to the cause of peace, and not least of all because of the strong

and rising peace sentiments in our country and the increasing popular resistance to the war program.

By basing ourselves on the mounting anti-war feelings of the broad masses and the growing dissatisfaction with Administration policies, by working among the masses, by encouraging and developing their resistance and opposition to the government's bi-partisan war policy and the arrogant exponents of "preventive war," by organizing the broadest unity of action for peace, favorable conditions will be created enabling the masses to compel a change in foreign policy in the interests of the American people and world peace.

Of this we are confident. And now we should imbue the broad masses with this confidence, with confidence in their own strength, unity, and independent action for peace.

By J

MANY  
the fl  
work  
every  
the c  
is th  
the i  
one h  
world  
powe  
the d  
ity, a  
war p  
day  
the v  
demo  
their  
the  
peace  
a wo  
live  
hood  
expl  
been  
Or  
class  
mun  
task  
lies  
men

# The Defense of Labor's Living Standards and the Fight For Peace

By John Williamson and Sid Stein

MANY and varied are the slogans on the flowing banners of millions of workers celebrating May Day in every corner of the globe. But the essence of all demonstrations is the determination to defeat the imperialist warmongers. With one heartbeat, one resolve, the mighty world working class stands in its power and grandeur, representing the deepest aspirations of all humanity, as an effective barrier to the war plans of the imperialists. On this day of international labor solidarity, the working masses and their allies demonstrate abiding confidence in their strength to lead humanity along the glorious road of struggle for peace and democracy to socialism, to a world where nations and peoples live in independence and brotherhood, where peace is secure because exploitation and oppression have been forever abolished.

On this day of glorious working-class tradition, we American Communists rededicate ourselves to the task of uniting our class and its allies in a powerful, invincible movement that will break the chains of de-

ceit, falsehood, chauvinism and terror with which American imperialism seeks to make of our class a tool in the service of its program for world domination.

Nineteen fifty-one marks 65 years since American labor gave birth to the great day of proletarian internationalism, the First of May. The May Days of the past light up like beacons the struggles of American workers for over half a century. Born in the struggle for the 8-hour day in the United States, May Day since the turn of the century became the occasion of labor's worldwide struggle against imperialism and imperialist war.

The May Days in the early years of the twentieth century were first of all demonstrations against imperialist war, and in 1918 and 1919 were occasions when workers marched in support of the infant Socialist Republic—the Soviet Union.

It was on various May Days in the 1920's and '30's that workers demonstrated for the release of Tom Mooney, Sacco and Vanzetti, the Scottsboro Boys and other martyrs

in the struggles of labor and the Negro people for a better life.

It was on May Day 1936-38 that a new rising American labor movement celebrated its success in organizing millions of unorganized. And in 1945 American labor joined with millions throughout the world in rejoicing at the first free May Day after the military defeat of the Hitlerite fascists.

But no May Day in the past ever confronted the American working class with such an ominous and yet so promising a future as today. The imperialism of Wall Street threatens the peoples of the world with bloody aggressive warfare and plunder, and simultaneously unlooses upon the people of the U.S.A. economic catastrophe and a steady growth of fascist reaction. The peoples of the world, who hate American imperialism, turn their eyes to the millions of the plain people of the United States—in the first place to the workers and the labor movement—where they look for a different America, for a different American policy.

That is why, on the banners of the class-conscious American workers on this First of May are inscribed such outstanding demands for peace as: Stop the war in Korea now by negotiating peace and withdrawing American troops; For a Big Five peace pact; Prevent the growth of fascist reaction; Defend the workers from the ruin of war economy and inflation imposed under Truman's Emergency Decree; Develop united

labor action and labor's unity with the Negro people and the farming masses; Heighten the consciousness and expressions of international working-class solidarity.

#### ECONOMIC BURDENS OF WALL STREET'S WAR DRIVE

As this May Day rolls around, American imperialism, as a direct part of its war policy and its drive toward fascist reaction, is imposing unparalleled economic burdens on the workers and the masses of the people. Recently a Congressional subcommittee warned of a period of "galloping inflation." It is an undisputed fact that there is already a serious growth of inflation. This is reflected in the depreciation of the value of the dollar, of savings and government bonds, with all the other consequences that flow from this. While various bourgeois economists express concern as to the consequences of this inflation, the dominant Big Business representatives in government drive through a policy which speeds it up. And while doing this, they seek to place responsibility for inflation upon the masses, by shouting about high wages, not enough productivity, excess purchasing power, and other such spurious arguments.

The Wall Street boss of the war mobilization program, C. E. Wilson of the General Electric Co., in his recent quarterly report, predicts two more years of "greater sacrifice" by

the American people and says that "the effect of the rearmament program on civilian life has hardly yet been felt."

What this perspective of Mr. Wilson means for the workers can best be understood by examining briefly the economic situation today.

This May Day finds *fabulous profits, the highest on record, being extracted from American workers*. Profits average a rate of 42 billion dollars this year, before payment of taxes, and some 24½ billions after taxes. During 1950 all manufacturing corporations had an average "profit take" of \$1700 per worker, and General Motors reached up to \$4,000 per worker as compared with \$2445 in 1949.

On this May Day *prices continue soaring to ever higher levels*. As of March 20, even the rigged B.L.S.\* index showed all wholesale prices up 17 percent above the pre-Korea level and 21 percent above that of a year ago. The government food price index, as of March 1, was 23.9 above the index of a year ago. And all this takes place under the farce of government price control. While the "price controllers" cynically admit that prices shoot up at a rate of 12 per cent a year, the Price Control Regulation was used as the excuse for proclaiming a wage freeze.

This May Day witnesses *taxes mounting on lowest income groups*, to pay for the war budget, boosted

to \$72 billion. This situation is graphically illustrated by contrasting 1939 and 1950. In 1939, people with a yearly income of less than \$3,000 (\$57.00 weekly) paid less than 5 percent of all Federal income tax revenue, while in 1950 those in the same income category paid 50 percent of all Federal income taxes. But the Federal income tax is only a small part of the burden of taxation that falls on every worker. When all direct and indirect taxes levied by all government levels are added together, it is estimated that the average worker in manufacturing industries with a family to support pays \$800 yearly, and the latest tax proposals of the Big Business lobbies would increase this to \$1,000 per year.

The International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union research department made a popular breakdown of the extraction of taxes from a day's labor of an average worker in manufacturing industries who supports a family. One hour and 45 minutes of his labor time goes to pay all the taxes he is called upon to pay. Another hour and five minutes of his labor time goes to pay what his employer eventually pays in taxes. Thus two hours and fifty minutes of each eight hour day go for taxes.

This May Day finds *wages frozen by government decree*. Since February a government wage freeze has been in effect for all workers, in contrast with soaring prices, profits and taxes. Strikes and growing discon-

\* Bureau of Labor Statistics

tent forced some trivial adjustments in wage rates, the right to increase wages by 10 per cent from the level of January 1950, and the exclusion of some escalator wage increases up to January 1951. But the wage freeze remains in effect, as the weapon of monopoly capital to drive down the living standards of the workers, to intensify their exploitation and to legally deny them the right to fight and strike for higher wages and against the effects of the galloping inflation.

This May Day hundreds of thousands of unionized workers, who through their organized strength and strikes have forced their employers to grant wage increases, are being denied part of these wage increases under the government wage freeze. Among these are 200,000 packing house workers; 70,000 woolen workers, 150,000 cotton and rayon workers, 40,000 East coast shipyard workers. Millions more have contracts that expire, or wage reopeners that come due, but wage increases for these workers can be realized only by busting the wage freeze.

In order to split the workers, the government has allowed some two million workers, whose union contracts have Reuther-type escalator clauses — tying the workers' wages to the B.L.S. price index—to receive a few pennies above the 10 per cent wage formula, and also approved a wage increase for the coal miners that went beyond the 10 per cent, in order to prevent a repetition of the

inspiring coal miners' strike of two years ago.

But discontent with the wage freeze remains in the center of an over-all disgust with the impact of the war economy-inflation which is hitting American workers in an unprecedented way. It is becoming clearer to millions, on this day of labor's mustering of its forces, that the entire war economy is one big racket for the employers and one long nightmare for the workers. A number of conclusions must be driven home among all workers. What are these?

1. That the war program of Big Business and the government is responsible for the present inflation and its consequences for the workers; that the wage freeze, the breaking of the railroad workers' strike, the attempt to abolish the 40-hour week, all flow from the Truman Emergency Decree. We must make clear that these monopoly attacks are not separated from the previous splitting of the C.I.O., attempts to destroy progressive-led unions, arrests and convictions of progressive trade-union leaders, etc. The idea insidiously cultivated by the war makers and their stooges among labor leaders, that war and a war economy brings "prosperity" is being exploded for the myth it is. And it is becoming crystal clear that Wall Street and Washington fear that peace will wreck their bonanza of war profits; therefore they do not hesitate to sacrifice millions of American lives on their cross of gold. As they cynically declare, "The

only factor which might upset the appercart (for businessmen) would be the attainment of some plausible formula for lasting peace with Russia."<sup>\*</sup>

2. The entire so-called "Economic Stabilization" program of the government is merely a device to help shift 25-30 percent of the national industrial output from civilian to military use—and to do it in such a way as to allow fabulous profits to the monopolies while unloading the cost of the war budget on the masses.

3. Big Business spokesmen frankly advance their program of rigid wage freezes and other government regulations to fetter the workers. They frankly admit this may lead to strikes. But they figure that these will be strikes against the government and that the government would handle them through "existing machinery," which means the Emergency Decree, the Taft-Hartley Act, the Magnusson Act, the McCarran and Smith Acts.

4. Despite the beating of the war drums, the issuance of the Emergency Decree and the efforts of the reformist labor leaders to sell the workers on the war program of Truman and MacArthur, the great mass of workers have not yet "been sold" on the "national emergency." That explains the strikes of railroad, textile, lumber and other workers, the stoppages and other militant actions in the packing, auto and other industries; the hundreds of small strikes that have taken

place and the wage increases won (although not yet received). Clearly, such struggles indicate that a great —though as yet unorganized—peace sentiment is at the bottom of these struggles on economic issues, that the workers are determined not to accept wage freezes issued under the Emergency Decree and that they are beginning in their own way to experience the class role of the government.

Of great significance was the election struggle in the United Auto Workers local at Ford Motor Co. in Detroit, with a membership of 60,000. No longer was the struggle for peace limited to such progressive-led internationals as Fur & Leather, I.L.W.U., U.E. or M.M.S.W.U. The Reuther war program was challenged and his slate of supporters in the Ford Local elections was partially defeated by a rank and file slate with a program that tied up their demands for economic improvements and against undemocratic attacks upon duly elected officials with a clear-cut challenge to the war economy and war program. A summary of their program, taken from one of their own leaflets, says:

1. Immediate removal of all credit and metal restrictions which cause layoffs;
2. 10 percent cut-back in production standards to reduce speed-up. Workers to be in on setting production standards;
3. Immediate lowering of pension age, with voluntary retirement;
4. Fight for a 30-hour week with 40 hours pay;
5. The Union not to permit transfer

<sup>\*</sup> *Financial World*, March 14, 1951.

of any jobs from Rouge which cause layoffs;

6. Elimination of discrimination against Negro workers in hiring and upgrading and

7. Increasing workers' purchasing power (ability to buy cars) through a wage increase, reduction in taxes, roll back prices to pre-Korean level and strict price control. . . .

Immediate cease-fire and withdrawal of all foreign troops from Korea, with mediation;

Continuous meetings of the Big Five (U.S., Britain, Soviet Union, France, People's Republic of China) to settle all questions through peaceful means.

5. Because of the moods of discontent among the rank and file of the trade unionists, as well as the growing difficulties the reformist trade union leaders like Murray, Green, Reuther and Hayes, (President of the International Association of Machinists) faced in fulfilling their role of keeping the workers harnessed to the war program, these top leaders were forced to maneuver. At one point they resigned from the Wage Stabilization Board. Later they resigned from all government boards. Then they called a conference of 700 top labor leaders in Washington, supposedly to organize a struggle against the wage freeze. But true to form, and in accord with their own public declarations of continued support to the war program of Wall Street and Washington, and of the need for the workers accepting a policy of "sacrifice" for the war program, the con-

ference served merely as a platform for some mealy-mouthed double talk by the "top brass." They reaffirmed their readiness at the conference to return to the government war apparatus if some concessions were thrown their way. Already now they are on their way back, although so far they have not yet secured the concessions requested. But these maneuvers by the Social-Democratic and other war-minded reformist leaders of American trade unions cannot for long halt the gathering storm of opposition to the consequences of the war economy and wage freezes upon the workers and their trade unions. *This international day of labor is a day of demonstration against the Wall Street war economy.*

#### STRUGGLE AGAINST WAGE FREEZE—A CENTRAL ISSUE

This situation offers great opportunities for moving masses of workers into struggle to defend their own interests, and to advance the interests of the American people as a whole.

While labor must challenge the effects of the war economy, of inflation, all along the line, it must place in the very center the struggle for higher wages, against the government-imposed wage freeze. Because of the sky-rocketing inflationary prices and a constant lagging of wages behind prices, some workers begin to feel that the wage struggle is "hopeless." The reformist labor leaders make use of such sentiments and

talk about reducing prices rather than demanding wage increases, although they do nothing about struggles against higher prices. They seek thus to divert the workers from the struggle against the employers and war-makers at the point of production.

The issue of higher wages, of breaking through the government wage freeze, can and must become the central economic issue and basis of struggle today, because:

a) Big Business intends through the wage freeze to slash the standard of living and increase the exploitation of the workers—while Big Business gains from inflation;

b) under capitalism the workers must again and again return to the struggle to maintain the wage and living standards, in order to avoid being driven down to a pauper level;

c) failure to place the wage fight in the center of the overall struggle against inflation will weaken the fight on all fronts, since the gap between wages and living costs must under monopoly conditions become ever greater, and unless resisted must result in increasing impoverishment of the workers.

Following this May First, the contracts of many unions expire, while in others, wage reopeners come due. Among these are all maritime unions, United Electrical, Radio & Machine Workers, Mine, Mill and Smelter Workers, International Ladies Garment Workers, Amalgamated Clothing Workers, and others. The progressive-led unions concerned—U.E.,

M.M.S.W. and I.L.W.U. — have all spoken out against the wage freeze and have presented a proper bid for wage increases. U.E. has demanded a wage increase of 32 cents an hour, and M.M.S.W.U. of 30 cents an hour. These unions base their wage demands on the increase in the cost of living plus the greater company profits as a result of greater productivity per man-hour.

Even in those unions where the workers are tied to a contract till next December, as in the steel industry, the situation of the workers demands that they develop a movement to open the contract now. In auto and other industries, where the unions have tied the workers to escalator clauses that limit wage increases to the far-from-adequate three to five cents, it is necessary that wage increases be fought for now over and beyond the escalator limits.

It is in such an atmosphere that Reuther has come forward with his new "labor strategy" of tying the workers' wages to two-way escalator clauses which are based on the B.L.S. index.

In contrast to the traditional attitude of American labor of opposition to escalator clauses, there has been an increase in the number of workers tied to contracts with escalator clauses from 500,000 before the Korean war to 2,000,000 today.

This bait of a special American type of escalator wage clauses, promoted particularly by Reuther and Carey, is the latest form of class col-

laborationism in our country. It is the Social-Democratic contribution to tying the workers more securely to the American war economy.

Consequently, to arouse labor to a struggle against any such development, it is necessary to explain again and again why this Reuther-projected escalator wage clause is against the best interests of American workers. This is so because:

1. The Reuther escalator establishes the principle that the working class cannot improve its standard of living.

2. It results in a steady deterioration of the standards of living, but always under the initial illusion of the opposite. This is due to the fact that it is based on the B.L.S. index which is admittedly doctored, and fails to consider Federal income tax and social-security tax payments as well as practicing improper weighing and selection of goods not typically representative of those consumed by workers. Furthermore, because it ignores the fact that a considerable part of the increase in the cost of living in a war economy is caused by the scarcity of certain essential goods, with resulting black market prices, lowering of the quality of goods, which reduces sharply their durability, etc. These sizable additions to the cost of living are not shown in the B.L.S. index on which the escalator clauses are based. Furthermore, the pittance of an escalator shift is always calculated on the basis of the preceding ninety days, resulting in a constantly growing gap be-

tween wages and the cost of living.

3. Escalator wage clauses, such as in the auto industry, are invariably tied in with long-term contracts, like the five-year contracts Reuther has negotiated with the big auto corporations. Their objective is to prevent strikes and wage struggles while employers roll up their profits.

4. The escalator wage clause in General Motors has an appendage called "an annual improvement factor" amounting to 4 cents an hour wage increase once each year, which Reuther characterizes as "an ever increasing standard of living." Here we see the end result of all the demagogy of this renegade and present-day "bright young man" of American capitalism—an annual wage increase of four cents! And even this measly four cent "annual improvement" increase has not been approved by the W.S.B. and Eric Johnston.

5. Escalator wage clauses as exemplified by the Reuther-negotiated contract with General Motors Co. have actually resulted in a decrease in the rate of wage increases compared with other comparable industries.

Clearly, workers must not be sucked into support of this new "labor strategy" of the Social-Democratic warmongers, Walter Reuther, under the misleading name of an escalator clause. It is calculated to further depress the standard of living of the working class and to deny them the right to strike. The workers must stand firm on the traditional reliance on their organized strength and abil-

ity to struggle.

However, even where such Reuther-type escalator clauses are already in existence, militant trade unionists must be alert not to isolate themselves in their opposition to them, but to work out the most effective tactics to fight for additional wage increases, by demanding a substantial increase in the amount of the "annual improvement factor"; having the trade unions determine the status and changes of the cost of living index in place of the phony B.L.S. index; reopening the contract at brief intervals in order to increase the base rate of wages through the organized strength and struggle of the workers in place of the 4 cent annual improvement factor; changing the basis of the points on which cost of living increases are calculated so as to favor the workers, and agreeing only to upward escalator clauses. Furthermore, it is understandable that where there exist Right-led and progressive-led unions in the shops of the same company, in which the company already has, with the connivance of such reformist trade union leaders, concluded an agreement embodying a Reuther-type escalator clause, there the progressive-led union may under certain conditions find itself unable or too weak to avoid concluding an agreement which also includes an escalator clause. Under such circumstances, however, the employer features of the Reuther-type escalator clause should be resolutely fought against.

#### IMPORTANCE OF THE STRUGGLE AGAINST THE HIGH COST OF LIVING

American workers are not against an upward sliding wage scale (escalator clause), over and above regular substantial wage increases in order to meet the constantly upward-spiraling cost of living. In France and Italy, where the trade unions are under militant class conscious leadership, they fight for such upward-sliding wage scales, based on changes in the cost of living. However, such unions separate the sliding wage scale from regular wage increases, which, based on their organized strength, they continue to demand. Furthermore, these unions themselves determine the extent of the increases in the cost of living; they do not tie this demand to increased speed-up or have an "annual improvement factor," and, above all, they do not agree on long-term contracts. Their sliding wage scale is a means of defending the interests of the workers against the consequences of inflation flowing from a war economy, and not for achieving the opposite.

What the workers in the U.S. are confronted with and must fight against is accommodation to the Reuther-promoted "new labor strategy," based on a two-way escalator wage clause tied to a phony government index, long-term contracts and increased speed-up—all predicated on no increase in the base rate of wages except of 4 cents a year and adver-

tised by these labor lieutenants as guaranteeing for the big corporations a long period of "industrial stability" and "no struggles" for the period of the war economy.

In the period ahead it is no longer possible to fight back effectively against the combination of Big Business and Big Business-dominated government boards, which have the support of the Greens and Murrays, unless there is counterposed to this array of the capitalist class, the *united strength of the rank and file* of the labor movement. Hence, there must be concern and support for the struggles of every *individual* union by the members of *all* unions—whether they are A.F. of L., C.I.O., independent, whether progressive or Right-led.

Anyone of a number of issues might be the spark that could serve to develop a general struggle to break the wage freeze. Such issues may arise in connection with the forthcoming strike of the packinghouse workers which was postponed to May 6; the present strike of the 40,000 Southern textile workers; the railroad workers' continued dissatisfaction; the denial of the annual 4 cent productivity increase to all workers under escalator clauses, etc. Especially pertinent is the discontent among increasing hundreds of thousands of workers who are not receiving in full the wage increases their unions negotiated with the companies.

Of central importance are solidarity movements in support of the wage demands of the workers in U.E.,

M.M.S.W.U., I.L.W.U., all maritime workers and all others who are now making wage demands. The fight on the wage front—for higher wages and to break the wage freeze—must be mounted in all unions, especially among the workers in the Right-led unions. Joint action by workers in various unions in related industries is on the order of the day. While main emphasis and reliance in organizing united labor action should be on the rank and file, this can be reinforced with accompanying bolder united front approaches from union to union. Of considerable significance in this respect was the U.E. appeal to the 700 representatives of the C.I.O. and A.F. of L. who gathered in Washington, D.C. The U.E. appeal appeared as an ad in the *Washington Post* and seemingly is being printed in hundreds of thousands of copies as a leaflet, since it is appearing in many auto, steel and metal shops.

The emphasis on the struggle for increased wages does not lessen the importance of labor organizing broad struggles against rent increases, taxes and speed-up, for defense of the conditions and jobs of the Negro and women workers, and for longer vacations and the shorter work week. Of particular importance is the organizing of effective struggles in shops and communities, against the high cost of living—to effectively roll back prices and establish real price control. Tens of thousands of workers in the Jones and Laughlin steel mills in Alliquippa and Pittsburgh, themselves

engaged in an effective refusal to buy meat until prices were cut. To be effective, such struggles have to cover entire cities or states, involving other strata of the people as well as workers and their wives.

Of particular importance is the organizing of effective mass struggles everywhere, especially in the shops and working class communities against the high cost of living—to effectively roll back prices and establish real price control. This is a central issue that is agitating every worker, irrespective of his understanding on the war question, his allegiance to Right-wing or progressive trade union policies and leaders, or whether he receives or doesn't receive escalator wage increases.

Recently, tens of thousands of workers in the Jones & Laughlin steel mills in Alliquippa and Pittsburgh themselves engaged in stoppages as a protest against the high cost of meat. Demonstrations of workers, involving entire plants, unions or all unionists in a city, would register in Washington. In such demonstrative struggles against the high cost of living, the wives of workers can readily be involved—as can the entire Negro community who are hit doubly, when Jim Crow prices are added to the already upward galloping prices.

#### THE STRUGGLE FOR PEACE

This May First, *the day of proletarian internationalism*, the over-

riding issue is the issue of peace. The possibilities of the workers taking their rightful place in the van of the struggle for peace are maturing. For, it is clear that the fight to defend their living standards will facilitate the exposure of the labor bureaucrats, the agents of the imperialist war makers, their maneuvers and schemes. It will help to bring to the American working class an understanding of the character of the war economy and of the war schemes of Wall Street.

The crisis in the Korean war, the "great debate," the spontaneous grassroots expressions of peace sentiments among the mass of the American people, the dismissal of the Proconsul, MacArthur, all this coupled with the increasing economic burdens of the war drive, make it possible now to move millions into the struggle for peace, for an end to the war in Korea, against the re-armament of Germany, for a Five Power conference to negotiate a peace pact.

The developing mass movement for peace requires that the Communists and progressives seek out every opportunity to unite masses in struggle on every single issue of agreement. It requires that we seek unity of action with workers who are still under the influence of the labor bureaucracy and the Truman Administration.

We must be quick to recognize and resolute to pursue every development which makes it possible to bring masses of workers into action for

peace, even though the demands and actions are limited at the moment and do not yet reflect a full grasp of the fundamental issues. These limited movements and actions are the indispensable curtain raisers to a fuller understanding by the masses of the vital issues at stake.

But this mass understanding cannot come about spontaneously on the basis of the experience of the workers in the economic struggles, important and basic as these struggles are. The Communists and progressives must increasingly and more effectively help the workers to draw the lessons from their economic experiences as well as from the political events, in order to expose the treacherous enemy-class ideology of anti-Sovietism, white-chauvinism and imperialist racism which the bourgeoisie and its lackeys are spreading among the masses.

In conducting this decisive struggle, we must take into account not only the growing realization that war preparations and war mean, not prosperity, but economic ruin for the masses. We must take account also of the growing sentiments for peace and the fear of war that is widespread among the workers and people of our country. The war preparations, civilian defense preparations, drills in schools which are being organized by the warmongers to heighten the war hysteria, at the same time emphasize to the masses the fact that the war that is being prepared means not only destruction of foreign lands and distant peoples, but places in mortal danger the lives of the American peo-

ple and presages the horrible destruction of American cities.

We must at the same time realize fully the need for appealing to the American working class on this international day of labor not only on the basis of immediate self-interest but on the basis of its fundamental interests and its obligations of solidarity with the working class of the world.

Fundamentally, the American working class, if it doesn't stop the warmakers, is threatened with economic ruin, just as the workers of other capitalist countries are threatened with economic ruin.

It is threatened with the horrible destruction of war, just as the peoples in all lands are threatened with atomic devastation.

But the American workers must be helped to see that they are threatened with the worst catastrophe of all—namely, with the national shame of BECOMING PARTNERS IN THE CRIME OF IMPERIALIST WORLD WAR.

On May 1, 1951, the day of international labor solidarity, we have no greater duty than to seek and re-examine avenues of approach whereby this basic question of what threatens our working class becomes generally understood among the masses.

The bourgeoisie and its ideologists in the labor movement have constructed formidable road blocks in the minds of the masses to keep them from this basic understanding.

In the first place they rely on perpetuating the notion that the United

States, unlike Britain or the other colonial powers, is not an imperialist country and is even opposed to "colonialism." In this endeavor the imperialists have also been served by Earl Browder with his theory of "progressive American imperialism," which he claims plays a progressive role as compared with the older colonial powers. These theories are actually the starting point for putting across the colossal fraud of alleged "Soviet aggression"; for if the American workers can be made to believe that there is no such thing as aggressive American imperialism, the task of creating a non-existent "Soviet imperialism" becomes more feasible. If the workers are led to believe that the government of the United States is pursuing a policy of seeking peace, then it becomes feasible for the Social Democrats and other labor misleaders to present the war preparations program as a "Defense Program" and the imperialist invasion of Korea as "a campaign against aggression."

It is therefore not sufficient to develop movements which generally express a desire for peace, for settlement of the war in Korea, and against the consequences of the war economy—as urgent as these tasks are. The scope of these movements and their effectiveness in the fight for peace cannot grow unless an ever larger number of workers learn in the process to break away from the ideology of the bourgeoisie and begin to see the American ruling class in its true role, not only as the enemy of the American working class and

people, but also as the organizer of aggressive military adventures in the world.

But even among those workers, who from their own experiences have learned in some measure the truth of the role of American imperialism and do not believe that it is benevolent and dedicated to world peace and progress, even there, the tremendous barrage of lies and slander against the Soviet Union must be effectively answered. The truth about the character of the Soviet Union, its internal structure as a socialist workers' state, its foreign policy based on the freedom of all nations and the right to freedom of the colonial peoples, and its struggle to maintain peace on the basis of the co-existence of the two systems (socialism and capitalism) must be effectively brought to the attention of these workers.

There can be no effective international solidarity between the American working class and the workers of the world unless the American working class learns to appreciate two fundamental truths about the world in which we live, namely:

1. That while the working class and the people of the United States desire peace and do not want to enslave or dominate the peoples of other countries, the financiers and industrialists of the United States and their government in Washington have precisely the opposite objective. That objective is the preparation and launching of a war of aggression for the purpose of establishing their capitalist rule over the working masses

and nations that have freed themselves from capitalist exploitation, of enslaving the nations that have freed themselves from colonial oppression, of forcibly suppressing the struggles for national liberation on the part of peoples now engaged in such struggles.

2. That the Soviet Union, as a socialist state, has not, and cannot have, any imperialist ambitions to rule other nations, because it is based upon the principle of abolition of exploitation of man by man or nation by nation.

To help the American working class to understand these great truths is to render the highest service to the interests of our class, our nation, and to the cause of international labor solidarity.

In discharging our responsibilities of expressing international working class solidarity, we must recognize a special obligation to our colonial class brothers and to the nations directly oppressed by American imperialism. The working class of the countries of Latin America must receive the greatest support from the American working class.

This is especially urgent now when the mis-leaders of American labor are actually engaged in splitting and undermining the trade union movements of Latin America on behalf of the American imperialists.

The working class and people of Puerto Rico have a special claim to our international working class solidarity and support since they are most directly under the heel of

American imperialism — and are struggling for their national liberation.

Within the boundaries of our country, an oppressed nation, the Negro people in the Black Belt of the South, is fighting for full freedom, while the Negro people everywhere, both North and South, is fighting for full equality, against Jim Crow. Our Party is justly proud of its role in the struggle against the oppression of the Negro people. It has blazed the trail in the struggle for Negro-white unity, without which there can be no successful fight for the interests of the people against the predatory forces in our country. Our Party has pioneered in bringing to the working class the understanding that not only the Negro workers, but the Negro people as a whole, in their struggle for freedom, are a most important and staunch ally of the American working class, and that the future fate of the American working class is closely bound up with the future of the Negro nation.

On this May Day, 1951, we raise our working class banners in salute to the fighting Negro people.

And to the white workers, we proclaim: "You have learned from your own experience in your shop, factory, mine and mill that unity of Negro and white is indispensable in the class struggle, that without such unity there can be no victory.

"You must now lift your eyes to wider horizons:

"See a whole people of 14 million

struggling for freedom, the Negro workers rising to lead the way.

"See the millions and clasp their hand in solidarity as you clasped the hand of your Negro brother on the picket lines. For these millions—workers, sharecroppers, farmers, in the first place, but the whole Negro people, and oppressed nation in the Black Belt—are your most reliable allies in the struggle for Peace, for Democracy, for a better future."

On this May Day the nation and its working people must choose between the reactionary bipartisan war program and the progressive Roosevelt policy of American-Soviet friendship as the basis of world peace. We must choose between a policy of continuing and extending the war in Korea and driving to world war by re-arming Germany and Japan and pushing the war-like Atlantic Pact, or a policy of withdrawing all foreign troops from Korea, seating the Chinese People's Republic in the United Nations, and concluding of a Big Five treaty that would secure world peace. We must choose between the Truman Emergency Decree, the wage freeze, the Taft-Hartley Act with its injunctions, and a free labor movement with an unrestricted right to strike and to fight for higher wages. We must choose between the system of lynch terror for the Negro people and its accompanying Jim Crow in housing, in the schools, in jobs, in industry, even in some unions, or the wiping out of this disgrace in

America, abolishing the Jim-Crow system, adoption of an effective national F.E.P.C., and opening up all job opportunities to Negro workers. We must choose between the Hitler doctrine of outlawing and persecuting the Communist Party as a prelude to smashing the trade unions through the Smith and McCarran Acts, and a resolute struggle in defense of the Bill of Rights. We must choose between being chained to the two old parties who today are both agents of General Electric, General Motors and the other Economic Royalists, and a policy of all labor, peace and anti-fascist forces beginning to organize a third party of labor and the common people.

This is the choice that confronts the nation on this May Day. Labor, which has been in the forefront of every progressive and forward move of our nation—from the fight for independence, the defeat of the Alien and Sedition Laws, the fight for free schools, through support of the Abolitionists and activity in the Civil War and for the Homestead Act—to the recent great war against fascism—must not fail at this critical moment. With clarity on the main issues, a fighting policy and confidence in united action, the workers of our country will go forward on this May Day in the fight for peace, for the defeat of the pro-fascist forces, for full rights for the Negro people, better living standards and stronger militant trade unions.

## Where Is the "Monthly Review" Going?

By Alexander Bittelman

It is two years now since the *Monthly Review*, edited by Leo Huberman and Paul M. Sweezy as "an independent socialist magazine," began publication. During this period, the editors have made known their general programmatic positions, as well as the policies which they favor on the major issues of our time. It is therefore possible to examine the political nature of the magazine and the direction in which it is going. This is obviously a necessary job and one that is long overdue.

Defining their stand in the first issue, the editors proceed from the belief that "... in the long run, socialism will prove the only solution to the increasingly serious economic and social problems that face the United States." Consequently, they are "founding *Monthly Review*, an independent magazine, devoted to analyzing, from a socialist point of view, the most significant trends in domestic and foreign affairs."\*

As is absolutely necessary for editors of a magazine devoted to socialism, they proceed to define their attitude to the Soviet Union thus:

Socialism became a reality with the introduction of the first Five Year Plan in Soviet Russia in 1928; its power to survive was demonstrated by the subsequent economic achievements of the U.S.S.R. during the '30's, and finally, once and for all, in the war against Nazi Germany.\*

The substance of the foregoing, aside from the exact wording, is absolutely true and has become axiomatic for every genuine socialist. But then the editors go on to add the following qualifications:

We find completely unrealistic the view of those who call themselves socialists yet imagine that socialism can be built on an international scale by fighting it where it already exists. This is the road to war, not to socialism. On the other hand, we do not accept the view that the U.S.S.R. is above criticism, simply because it is socialist. We believe in and shall be guided by the principle that the cause of socialism has everything to gain and nothing to lose from a full and frank discussion of shortcomings as well as accomplishments of socialist countries and socialist parties everywhere.\*\*

\* *Ibid.*, pp. 1-2.

\*\* *Ibid.*, p. 2.

\* *Monthly Review*, May, 1949, p. 1.

This significant declaration would seem to open several doors. Some of these may lead in time from genuine sympathy and friendship for the Soviet Union as a socialist state to a true internationalist, Marxist-Leninist position. They should also lead to a policy of united action for peace and for American-Soviet friendship. But the above declaration also opens other doors, which tend in an entirely different direction—in the direction of Social-Democratism, Trotskyism, and Titoism.

For who are those "who call themselves socialists" and want to fight against the Soviet Union? They are the reactionary Social-Democratic leaders, and the fascist crews of Trotskyites and Titoites, who serve the imperialists in the preparation of a new world war, a war against the Soviet Union. The editors themselves seem to recognize this fact when they designate the road of these so-called "socialists" as "the road to war, not socialism." Yet the editors find it possible in the same breath to characterize the views of these fascist war incendiaries merely as "completely unrealistic" and to adopt as the position of the *Monthly Review* the fraudulent and warmongering "criticize Russia" slogan of the imperialists and of their Trotskyite and Titoite agents.

It is impossible any more for an honest and informed socialist not to know that the innocent-looking proposition of the so-called principle or

right to discuss "shortcomings as well as accomplishments" of the Soviet Union links up directly with Wall Street's warmongering incitements "to criticize Russia." The warmongers and their Trotskyite and Titoite agents have made this demand one of their main weapons of intimidation and of ideological war preparation. They use this demand to try to divide the peace camp and to obstruct all movements toward friendship between the American and the Soviet peoples.

As to real and honest criticism of shortcomings, who can do it better, who in fact *is* doing it better, than the peoples, and their leaders, of the Soviet Union itself? Was it a secret to the editors of the *Monthly Review* that criticism and self-criticism is systematically practiced and cultivated in all fields of Soviet life from top to bottom and bottom to top? And if they knew about it, as they were duty bound to know, why did they proclaim this so-called principle of "frank discussion"? Wasn't it, objectively speaking, a concession to the warmongers, to the Trotskyites and Titoites?

#### PROGRAMMATIC AND THEORETICAL POSITIONS

We shall be in a better position to answer this question after examining the programmatic positions, as well as the policies, of the *Monthly Review*.

The first elaborate programmatic

document of the *Monthly Review* is embodied in a long editorial article on "The Communist Manifesto After 100 Years." Following are its main features:

Marx and Engels have transformed socialism from utopia to science. But how? By "systematization," say the editors, by "a careful review, picking out what was sound, dropping what was unsound, integrating into the socialist outlook the most progressive elements of bourgeois philosophy and social science."\* Systematization and integration—is that really all that Marx and Engels did? Have they not *discovered the materialist conception of history and the secret of capitalist production through surplus value*? Engels credits Marx with "these two great discoveries" and he says: "With these discoveries socialism became a science."\*\*

Answering the question of how well the "theoretical framework" of the *Communist Manifesto* stood up after a hundred years, the editors recognize that "On the whole, the Manifesto stood up amazingly well."\*\*\* But in examining its contents, the editors do not discuss the theory of Marxism—dialectical materialism. Why? Are the editors ignorant of it? They discuss *historical materialism*, and apparently accept it, but give no indication that historical materialism is the application

to society of the theory of *dialectical materialism*.

The editors, of course, discuss the contradictions of capitalism; but these are referred to mainly in a quotation from the *Communist Manifesto*. As to the Marxian theory of surplus value, which Engels calls a great discovery and the secret of capitalist production, this the editors do not discuss, even though they examine various points of Marxian economics.

On the Marxian theory of the road to socialism, the editors say that "Much of what Marx and Engels said in the Manifesto about the general character of the socialist revolution has been amply confirmed by the experience of Russia."\* They then take note of the fact that "The socialist revolution has not taken the form of a simultaneous international uprising; rather it has taken, and gives every prospect of continuing to take, the form of a series of national revolutions which differ from one another in many respects."\*\*

Now, at this point, it was incumbent upon the editors to examine the reasons why life has not confirmed the view current among Marxists in the pre-imperialist era, that the victory of socialism in one separate country was impossible and that it would take place simultaneously in all civilized countries. Had the editors done so, they would have had to discuss immediately Lenin's

\* *Monthly Review*, August, 1949, p. 103.

\*\* Engels, *Socialism, Utopian and Scientific*, International Publishers, 1935, p. 53.

\*\*\* *Monthly Review*, August, 1949, p. 119.

\* *Ibid.*, p. 113.

\*\* *Ibid.*

theory of the socialist revolution, which Stalin rightly calls "a new and complete theory."\* But this the editors do not do. They do not examine the question. They do not even mention Lenin's theory of the socialist revolution, without which no Marxist understanding of the present epoch is possible. In fact, they make no mention of Marxism-Leninism, *i.e.*, of the only Marxism of the imperialist era. What is the explanation? Do the editors believe it possible to be Marxists in our time and to oppose Leninism?

There are, of course, large and growing numbers of workers and other working people who are acquiring genuine sympathies for socialism, for the Soviet Union, developing socialist strivings and consciousness, without having learned as yet very much about Marxism and Leninism. This is a well known fact. But the editors of the *Monthly Review* hardly belong to that category.

A most significant, as well as disturbing, feature of this programmatic document is the projection of the possibility of conflicts between socialist states and the reference to the so-called "quarrel between Yugoslavia and the other [!] socialist countries of Europe." We quote:

We cannot yet state as a fact that this new world order [socialism—A. B.] will be one from which international enmity will have vanished, and the quarrel between Yugoslavia and the

other socialist countries of eastern Europe may seem to point to an opposite conclusion. The present status of international relations, however, is so dominated by the division of the world into systems and the preparation of both sides for a possible "final" conflict, and the existence of more than one socialist country is such a recent phenomenon, that we shall do well to reserve judgment on the import of the Yugoslav case.\*

We shall comment later on the misleading and false estimate that "both" sides are preparing for the "final" conflict. Here it is necessary to see that this seemingly "objective" approach to the so-called "Yugoslav case" as a "quarrel between Yugoslavia and the other socialist countries" already contains the elements of Titoism. The editors' doubts whether international enmity will vanish in a socialist world are not only fantastic, but they reflect a background of orientation which, unless checked in time, must lead inevitably into the camp of the imperialist warmongers. For, what informed person does not know that one of Wall Street's dearest hopes and main weapons is to use Titoism, which the warmongers treat as a division "between Communists," in order to weaken the peace movements, to confuse the masses, to obstruct the growth of the camp of peace, democracy and socialism led by the Soviet Union? Consequently, to project the possibility of conflicts be-

\* *History of the C.P.S.U.*, p. 169.

\* *Monthly Review*, August 1949, pp. 113-114.

tween socialist states, a monstrous assumption both theoretically and practically; and to consider that the fascist Tito gang is building socialism in Yugoslavia when it was fully evident even in August 1949 (the date of the *Monthly Review* article under discussion) that the Tito clique was restoring capitalism in Yugoslavia and preparing to sell the country to Wall Street; to do these things is, at least objectively, to help Wall Street use Titoism to prepare the new world war, the war against the Soviet Union.

The subsequent issues of the *Monthly Review* do not show that the editors have freed their thinking of these elements of Titoism.

Answering their own question why the advanced capitalist countries did not fulfill the revolutionary expectations of the *Communist Manifesto*, the editors say:

. . . Imperialism prolonged the life of capitalism in the west and turned what was a revolutionary working class movement (e.g., Germany) or what might have become one (e.g., England) into reformist and collaborationist channels. It intensified the contradictions of capitalism in Russia. And it laid the foundations of a revolutionary movement in the exploited colonial and semi-colonial countries.\*

The following deserves particular attention.

First, the editors maintain absolute silence on Lenin's theory that imperialism is *the highest and last*

*stage of capitalism, the eve of the socialist revolution.* All they take from Lenin is a quotation to the effect that capitalism has grown into a world system of colonial oppression. What about the decay and parasitism of capitalism in its imperialist stage? What about imperialism being dying (not dead but dying) capitalism? These basic and most essential features of imperialism, the substance of Lenin's theory, the editors do not mention. Why?

Secondly, according to the editors, the late nineteenth century was the time when "the new system of imperialism . . . was beginning to be put into operation."\* What does a new "system" of imperialism mean? Is it a stage of *capitalism, the last stage, the eve of the socialist revolution?* And who is it that "puts it in operation"? Here we may be dealing with a mixture of the old opportunist (Kautsky) conception of imperialism as a policy combined with elements of the bourgeois-liberal dreams of a going back to a capitalism, "progressive" capitalism, unconnected with imperialism.

Thirdly, according to the editors, the life of capitalism in the West was not prolonged by the reformists and opportunists who split the working class and actually led in the suppression of the revolutionary working-class movements. They do not speak of the corruption of the labor aristocracy and bureaucracy by imperialism at the expense of the

\* *Ibid.*, p. 117.

\* *Ibid.*, p. 118.

super-exploitation of colonial peoples, and that this was one of the main factors that delayed the socialist revolution in the West. On the contrary, the editors simply say that "imperialism prolonged the life of capitalism in the west," "gave capitalism a new lease on life," and enabled capitalism to make "concessions to the working class."\*

In other words: Lenin's theory says imperialism is the eve of the socialist revolution; the editors say imperialism gave capitalism a new lease on life. Lenin's theory demonstrates the crucial role of the opportunists, basing themselves upon the corrupted labor aristocracy, in obstructing and delaying the socialist revolution; the editors say that imperialism prolonged the life of capitalism in the West by enabling it to make concessions to the working class.

Significantly, this is also the way the editors speak of American imperialism. According to them, American capitalism "offered opportunities for advancement to members of the working class which—at least up until the great depression of the 1930's—were without parallel in the history of capitalism."\*\* Again, it is the working class, not just the aristocracy and bureaucracy of labor. Moreover, what happened to the American working class, *to the process of its absolute and relative impoverishment*, in the period from 1929, the outbreak of the crisis, to 1941, the en-

try of the United States into World War II? To what degree has this accelerated impoverishment driven down working-class average living standards *for the whole of the present century?* Is it not incumbent upon Marxists—and the editors seemingly wish to be Marxists—to examine the process of relative and absolute impoverishment of the American working class through the entire imperialist era? Had they done so, the editors would have discovered that the lot of the *mass* of the working class, not the corrupted aristocracy, has grown worse, not better, absolutely and relatively.

The same is true of the lot of the *masses* of the American people as a whole—the working farmers and particularly the Negro people. The editors say nothing in their programmatic document about the Negro people, its economic position, its movements of national liberation, the meaning of the Negro question in general.

Indirectly, the editors go so far as to say that it was unfortunate that the socialist revolution did not begin in the "most productive and civilized nations." Because of that we are in a "long drawn-out period of intense suffering and bitter conflict." Worse still, according to the editors:

There is even a danger that in the heat of the struggle some of the finest fruits of the bourgeois epoch will be temporarily lost to mankind, instead of being extended and universalized by the spread of the socialist revolu-

\* *Ibid.*, p. 117.

\*\* *Ibid.*, p. 118.

tion. Intellectual freedom and personal security guaranteed by law—to name only the most precious—have been virtually unknown to the peoples who are now blazing the trail to socialism; in the advanced countries, they are seriously jeopardized by the onslaughts of reaction and counter-revolution. No one can say whether they will survive the period of tension and strife through which we are now passing, or whether they will have to be rediscovered and recaptured in a more rational world of the future.\*

This is really a remarkable outpouring from editors of "an independent socialist magazine" who seem to want to be Marxists. What laws in the United States guarantee to the people real and all-round intellectual freedom and not just formal freedom? What laws guarantee economic security? Who actually enjoys these rights? One begins to wonder in what world the editors of the *Monthly Review* live.

Most outrageous is the insinuation that these "finest fruits of the bourgeois epoch" may be lost because the peoples who are now blazing the path to socialism—the peoples of the Soviet Union, the People's Democracies of Europe, the people of China—have not had any extended historic periods of bourgeois democracy. Did it occur to the editors, who seem to be affected a bit by a kind of "western" imperialist chauvinism, that to be capable of blazing a trail to socialism the peoples doing so must

have acquired a pretty keen sense of appreciation of the importance of intellectual freedom and personal security? Is not socialism the *highest* type of democracy, real democracy for the masses of the people as against bourgeois democracy which for the people is purely formal—if that—and is real only for the ruling exploiters of the people?

In the Soviet Union, which is now moving to communism, the highest stage of socialism, intellectual freedom and personal security are not only guaranteed by law but actually enjoyed—in fact, in practice, in every aspect of life—by the masses of the people, by every builder of the communist society. This is the truth. Yet the editors of a "socialist magazine," who claim or want to be Marxists, and who cannot be ignorant of these facts, have the audacity to insinuate that the socialist Soviet Union and the countries in transition to socialism do not enjoy and have no knowledge of such rights as intellectual freedom and personal security.

Intellectual freedom and personal security exist today only in the Soviet Union and are coming to fruition in the new People's Democracies of Europe and in the People's Republic of China. Socialism and the transition to socialism—this is the basis for the flowering and growth of intellectual freedom and personal security in these lands. At the same time, dying and decaying capitalism is dehumanizing and destroying all true cultural values of the past and in this Wall

\* *Ibid.*, p. 120.

Street imperialism leads the procession. As to the "fruits of the bourgeois epoch," whatever is really precious and progressive, socialism raises to a higher level and makes them the property of the masses of the people.

How then can socialists, claiming to be Marxists, entertain fears that intellectual freedom and personal security will be lost in the socialist countries? The impression is therefore inescapable that we are dealing here with an ideological attitude representing a mixture of elements of Social-Democratism with "western" bourgeois-liberal apologetics for "the fruits of the bourgeois epoch." It is an attitude which has the peculiar capacity to forget that fascism, colonial slavery and national oppression, atom-bomb diplomacy and imperialist war are also "fruits of the bourgeois epoch."

Summing up on the nature of the programmatic document of the *Monthly Review* we must note most particularly the following. Even though implicitly, this document seems to draw a clear line of demarcation between itself and Marxism-Leninism. Obviously, this must make the program of the *Monthly Review* un-Marxist and anti-Marxist; for the only Marxism of our time is Marxism-Leninism.

#### CERTAIN ASPECTS OF AMERICAN CAPITALISM

It is necessary to examine certain aspects of American capitalist devel-

opments in this period as treated by the *Monthly Review*. This treatment we find especially in the writing of Paul M. Sweezy, one of the editors and publishers of the magazine.

In the issue of July, 1949, he writes on "Is the Marshall Plan an instrument of peace?" This important question the writer does not answer directly. He says that the "economic subsidies" of the Marshall Plan "would give the old order [in Europe—A.B.] a new lease on life." He says, further, that the Marshall Plan is "the means by which American capitalism seeks to prevent western Europe from solving its own crisis in the only possible way it can solve the crisis, by the adoption of socialism." He reaches the conclusion that "it is hardly accurate to say that the Marshall Plan as such is a threat to peace."\*

This looks pretty much like a defense of, and apology for, the Marshall Plan. For what are the facts? From the very beginning of the Marshall Plan it was clear that it was an instrument of Wall Street imperialism, of the American monopolies, to penetrate and subjugate the economic life of the Marshallized countries, to turn these countries into dependencies of American imperialism and to destroy their national independence, and to build up in these countries *military bases*—naval, air and ground—for a new world war to establish Wall Street's world domination. We say this was absolutely

\* *Ibid.*, July 1949, pp. 82-83.

clear from the outset, and the Communist Party of the U.S.A., among others, said so. But the *Monthly Review*, speaking through Paul M. Sweezy, did not think so. It saw no Wall Street drive to economic, political and military domination of Western Europe. It saw no attempt to turn that part of the world into a Wall Street base for a new world war. It said specifically that it was not accurate to say, as we did, that the Marshall Plan was a threat to peace. All that it saw was a prolongation of capitalism's life in Western Europe.

Events have fully confirmed the correctness of our estimate of the Marshall Plan. They have shown that the estimate of the *Monthly Review* was wrong. Was this wrong estimate of the Marshall Plan just an accidental mistake in judgment? Writings on related matters, mainly by Paul M. Sweezy, show that it was much more than that.

Discussing "Recent Developments in American Capitalism," Paul M. Sweezy does the following two things. He projects the idea that the American capitalist class, as a class, is able to prevent depressions and mass unemployment. He also gives expression to the thought that imperialism, instead of being a stage, the last stage, of capitalism, is a kind of policy used by the capitalists to maintain their system. He writes:

By far the most important thing to understand about American capitalism

is that its power to accumulate capital is much greater than its capacity to make sustained use of additional capital in private profit-making industry. Individual capitalists can do nothing about this; unless they take action as a class, *i.e.*, through the state, the result is bound to be chronic depression and mass unemployment.\*

Paul M. Sweezy refers here to a well known feature of the general crisis of world capitalism, analyzed by Marxist-Leninists at various times. It is, namely, the rapid growth of excess capacity of production, resulting from the acutely sharpening capitalist contradiction between the growth of productive capacity and the shrinking of markets. This contradiction, whose concrete recent manifestations require further examination, has become especially acute in the United States with the accelerated deepening of the general crisis of world capitalism following World War II. But in dealing with this fundamental feature of present-day American capitalism, Mr. Sweezy makes the serious error of *confining* the operation of the contradiction between productive capacity and markets only to "*private* profit-making industry." And from this error follows another, namely, that non-private profit-making industry, meaning state capitalist enterprises, would be free from the operation of this contradiction. This error he spells out by saying that only "as a class *i.e.*,

\* *Ibid.*, May 1949, p. 16.

through the state" can the capitalists prevent chronic depression and mass unemployment. In other words, state capitalism, according to Sweezy, is able to abolish the most fundamental contradiction of capitalism, the contradiction between the social character of production and the private, the capitalist mode of appropriation. State capitalism, it follows from Sweezy, can abolish economic crises and can pull out capitalism from the general crisis of its system.

Now, according to real Marxist analysis — Marxist-Leninist analysis as practiced, developed and taught by Stalin—state capitalist developments, far from mitigating or solving capitalist contradictions, further aggravate them. State capitalist developments intensify to the utmost *monopoly domination* in the economy and politics of a capitalist country. This spells greater exploitation of the masses, greater instability of the economy, growth of political reaction. *It spells growth of fascism and of the war danger*, both of which deepen the general crisis of capitalism and all its contradictions. *By attempting to turn militarized economy and war economy into "normal" aspects of capitalist development, state capitalism is hastening the downfall of the capitalist system instead of solving its contradictions, as would appear from Paul M. Sweezy.*

Accordingly, Mr. Sweezy makes the second error. He writes:

... The capitalists resolutely reject the sweet reason of liberal reform and rely increasingly on imperialism and militarism to maintain the system from which they benefit.\*

Of course, it is clear that militarism is not the same thing as imperialism. Wall Street did indeed resort to a militarized economy, an aspect of militarism, and to war economy in an effort to retard a developing economic crisis and to forestall the outbreak of an economic crash. This is part of Wall Street's drive for world domination and its preparations for a new world war, as well as of its aggressions against Korea and China. But this drive for world domination is not just a policy. It is the essence of imperialism, which again is not just a policy of the capitalist class, but a *stage* of the capitalist system, the highest and *last* stage, whose economic basis is the monopolies.

The analysis of Paul M. Sweezy is definitely anti-Marxist. It is revisionist and strongly influenced by bourgeois New Dealish economic theories and ideas.

Advancing further in this direction, the *Monthly Review* and Paul M. Sweezy have been getting deeper and deeper into the mire of capitalist and revisionist economic theories.

Analyzing "The American Economy and the Threat of War," Sweezy develops the following ideas:

\* *Ibid.*, p. 19.

(a) We have entered a new stage of capitalism—the “fourth stage of capitalism.” This fourth stage of capitalism is also “a new stage of imperialism.”\*

(b) One of the chief features of this “fourth stage of capitalism” and “new stage of imperialism” is that “*American capitalism has at last found its panacea in the creation of a permanent war preparation economy. It is not only the internal contradictions of American capitalism which are resolved by the war-preparation economy. The most baffling problems of the relations among the capitalist states of the world also yield to the same cure.*”\*\*

In plain words, these two pronouncements of Sweezy really amount to saying that American capitalism has discovered the secret of eternal life. What then becomes of the *Monthly Review's* socialism for the United States? Sweezy says that in the war-preparation economy American capitalism has found “its panacea” for abolishing all its contradictions—internal and also external, in the relations to the other imperialist states. And so, there remains only the contradiction between capitalism and socialism. Writes Sweezy:

(c) “. . . one of the crucial distinguishing characteristics of the latest phase of capitalism” is this: “the decisive struggle is no longer between the capitalist powers but between the capitalist world as a whole

and the socialist world as a whole.”\*

Now, it is becoming quite clear what this “fourth stage” of capitalism and “new stage” of imperialism really mean. They constitute an attempt to revive the old and discredited Kautskyan proposition—revisionist, opportunist, anti-Marxist—of a super-imperialist phase of capitalism, which abolishes all inter-imperialist contradictions and organizes the economy and politics of world capitalism. This is, of course, fantastic, in the light of the present world situation in which the world capitalist system is in the deepest and ever deepening *general crisis*. This means the intensification, not the weakening, let alone the disappearance, of the *anarchy* of the capitalist economy and the *sharpening* of the imperialist rivalries and contradictions. Far from softening these contradictions, Wall Street’s expanding domination over the other capitalist countries and the steady capitulation to Wall Street, to American imperialism, of the imperialists and their labor lieutenants in these other capitalist countries (England, France, Italy, etc.), are making these contradictions constantly *more acute*. In addition, great struggles are maturing for national independence in the Marshallized countries against Wall Street domination.

Evidence abounds of the sharpening Anglo-American antagonisms over oil and strategic bases in the Middle East, of continuing differ-

\* *Ibid.*, November 1950, p. 336.

\*\* *Ibid.*, pp. 340-41.

\* *Ibid.*, p. 341.

ences in the Far East, of the failure to settle the question of trade and tariffs (the failure of the Torquay Conference), of the mounting Wall Street pressure to tear the dominions away from the Empire and of the sharp struggle around the Schuman Plan. These are only some of the current issues. The Schuman Plan itself is accentuating the antagonisms between all imperialist powers—Britain and the United States, France and the United States, and between the Big Three and the smaller powers (Belgium, Holland, etc.). Even in the process of European rearmament, antagonisms are coming to the surface on the issue of distribution of raw materials which Wall Street is cornering and using as an additional weapon for subordinating the other capitalist countries. All this illustrates plainly that the growing dominance of the United States in the imperialist camp and the deepening dependence of the Marshallized countries upon Wall Street aggravate the imperialist antagonisms, which become even sharper as a result of the policies of capitulation to Wall Street by the governments of the Marshallized countries.

But Sweezy adds something of his own to the discredited and bankrupt Kautskyan phantasies. He says that in this "fourth stage" of capitalism and "new stage of imperialism," American capitalism has found "the panacea" by which it can resolve its

"internal contradictions."\* Presumably, this includes the class struggle. So, we ask again, what becomes of the *Monthly Review's* socialism for the United States?

Guided by Stalin, Marxist-Leninists everywhere have been emphasizing the major proposition, for a great many years, that with the deepening of the general crisis of capitalism, *capitalism in each country will find it ever more difficult to reach a normal way out of its inevitable cyclical economic crises and will therefore resort more often to war economy and war as a way out.* In other words, a militarized economy in various stages tends to become a more or less "normal" capitalist development to retard the maturing of a crisis or to find a way out, and practically the only way of achieving any significant rise in production. Marxist-Leninists saw in this development further evidence of the deepening general crisis of capitalism. They saw and pointed out, following Stalin's guidance, that turning the militarization of the economy into a "normal" capitalist development, which for a while may retard the maturing and development of an economic crisis or modify the forms and course of its development, *cannot and does not abolish economic crises.* And our own postwar experience in the United States proves that beyond any doubt. Government spending and militarization of economy in 1945-

\* *Ibid.*, p. 340.

48 *did not stop* the beginnings of an economic crisis which developed from October 1948 to about the end of 1949, although they retarded the rate of maturing and development of that crisis. But this retardation was piling up new conditions for a real crash which has thus far been averted only by the rapid shift to a war economy, the opening of Wall Street's aggressions against Korea and China and the intensified preparations for world war.

Thus far the economic crash has been averted. But what is the outlook? Is it, as Sweezy says, that American capitalism has found the "panacea" for the resolution of its internal and external contradictions "in the creation of a permanent war-preparation economy"? Not at all. There can be no such thing as "*a permanent*" war-preparation economy. Militarization of the economy produces a war economy, an economy geared to the preparation and the carrying on of war. Consequently, the following is the outlook. The currently developing war economy in the United States leads to a new world war, *and national disaster*, if the American people, headed by the working class, do not succeed in curbing Wall Street's drive to a new world war. On the other hand, if Wall Street is allowed to continue to build a war economy, piling up arms and munitions, reducing and destroying the people's living standards, curtailing ever more the distribution and mass consumption of

the means of livelihood, spending non-productively hundreds of billions, unleashing a maximum of inflation in all fields of economy, without the actual outbreak of a new world war, then the country will inevitably be faced with a devastating economic crisis. It will be faced with an economic crash of catastrophic proportions, with bankruptcy and economic ruin.

A war economy has its own, the above-stated contradictions, developing on the basis of the fundamental contradictions of capitalism. And these contradictions are turning into sheer phantasy Sweezy's concepts of "a permanent" war-preparation economy as the "panacea" of American capitalism. To give the American people this kind of analysis is to deceive them cruelly. It is to demobilize them in the face of great dangers. It is absolutely incumbent upon every fighter for peace, let alone Socialists, to help the American people clearly to understand, and the working class most particularly, that the only way to escape a new world war and national disaster or a catastrophic economic crash growing out of a war economy without a world war is **TO FIGHT FOR PEACE**. This means to fight against the whole business of war economy and war-preparation economy, for the defense of the people's living standards, for a peace pact of the United States, England, France, the Soviet Union and the Chinese People's Republic. It means to fight to curb Wall Street's

drive to a new world war and to impose upon the government corresponding foreign policies. It means to bring about a world situation in which normal and peaceful trade relations, on the basis of equality, will become possible between the United States and the Soviet Union, the new people's democracies, and the new China.

It should be added, however, that none of these struggles can or will abolish the contradictions of American capitalism. This is not the objective of the struggle for peace, since only the socialist revolution and socialism can abolish these contradictions. The objective of the peace struggle is the maintenance of peace. It is to establish the least painful way for the American people to escape the terrible dangers of national disaster in a world war, or bankruptcy and economic ruin—dangers facing the American people because of Wall Street's war economy and its drive to world domination. Victory in the struggle for peace and against the militarization of the economy will surely spell a historic victory for progress in general and for democracy. Such a victory of the people, headed by the working class, over Wall Street will certainly create conditions most favorable for the advance of the forces of peace, democracy and socialism in the United States, conditions favorable for the subsequent advance to socialism.

As we saw in the foregoing, Mr.

Sweezy's "fourth stage" of capitalism has still another characteristic. It is that "the decisive struggle is no longer between the capitalist powers but between the capitalist world as a whole and the socialist world as a whole." That is wrong, too, and bound to lead to a complete political disorientation. It is wrong, first, because the contradiction between the world of capitalism and the world of socialism has been *the major* world contradiction ever since the rise of the socialist Soviet Union; it is not the product or characteristic just of the present time or "fourth stage." It is wrong, secondly, because the central struggle of the present period, in the present international situation, is not between the world of capitalism and the world of socialism, but between the camp of imperialism, war and fascism, headed by American imperialism, and the camp of peace, democracy, and socialism, headed by the Soviet Union. This does not do away with the major world contradiction of our epoch which underlies and affects all other contradictions. But the relation of world forces in the present period is such that the central struggle on the international arena is between the two camps as stated above.

Moreover, in this decisive international struggle the question of peace occupies the central place. It is the major issue in the world today. And it is on this issue that great alignments are crystallizing nationally and internationally. It is, of course,

no accident that the camp of peace is led by the socialist Soviet Union and the camp of war is led by American imperialism (capitalism). From socialism flows a policy of peace; from imperialism (capitalism) flows a policy of war. From socialism flows a position that war is not inevitable and that the two systems can and should co-exist and compete peacefully; from imperialism flows a position that war is inevitable and that it is dangerous for imperialism to allow the peaceful co-existence and competition of the two systems. That is why the central struggle of this period is between the camp of peace, democracy and socialism, on the one hand, and the camp of war, imperialism and fascism, on the other. Mr. Sweezy's analysis that the decisive struggle is between capitalism and socialism is not only wrong but could easily mislead into accepting Wall Street's explanation that its main fight is "against Communism" and that this is the meaning of the Truman Doctrine and Marshall Plan.

Wall Street fights for world domination and is preparing a world war to achieve that aim. Wall Street makes the Soviet Union its main target because the Soviet Union is the most powerful and consistent opponent of imperialism and war and is leading the camp of peace. In short, the Soviet Union stands in the way of Wall Street's mad ambitions for world rule. Hence, Wall Street is organizing a war against the Soviet

Union and against the entire camp of peace, democracy and socialism, headed by the Soviet Union.

But Mr. Sweezy denies that Wall Street seeks world domination. He writes:

If world conquest is not the real aim of the American ruling class, what is? The answer, I think, is fairly simple: the American ruling class is trying to hold the world capitalist system together and to prevent any further defections from its ranks. This is an aim which corresponds to the realities of the present historical epoch.

And he adds:

. . . The doctrine of preventive war does not arise directly and spontaneously from the interests of American Big Business.\*

With Mr. Sweezy it is either—or: either world conquest or holding the capitalist system together. But it is not so with American imperialism, and it is not so in real life. Wall Street seeks world domination *and* the maintenance of capitalism and imperialism. Wall Street finds that the camp of peace, democracy and socialism, headed by the Soviet Union, is waging a determined and successful fight against its insane ambitions for world rule. Hence, Wall Street is organizing a new world war to remove the obstacles to its imperialist drive. That is why it is bent on a criminal policy of aggression against the Soviet Union, the

\* *Ibid.*, pp. 342-43.

Chinese People's Republic, the People's Democracies of Europe, all colonial liberation movements, against the Communist parties, the world labor and socialist movements. That is why it is directing a fascist-like drive against all forces of peace and democracy. This is the real line-up. This is the real fight.

The totality of Mr. Sweezy's writings in the *Monthly Review*, as discussed in the foregoing, clearly indicates a confused and contradictory position on most major economic and political developments of our time. Moreover, this position is shot through with revisionism, Kautskyism and bourgeois New Dealism. On many crucial problems this position comes very close to apologia for American imperialism. It certainly is so objectively.

#### TACTICS AND POLICIES

Coming to questions of tactics and policies, we find that the *Monthly Review* speaks generally of the tasks of the "Left." This term it uses in different ways. Sometimes the "Left" is considered "as including all classes and strata of the population, which are, either actually or potentially, hostile to monopoly capitalism." Sometimes the "Left" is made to include only political groupings and organizations such as "New Deal Democrats, Progressives, Communists, independent liberals, and non-party socialists," as well as "the trade unions, the Farmers' Union

and the N.A.A.C.P.)\* And "The task of the American Left is nothing less than the conquest of the main center and chief support of world capitalism."\*\*\*

While entertaining bright hopes for the future of the American Left, the *Monthly Review* is quite pessimistic about its present condition or immediate outlook. It does not admit the existence of "any effective leadership on the Left." This sweeping pronouncement, a pronouncement *ex cathedra*, so to speak, is supported by no worthy evidence. No real attempt is made to analyze the tremendously important leading role of the Left and progressive forces in the trade unions, even though they are still minority forces; or the role of the same currents in the progressive movements of the middle classes; or of these forces in the Negro liberation movements—a major factor in American life. Nor is there any serious attempt to estimate the vanguard and pioneering role of the Communist Party—still a small party, to be sure, but undeniably exercising a leading role in significant progressive movements of the American workers and their allies.

The editors seem to be unwilling to take note of these facts. They simply say that "The American Left is in a bad way, and we cannot even say with assurance that the worst is over."\*\*\* We shall see later that this "pessimism" is not just a mood. *It*

\* *Ibid.*, March 1950, p. 336.

\*\* *Ibid.*, p. 334.

\*\*\* *Ibid.*

is a political attitude, and herein lies the danger for the *Monthly Review*.

Now to review the situation as the *Monthly Review* sees it, the editors have initiated a discussion in the March 1950 issue under the heading of "COOPERATION ON THE LEFT." In doing so, the editors formulated the scope and nature of this cooperation as follows:

The most that can be done—though, of course, it is a lot—is to organize an ever-increasing degree of cooperation for common ends—especially the preservation of peace and the defense of civil liberties.\*

At the time, the editors of the *Monthly Review* seemed quite hopeful of the possibility of such cooperation, especially between socialists and liberals, but also between Communists and non-Communists. And had they stuck by this approach of cooperation "for the preservation of peace and defense of civil liberties," the editors might have been instrumental in making a contribution to the major fight for an American people's coalition for peace and democracy. Unfortunately, they did not. They injected into the discussion something entirely different. They said:

We are not so much interested in who should be supported for Congress in 1950 or for President in 1952 as we are in analyzing the reasons why the American Left is weak, why it has stagnated during the period since the war,

why it has not learned to grow and take advantage of the undoubted gaps in the defenses of the American ruling class. When we know the answers to these questions we shall be in a much better position to see the road ahead.\*

The whole thing then became confusing and contradictory. On the one hand, it called for unity of action of all opponents of monopoly for the preservation of peace and the defense of civil liberties. This was good and timely, even though accompanied by a pessimistic outlook. It was a positive step and might have produced certain positive results. But, on the other hand, it injected a discussion on the past and future of the American Left, and made agreement on this discussion the basis and condition of cooperation. It should have been evident to the editors that, if they really wanted to promote cooperation for peace and democracy, they had no business to tie this up with agreement on the past, present and future of the American Left. In doing so, they doomed to failure their own positive role in promoting unity of action for peace and civil liberties, assuming that this was their desire. Moreover, in urging the exclusion from this discussion of such matters as the Congressional elections of 1950 and the Presidential elections of 1952, the *Monthly Review* clearly was urging the abandonment of one of the most important fields of struggle for peace and civil liberties—the field of

\* *Ibid.*, p. 340.

\* *Ibid.*, p. 344.

political and parliamentary struggle—to influence government policy.

Eight months later, in December 1950, the editors summed up the discussion in *Monthly Review* as follows: "the discussion has been useful" but "has not had the kind of success we hoped it would." No wonder. The editors themselves are mainly responsible, for it is they who turned the discussion away from the main basis of cooperation on the Left—the struggle for peace and democracy and the building of a united working-class and people's front for that purpose. They aggravated their mistake by drawing false conclusions. They write:

The American Left, for all its weaknesses and political impotence, still has an enormously important task to perform. It is the trustee of social rationality, of hope for a better future, of the ideas that must eventually be harnessed to the service of the American people as of all mankind. Those of us who were privileged to live and learn in better times have a special responsibility. We must teach and help those among the upcoming youth who are willing to learn and who will be able to take the lead in building a victorious political Left when conditions change again, as they surely will. This is as honorable a task as any, and those who do it well will be remembered with gratitude in the socialist America of the future.\*

Here we have a complete retreat

\* *Ibid.*, December 1950, p. 360.

from the field of struggle for peace and democracy. We have the abandonment and desertion of the working class and the masses of our people in the face of the menace of a new world war and of growing fascism. This is covered up with grandiloquent phrases about socialism as though it were possible for the American working class to advance to socialism without fighting and defeating—fighting today and tomorrow and everyday—Wall Street's drive to war and fascism. The editors of the *Monthly Review* may be able to retreat to their libraries and wait "for better times," but the American working class and the American people cannot do so. They have to fight for better times now. They have to create better times by defeating those who create bad times. They are doing so now, and they will do it ever better until they have won.

But apparently the editors of the *Monthly Review* do not plan to retreat into their libraries altogether. Having dismissed the role of the Left in the present-day struggles as of no account, the editors say this:

The Left's main job now is . . . to build a solid, if small core, of convinced socialists who will be able, when conditions again become favorable, to assume the leadership of a revitalized mass movement.\*

A sort of hot-house leadership, *Monthly Review* brand, that will ap-

\* *Ibid.*, p. 357.

pear on the stage later to take charge of a mass movement that will be "revitalized" by someone as yet not named. Ridiculous, of course. But the editors of the *Monthly Review* take it seriously, and here may lurk certain dangers for the Left.

#### WHERE IS "MONTHLY REVIEW" GOING?

The *Monthly Review* very likely reflects, even though distortedly, certain positive attitudes, tendencies and moods among such circles as teachers, students and professionals. We refer to such attitudes as socialist strivings, sympathies for the Soviet Union, tendencies toward Marxism, appreciation of the importance of the Communist Party for the progressive struggles of the American people, desires for unity of action of all anti-monopoly forces especially for peace and civil liberties, and tendencies of orientation toward the working class.

But the *Monthly Review* also reflects and cultivates entirely different moods, attitudes and tendencies. These are pessimism, lack of confidence in the working class and in the masses of the people, lack of confidence in the vanguard role of the Communist Party. Moreover, the publication very definitely reflects and cultivates a certain imperialist and white chauvinist ideology, petty-bourgeois individualism and strong tendencies to political passivity. It cultivates liberal bourgeois and New Dealish ideas, especially in the eco-

nomic field, combined with revisionism (Browderism), theories of American exceptionalism, Kautskyism, etc. Most serious are the magazine's tendencies of so-called "objectivity" toward the fascist Tito clique which opens the door to Titoism and Trotskyism. The *Monthly Review* also demonstrates strong tendencies of apology for American imperialism, especially in the writings of Paul M. Sweezy.

The claim of the *Monthly Review* to be a socialist magazine standing on Marxist positions, while separating itself from Marxism-Leninism and in fact opposing it, is false. This position of the publication is anti-Marxist and leads to the camp of the enemy—to Social-Democratism and to support of the fascist Tito clique.

Consequently, the net effect of the *Monthly Review* must be considered negative. It is negative from the standpoint of the camp of peace, democracy and socialism in the United States, and even dangerous to it, because the *Monthly Review* propagates pessimism, lack of faith in the working class and in the masses of the people, political passivity, withdrawal from struggle, and the tendency to wait "for better times." It is negative because it tends to keep Left-minded students, teachers and professionals from actively joining in the fight for peace and civil liberties; to keep the Marxist-minded elements in these circles from moving to Marxism-Leninism and to the Communist Party. The im-

pression is left of an orientation to try to build up a cadre and resources for the launching at some future date of an anti-Marxist party moving in the direction of a Titoite set-up, acceptable to, and approved by, Wall Street's State and Justice Departments.

This is the dangerous road travelled by the *Monthly Review* and this is where it is going. The magazine's editors and publishers may still be able to stop and reverse their course. What they must do, immediately and clearly, in order to cease to be a danger and to become a positive factor in the Left and progressive forces of the American people is to get hold of their own statement "Cooperation on the Left" which said that the task of the Left is "to organize an ever increasing degree of cooperation for common ends—especially the preservation of peace and the defense of civil liberties." Get hold of this and stick to it. *Translate it into deeds.* Work and fight for such cooperation together with all like-minded, especially in the Left and progressive movements of the American work-

ing class and the American people, including the Communists. This is the beginning of all beginnings. This and this alone can reverse the present dangerous course of the *Monthly Review* and turn it into a really Left and progressive direction. Failure to do so, or procrastination, will certainly make the *Monthly Review* case hopeless from the standpoint of the Left and progressive forces. It will mark its definite and final emergence as an enemy of Marxism and everything progressive.

On the other hand, a turn to the daily fight for united action for peace and civil liberties may also open for the *Monthly Review* the road of development on the Marxist path, a development toward Marxism-Leninism. At any rate, a basis would then appear for friendly discussion and interchange of views on Marxism-Leninism and its relation to the struggle for peace, democracy and socialism in the United States.

This is the choice facing the *Monthly Review*. There is no other.

# The Stake of the American People In Philippine Independence

By Henry Newman

AS IN THE bloody adventure of 1898 when the Philippines were seized as a "stepping stone" to China, American imperialism is gearing the islands as a key base for aggression against China and Southeast Asia in a third world war. Significantly, Truman coupled the sending of American armed forces to Korea and the Seventh Fleet to Taiwan (Formosa) with an announcement that the Philippines would also receive increased military assistance. Truman's declaration was promptly implemented by the dispatch to the Philippines of a U.S. Military Defense Assistance Program survey team. The recognition of the importance of the Philippines in the development of an aggressive Pacific Pact of which remilitarized Japan becomes the chief gendarme was made clear by Dulles' recent visit to the Philippines directly after negotiations with the Japanese ruling circles for a separate treaty.

The Philippines occupy a strategic position as the southern anchor of the arc of bases formed with Taiwan and Japan. In the reckless strategy

of American imperialism, these bases will enable American sea and air power to cut communications and destroy industry on the mainland of Asia.

Herbert Hoover's reference to the Philippines as a key point in establishing an "impregnable ring" around the U.S. highlighted the importance attached to the islands by both sections of the war camp. This "impregnable ring" is not, however, as advertised, for the defense of the U.S. but for attack against the peoples of Asia. In particular the Philippines are conceived as the key point for the preservation of imperialist control over Southeast Asia, a most prized possession, the loss of which would further powerfully shake world imperialism. Southeast Asia—Indo-China, Siam, Malaya and Indonesia—chief supplier of tin, rubber, and other vital raw materials, are within easy striking distance. Southeast China with its great centers, Canton, Hongkong and other cities is only about 500 miles away. The Philippines are viewed as an "unsinkable aircraft carrier" and stag-

ing a  
troop  
mosa  
Great  
1946,  
Amb.  
missi  
clare

The  
signed  
Philip  
of the  
expect  
stallat  
ing a  
in the  
are to  
to a  
pines  
in ou  
phasi

Th  
ever,  
pines  
ning  
oned  
peop  
Asia,  
movs  
victo  
sapp  
color  
Ever  
that  
the P  
mun  
with  
gath

\* c

ing area for the deployment of U.S. troops much more secure than Formosa or its western counterpart, Great Britain. As far back as July, 1946, Paul V. McNutt, the then U.S. Ambassador and former High Commissioner to the Philippines, declared:

These [Philippine bases] are not designed merely for the protection of the Philippines, *nor even for the defense of the United States*. These bases are expected to be secondary supporting installations for supply, repair, and staging activities for all our armed forces in the Far East. . . . Committed as we are to long-time occupation of Japan, to a strong policy in Asia, *the Philippines are destined to play a major role in our diplomacy in the Orient*. (Emphasis added.)\*

The American imperialists, however, in their plans to use the Philippines as a major war base are beginning to realize that they have reckoned without their host, the Filipino people. As in the rest of Southeast Asia, the rising national liberation movement, inspired by the historic victory of the Chinese people, is sapping the foundations of American colonial power in the Philippines. Events are beginning to make clear that after 400 years of colonial rule, the Filipino people, led by their Communist Party and joined together with world democratic forces, are gathering strength to break for all

time the chains of foreign and domestic oppression.

American imperialism views with unconcealed alarm the mounting groundswell of popular opposition centered around the P.L.A. (People's Liberation Army). Filipino puppets, having at their disposal huge quantities of modern military equipment, have been unable to check the growth of this heroic army, much less to suppress it, after five years of constant "extermination" campaigns.

An article in *The London Times*, after describing the "formidable proportions" of the P.L.A., adds: "Hunger and suffering are now more widespread than in the worst days of the Japanese occupation"; while the June 1950 issue of *Reader's Digest* declares: "The Philippines today are a China in embryo." And further: "Huk morale was never higher."

#### THE HUKBALAHAP

The root causes for the phenomenal growth of the P.L.A. lie in the social conditions matured during and since the war. American imperialism from the very beginning of the war endeavored to curb the growth of popular resistance to the Japanese aggressors—to disturb as little as possible the underlying structure of feudal colonial rule. During the occupation, for the first time since 1898, the democratic forces of the Filipino people were freed from the heavy hand of American control and quickly developed a strong guerrilla

\* *Colliers*, July 6, 1946.

army (then known as the Hukbalahap or Peoples' Anti-Japanese Army) which won effective control of considerable areas on the principal island of Luzon.

At first American officers sought to assume command of the swiftly growing guerrilla army, and to enforce a lie-low, awaitist, "retreat for defense" policy on the Hukbalahap. This failed, and American policy directed by MacArthur shifted to open hostility.

By 1944, other guerrilla units under American control were repeatedly trying to ambush Huk forces, in some cases even cooperating for this purpose with Japanese troops. The Hukbalahap had become a powerful force rooted in the more than one million peasants of the rice basket region of Central Luzon. The Communist Party immediately after Pearl Harbor called upon all democratic elements to unite their forces in resistance to the Japanese aggressors. Party leaders, such as Vicente Lava, Juan Feleo and Luis Taruc played a major part in the building of the Hukbalahap, in defeating all capitulatory tendencies and politically arming the people for the struggle. In the course of 1,100 engagements the Hukbalahap wrested considerable areas from Japanese control, and instituted democratic government.

In March 1945, after the liberation of Manila, though the struggle with the Japanese continued elsewhere, the leaders of the Huk, Luis Taruc and Casto Alejandrino, were

imprisoned by American military authorities. A demonstration of some 50,000 enraged peasants forced their release.

#### SHAM INDEPENDENCE

For the American imperialists the liberation of the Philippines meant simply the restoration of American colonial control and the ouster of a competitor. American imperialism set as its immediate aims the re-establishment of the power of the feudal landlords and the crushing of the Huk forces and the peasant, and especially the labor movement, the main revolutionary force. Prime targets have been the National Peasants Union (P.K.M.) and the Congress of Labor Organizations (C.L.O.). And all this was preparation for sweating super-profits from Filipino labor, using the islands as a base for World War III and their manpower as cannon fodder.

A few trial balloons in 1945 by Paul V. McNutt, then High Commissioner for the Philippines, urging postponement of independence, burst under a barrage of hostile comment. American policy then definitely committed itself to granting formal independence, while using it as a screen behind which to impose greater economic, military and political control. In effect this represented a "cunning counteroffensive" of the imperialists, much the same as the Communist Party of India has described the formal grant of independence to

India  
great  
and  
cans.  
sibili  
power  
woul

THE

Ec  
thro  
in M

1)  
und  
gari

to c  
Phi  
exis

try,  
and  
yiel

dut  
pre  
gre

Ac  
est

the  
be  
up  
di

pe  
19  
Ph  
ve

ph  
19  
Ph  
ve

ph  
19  
Ph  
ve

ph  
19  
Ph  
ve

India. *Independence was to provide greater formal control to the Filipinos and greater real control for Americans. Divested of the formal responsibility for rule, retained American power, operating through puppets, would be all the greater.*

#### THE BELL TRADE ACT

Economic control was realized through the Bell Trade Act, passed in March 1946.

1) The Act continued free trade under which midget Filipino and giant American industry were "free" to compete in each other's markets. Philippine heavy industry is non-existent. Even Philippine light industry, textile, shoe, cigar, etc., is stunted and insignificant. The Philippines yielded the power to impose import duties on American goods and so prevent American dumping. Congressman Bell, sponsor of the Trade Act, admitted that "as a result of the establishment of free trade between the two countries, the Philippines became almost entirely dependent upon United States markets for the disposition of their products."<sup>\*</sup>

2) The Philippines' currency is pegged to the American dollar until 1974. This hinders adjustment to price fluctuations and tends to prevent trade with other countries.

3) Quotas are provided for Philippine exports to the U.S., but none

for U.S. exports to the Philippines. These quotas, according to the Department of State, are to prevent "competition with industries in the United States."<sup>\*\*</sup>

4) The Act required amendment of the Philippine Constitution to grant equal rights (parity) to Americans in the development of Philippine resources. Even Clayton, cotton magnate and then Assistant Secretary of State, in 1946 conceded that this provision would "require from the Philippines more privileges than we would be able to grant to a foreign power."<sup>\*\*\*</sup>

The provisions of the Act make clear that the Philippines are to remain as before a colonial source of raw materials and a market for American consumer goods. Senator Tydings, in a moment of candor at a Congressional hearing, declared that the philosophy of the backers of the Trade Act is "to keep the Philippines economically even though we lose them politically."<sup>\*\*\*\*</sup> Harold Ickes was closer to the truth, stating that under the Trade Act "the sovereignty is that of Wall Street . . . this was the act of a robber baron of the ancient Rhine." The Philippine-American Chamber of Commerce, whose hand-picked roster of about 200 members includes many of America's biggest corporations, took

<sup>\*</sup> Senate, Committee on Finance, Hearing on H.R. 5856, p. 102.

<sup>\*\*</sup> Statement submitted to House Committee on Ways and Means, November 15, 1945.

<sup>\*\*\*</sup> *Ibid.*, October 17, 1945, p. 90.

<sup>\*</sup> House of Representatives, Committee on Ways and Means, Hearing on H.R. 5856, p. 235, December 14, 1945.

the credit for the parity provision.

To help insure the adoption of the Trade Act, payment for \$620 million in war damages and rehabilitation was made expressly conditional on Philippine acceptance of the Trade Act—a naked carrot and club policy.

#### POLITICAL AND MILITARY CONTROL

Simultaneously, the stagehanded election to the presidency of Manuel Roxas, a key wartime collaborator with the Japanese, who owed his political life, if not life itself, to his release and clearance by MacArthur, was pushed through. One of his first services was to suspend duly elected opposition Congressmen on charges of election irregularities so as to assure the necessary majority in the Philippine legislature for passage of the Bell Trade Act. Feudal-compradore elements were placed in key governmental positions. More than half of the Philippine legislature served as collaborators with the Japanese. Recto, Yulo and other key officials of the Japanese occupation government were not only completely exonerated but were later rewarded with public office.

The arch of control was completed in June 1947 with the signing of a "Military Assistance Agreement" requiring the Philippines to grant a rent-free, 99-year lease, some 21 bases and such others as "exigencies" may require. This directly conflicted with the provisions of the Independ-

ence Act under which only naval coaling stations were to be retained. Simultaneously \$50,000,000 worth of U.S. military equipment was transferred to the Philippine Army.

The clearing of Roxas and the arrest of Taruc had its counterpart in the villages, in U.S. Army favoritism to feudal landlords and the use of U.S. artillery and other weapons against protesting peasants in Central Luzon as early as April 1945. Gangs of cutthroats hired by the landlords and outfitted with U.S. arms, however, proved quite unequal to the task of restoring the prewar feudal status quo. With the weapons seized from the Japanese—none had been provided by the American forces—the peasants possessed a measure of defense against the U.S. Army-aided and landlord-directed violence. This task was soon turned over to the national police force, the Philippine Constabulary, which had been supplied with up-to-date American military equipment.

Promises of amnesty and agrarian reform were made to the Huks as a bait to induce surrender of arms. This maneuver proved a dud and an all-out "extermination" campaign was ordered. Strategic direction of Philippine military forces in this operation was exercised by the high-ranking U.S. officers forming the permanent U.S. military mission.

#### THE ECONOMIC DECLINE

The problem facing the military, however, was clearly not only mili-

tary in character. Underlying the rising popular resistance was the deterioration of the economy.

Traditionally the Philippine economy had been geared for the export to the United States of raw materials—sugar, abaca (hemp), coconut and its products, and minerals (chiefly gold and chrome) — and to providing a market for U.S. consumer goods, mainly textiles. So strong was the colonial imprint that considerable rice, a staple in Philippine diet, had to be imported, though adequate arable land was available. Luis Taruc\* has given a classic description of U.S. economic penetration of the Philippines:

The Filipino moves about in an American-made world. The clothes he wears, the cigarettes he smokes, the canned food he eats, the music he hears, the news of the world he reads (and the books and the magazines) are all American, although his own country has the ability to produce all of these things. He eats pineapple canned in California, but he grows it in the Philippines. His country grows millions of coconuts, but he has to buy toilet soap made in New Jersey out of coconut oil. He buys sugar refined in American mills, but grown on his own island of Negros. The very home he lives in (if he lives in the city) is virtually American-made: the corrugated iron roof, the nails in the walls, the electric light bulbs, the electric wiring, the electric switch, the kitchen utensils, the plates and spoons, his

toothbrush, the bed clothes, the ring with which he weds his wife. And finally, of American make are the guns, the tanks, the planes, the artillery, the vehicles and even the uniforms of the troops that have been used to shoot down the Filipino people who would like to see a Filipino-made future for their children.

*I came to realize that all the ideals of American democracy that were preached to us were so much dust thrown in our eyes to conceal the colonial inequalities that we experienced. The only phase of the American way of life that had been put into operation was exploitation which, for us, was much worse than the exploitation of the American worker. . . .\**

During the course of World War II, much of the limited productive resources—sugar mills, mines, work animals, and other property—created during 50 years of American rule were wiped out. The Philippines paid dearly for their position as an outpost of American power in the Pacific. The war damage of over one billion dollars was proportionately far greater than that of any other country in Asia.

In 1949 the Philippines purchased over \$300 million more than they sold. Much of this huge trade deficit resulted from purchases amounting to \$438 million from the U.S., over 90 percent of which consisted of consumer, especially luxury, goods. Symptomatic of the increasing economic instability is the developing

\* Commander of the Philippine Liberation Army.

\* From an unpublished autobiography of Luis Taruc.

currency black market. The peso, though officially pegged by the Trade Act at two to each dollar, is now exchanged at more than four to each dollar, with speculators making huge profits at the expense of the people.

Dominating the Philippines is the god of American capitalism, (though now fallen somewhat from grace) MacArthur, who reluctantly, of course, accepted ownership of Philippine gold and chrome mines, plantations, the largest brewery and hotel, and other assorted real estate. His declaration after thousands of American troops had fought their way ashore at Leyte in 1944, "I have returned," was for once accurate, albeit an understatement. He had in truth returned to "his" Philippines.

#### THE POLITICAL CRISIS

The dry rot sapping the structure of this "republic" created, as official mythology would have it, by American generosity, is also reflected in the gross corruption rampant throughout the government.

Over \$500 million in U.S. surplus property left after the war has disappeared without a trace. Bribery of officials is the order of the day—for avoiding payment of taxes, or any other official favor. The President of the Philippine Senate, Jose Avelino, bluntly expressed the prevailing official viewpoint: "We're not angels! What are we in power for?" That this was no idle boast was proved by an increase in his bank account from

\$3,000 in 1946, before he assumed office, to \$500,000 by April 1948.

The Wall Street organ, *U.S. News & World Report*, describes the level of corruption:

Immigration racket (that is, selling of entrance permits to Chinese at about \$1,500 each), for instance, involves 19 Senators, 83 Representatives and President Quirino's three brothers, according to an official report.\*

Expressive of the official gangster atmosphere are signs in the halls of Congress inviting members to "check firearms."

The feverish amassing of fortunes by the governing clique has as its counterpart the extreme destitution of the mass of the people. Out of a population of less than 20 million, three million are unemployed. This would mean, if applied to the U.S., having some 23 million unemployed, though the figure would actually be higher if allowance is made for the proportionately smaller Philippine working class. The poverty of the people is aggravated by prices and rents inflated seven or more times over prewar, though wages have increased only from two to three times. At present beggars are fixtures in the streets of Manila.

Adding fuel to the fire of mass resentment is the denial of reparations from Japan (only about \$10 million has been paid); the failure to prosecute many Japanese war criminals,

\* The Philippine Congress has a total of 24 Senators and 96 Representatives.

especially the chief one, Hirohito, and the release of the few detained; the sending of Filipino iron and other raw materials to Japan; and, above all, the rearming of Japan. Correspondingly the cutting off, on American orders, of trade with China, established since ancient times, is also a sore spot.

At the last presidential elections in November 1949 Quirino urged his own re-election, declaring, "I know deep in my heart President Truman would prefer me." The spirit of Boss Pendergast no doubt also guided Quirino in counting election returns, such as these from the province of Madalum:

Quirino	6083
Laurel	0
Avelino	0

Even the hardened *New York Times* correspondent Ford Wilkins could not avoid turning up his nose at the stench and reported: "Armed groups snatched ballot boxes in suburban Manila, while others tore up whole batches of completed ballots in front of helpless inspectors and government officials."

Luis Taruc declared in a manifesto:

No one can reasonably entertain the hope that such frauds can yet be redressed through the regular constitutional channels. . . . Filipinos: Follow the path of the Hukbalahap in the armed struggle to overthrow the Qui-

рино administration, puppet of American imperialism.

Events more and more confirm that the mass of the Filipino people are turning toward support of the P.L.A. which has now established itself in all the principal islands of the Philippines. In March 1950 the P.L.A. held for periods of over a week some 30 towns extending from northern to southern Luzon. Wall Street took fright at this show of strength and within a few weeks leading magazines and newspapers demanded that U.S. troops be used to do the job of suppression which the Filipino local police, constabulary and army were proving incapable of accomplishing. Henry Luce led the wolf pack in April 1950 with a *Life* magazine editorial entitled "Let's Do It." At stake, the *New York Times* commented, is "not only the American strategic position in the Western Pacific, but the international standing of American-style governments as fostered here.\*"

A part of the problem of the reactionaries is to explain to the American people why the Filipino people, who are insulated from "Soviet influence" by over 2,000 miles of the Pacific Ocean, and with whom we were joined as allies only five years ago, have overnight succumbed to "Red infiltration." The task of wrapping a "made in Moscow" label on the Philippine progressive movement presents U.S. propagandists with

\* *New York Times* correspondent Tillman Durdin, June 4, 1950.

much greater difficulties than, for example, Korea. This much-worked alibi for aggression is rubbed quite thin when used to curtain off the Filipino people's struggle from American popular view.

### THE MYTH OF U.S. BENEVOLENCE

Now that the Filipino people are setting out on the path of the final struggle with imperialism it becomes necessary more than ever to dispel the illusions created during the past half century regarding U.S. Philippine policy.

*Illusion number one is that the U.S. benevolently acquired the Philippines by defeating Spain in the Spanish-American War and then paying Spain \$20 million as a price.\** This has been poetically formulated by Judge Schurman, member of the first Civil Commission appointed by President McKinley: "Into our reluctant lap destiny has thrust the Philippines. Saul went to seek his father's asses and found a kingdom." The facts are otherwise:

1) The Philippine revolution, begun in 1898, culminated some 35 previous revolts against Spanish rule. By 1898, before the arrival of American forces, the entire country (7 million population) was liberated with the exception of Manila where the Spanish were under siege by the people's forces. A republic was proclaimed in June 1898 and a constitu-

tion modeled on the U.S. constitution adopted.

2) General Otis had assured the 15,000 Filipino forces which had besieged the Spanish forces in Manila, that there would be no aggression. Nevertheless American forces attacked a Filipino detachment. The Filipinos asked for a truce and proposed establishing a neutral zone. General Otis in command replied that the fighting having begun must go on "to the grim end." General Smith instructed his soldiers: "I want no prisoners. I wish you to kill and burn" (all those over ten years of age) and convert the area into "a howling wilderness." General Shafter declared: "*It may be necessary to kill half the population of the islands in order that the remaining half may be lifted from their semi-barbarity to the civilization we are ready to give them.*"

3) The Philippine military forces were finally defeated in a war lasting eight years and requiring 125,000 U.S. soldiers. More than 16,000 Filipino soldiers were killed and over 100,000 civilians died from famine and pestilence. American casualties exceeded 10,000. The war cost the U.S. about \$600,000,000.\*

4) In answer to the proclamation of McKinley annexing the Philippines, Mabini, President of the Filipino cabinet, prophetically declared:

Annexation, whatever be the form

\* Col. William Thaddeus Saxon, *Soldiers in the Philippines.*

\* This purchase price also included Puerto Rico.

adopted, will unite us perpetually to a nation whose manners and customs are distinct from ours, who hate mortally the colored race, and from which we shall not be able to separate ourselves except by means of war.

5) The Anti-Imperialist League formed in 1899 opposed annexation of the Philippines. The League protested against the "spirit of militarism and force," opposed "a permanently large standing army," and declared that annexation was "fraught with danger to the peace of the world." Members of the League included Carl Schurz, Mark Twain, and Samuel Gompers (head of the American Federation of Labor).

Mark Twain concluded as follows a satire called "To the Brother Who Sits in Darkness":

There must be two Americas: one that sets the captive free, and one that takes a once-captive's new freedom away from him, and picks a quarrel with him with nothing to found it on, and then kills him to get his land. . . .

And as for a flag for the Philippine Province, it is easily managed. We can have a special one—our States do it: we can have just our usual flag, with the white stripes painted black and the stars replaced by the skull and crossbones.

A study of the record makes clear that the story of the so-called benevolent acquisition of the Philippines is pure fiction. Then, as now in Korea, the policy was compounded of humbug and force.

## ILLUSION NUMBER TWO

*Illusion number two is that U.S. policy after the acquisition of the Philippines was also benevolent.*

Potentially Philippine industrial resources — iron, coal, water power, non-ferrous metals and arable land—far exceed Japan's. Such industrial development (railways, docks, etc.) as has occurred, however, was solely to facilitate the extraction of raw materials for U.S. use.

As of 1939, less than 4 per cent of the population was engaged in manufacturing industries, and even much of these were handicraft industries providing part-time employment to agricultural workers. Only about one-quarter of the cultivable land was in use and of this practically none in growing cotton or ramie (a textile fiber) and other necessities. In 1939 only 9,000 Filipinos out of 16 million had to pay income tax and less than 3,000 of these had incomes of over \$2,000. The national wage average in 1939 was 30 cents a day and the income of the Filipino family of four (which is the norm) averaged only \$75 a year, about \$20 of which went for excise and other taxes. More than half the people were (and are) illiterate. Perhaps the most indicative fact showing the mass impoverishment entailed by American rule is that 25 of 1900, 80 percent of Philippine farms were operated by their owners, while by 1939 the number had fallen to 49 percent. *The Filipino under American rule was*

*simply converted from a poor man in a poor country to a poorer man in a richer country with most of the benefits of the development going to Wall Street, and the remainder to a clique of Filipino hangers-on and feudal landlords.*

#### THE PHILIPPINE LABOR AND PROGRESSIVE MOVEMENTS

The composition of the Philippine labor movement reflects the feudal-colonial character of the economy. Agricultural workers on the sugar, coconut and abaca plantations are the largest component, over 75 percent. The chief industrial workers are miners and those on the docks and the one railroad. Strenuous efforts have been made by the government to keep the workers company unionized and under the thumb of racketeers. The upsurge of the workers at the end of World War II, however, brought about the organization of a progressive labor center, the Congress of Labor Organizations (C.L.O.) comprising 100,000 workers (both industrial and agricultural) and affiliated to the World Federation of Trade Unions. The struggles of the C.L.O. to raise wages and improve working conditions have challenged the efforts of Wall Street to maintain the super-exploitation of the Filipino workers. The government has answered these organizing efforts by banning strikes and picketing and virtually outlawing the C.L.O., whose

officers have been jailed and in some cases murdered. The strike of the railroad workers last year, for example, was crushed by the use of tanks and other American military equipment. Despite all persecution, the C.L.O. has continued its militant fight for peace, democratic rights and independence.

The National Peasants Union (P.K.M.), comprising some 300,000 peasants, has also played an important part in the fight against American imperialism and its Filipino lackeys. Roxas and his successor Quirino sought to weaken the militancy of the peasants with promises of land reform and also to deprive them of the arms gained in the guerrilla struggle against the Japanese. In practice, government police and military forces, however, connived with the landlords to compel the tenants to accept as before only 30 percent of the crop they produced instead of the 70 percent provided by law. The P.K.M., although officially banned by government decree, has spread its organization more widely among the peasants than it ever did before.

Leadership in the struggle of the workers and peasants has been given by the Communist Party of the Philippines both during the occupation in the organization of the Huk-balahap and today in the fight for peace, to block the use of the Philippines as a base in a third world war.

The program of the Communist Party calls for the people to unite

in sup  
Army  
Peopl  
on th  
peasa  
and  
peria  
the M  
peopl  
publi  
tion  
comp  
lishm  
Th  
cialis  
of th  
toget  
nom  
the  
the  
was  
Com  
worl  
tle-h  
ingl  
broa  
who  
"thi  
Neh  
imp  
liber

BR  
D

A  
Phi  
alis  
de-  
clar  
lea

in support of the People's Liberation Army, for the establishment of a People's Democratic Republic based on the alliance of the workers and peasants, led by the working class and uniting all democratic, anti-imperialist sections of the people. For the Marxist-Leninist vanguard of the people, the People's Democratic Republic is a stage in the historic transition of the people to their final and complete emancipation — the establishment of a Socialist Philippines.

The influence of the October Socialist Revolution and the struggle of the Chinese people in the 1920's together with the onset of the economic crisis in 1929 helped mature the conditions for the founding of the Party in 1930. The Socialist Party was subsequently merged with the Communist Party leaving it the sole working-class party. The Party, battle-hardened in struggle, is increasingly winning the confidence of the broad masses of the Filipino people who are rejecting the illusion that any "third," reformist path—the path of a Nehru, the path of capitulation to imperialism—exists to their national liberation.

#### BROWDER'S DE-COLONIZATION THEORY

American imperialism's role in the Philippines helps clarify the imperialist swindle contained in Browder's de-colonization theory. Browder declared that America must take the lead in getting England, France, etc.,

to grant "independence" to the colonial peoples. He urged:

Since the ultimate concession of national independence to the Asiatic peoples is inevitable why not make that concession now. . . . What are the economic factors which make it impossible for the United States to accept a policy of reconstitution of the old colonial empire system in Asia? The chief consideration is that America, with by far the strongest capitalist economy in the world, must have enormous postwar markets for its products, for which Asia provides the chief potential. . . . In Indo-China, Malaya, Burma and Indonesia the basic problem is overlaid with the vested interests of French, Dutch and British colonialism. It is obvious that America will not and cannot carry through the Pacific war to victory merely to establish that old, corrupt and thoroughly decayed system.\*

It is also obvious that Browder tried to whitewash American imperialism as non-colonial and that the content of his proposals is: (1) formal independence must be granted the colonial peoples, and (2) America must penetrate the colonies of its rivals to secure needed markets and cannot therefore accept their "old" type closed "empire system."

It is significant that in this entire chapter entitled "National Liberation in Asia" Browder does not even once refer to the Philippines! Evidently nothing on the score required his attention as the U.S. had prom-

\* *Teheran, Our Path in War and Peace*, p. 46 et seq.

ised to grant the Philippines formal independence and already dominated its markets.

Browder's theory of American capitalism as non-colonial sought to induce the colonial peoples (as well as those of England, France, etc.) to accept Wall Street control without a struggle and to deprive them of the support of the American working class. The struggles of the peoples of Asia, especially the heroic Chinese people have, however, made short shrift of American imperialism's hope of peaceful conquest and forced it to more openly show its aggressive fangs and its fundamental weakness.

#### SUMMARY AND PERSPECTIVE

The history of American policy in the Philippines makes clear that it differs from that of other colonial powers only in the degree of its petty concessions and democratic pretensions. Phrases about self-government and independence are used only to enable the imperialists to fool the American people and their Filipino agents to continue to serve U.S. imperialism. The anti-colonial actions of the American people and the nationalist struggles of the Filipino people made necessary concealed forms of colonial rule.

In 1898, the U.S. took over from Spain's failing hands the job of executioner of the Filipino people's democratic revolution. Again in 1945 the Filipino people's war against Japan ended without a people's victory. Yet

in truth, from 1898 on the struggle of the Filipino people never ended, but was only interrupted. In the words of Luis Taruc:

Our revolution of 1896 had been an unfinished revolution, interrupted in its course by the tyranny of American imperialism and by the betrayal of Filipino moneyed, propertied elements. For fifty years that interruption had persisted, and now the struggle was being renewed. Our national liberation movement of today is a continuation of that which had been crushed at the turn of the century. There is one difference, however: moneyed and propertied elements today are not in the decisive leadership of the movement. The leadership is composed of working class elements. We have invited and urged the participation of all anti-imperialist groups to fight side by side with us and to share in the victory of a free Philippines, but we know that only the working class can carry the struggle to complete victory.\*

The Filipino people have had to drain to the bottom the bitter dregs of national humiliation in being forced by their own oppressor to send Filipino soldiers to their death in a vain effort to re-enslave the Korean people. The American headquarters did not even deign to permit the Filipino unit to retain its own Filipino commander. Though only a token force, it was worth many divisions to the American imperialists in their effort to dress up an old-style colonial

\* From the unpublished autobiography of Luis Taruc.

war in the raiments of the United Nations as a war of all democratic peoples. Quirino, fearing his own people, put up a show of opposition to sending troops but soon yielded. The Filipino people are able to see clearly that the lackey Quirino is leading them to catastrophe. They will intensify their struggle for peace and to block the use of their homeland as a base in a third world war.

The Philippines are rapidly ceasing to be a reserve of American imperialism and are becoming an advance post of the liberation struggles of the peoples of Asia. The inability of American imperialism, though long entrenched in the relatively small Philippines, to suppress the rising liberation struggle, is a clear portent that the American colossus has feet of clay. The Filipino people are losing their fear of warmongers "who are invincible in peace and invisible in war" (Lincoln). The Filipino working class, peasantry and all anti-imperialist elements, led by the Communist Party, inspired by the mighty achievements of the Socialist Soviet Union, and aided by world democratic forces, especially China, will, despite all obstacles, establish the Filipino People's Republic and move toward Socialism.

More and more the struggles of the Filipino and American people for peace and progress merge. Each blow of the Filipino people against U.S. imperialism strengthens the American people and the entire democratic camp.

Reaction plans, in the name of peace, freedom and democracy, to use American troops to oppose the Filipino people's liberation struggle and to expend American blood and resources in spreading further the flames of war. Efforts to make this program palatable as a guns *and* butter program cannot conceal the fact that this, unless checked by the action of the people, is only a way station to guns *without* butter with the burdens of high prices, ruinous taxes and speedup and the end result, fascism, and a third world war, falling on the American working people.

The American and Filipino workers face common enemies. The same Wall Street monopolies (General Foods Corporation, National City Bank, etc.) who squeeze super-profits from doubly exploited Philippine labor seek to force American labor to work for the same low wages paid their Filipino brothers. Wage standards and other conditions here will continue to be threatened so long as the employers can pay lower and, in fact, starvation wages in colonies.

Gus Hall in his report to the 15th Party Convention self-critically stated:

Of special significance are the heroic liberation struggles of the Philippine people, who for many years have been trying to throw off the rule of Wall Street and MacArthur, without, we must say, too much support from the working class of the United States.\*

\* Gus Hall, *Peace Can Be Won*, New Century Publishers, New York, 1951, p. 18.

In the spirit of the Party Convention, this remissness must be quickly overcome.

In the fight to maintain and extend democracy, the American working class allied with the Negro people, and led by the Communist Party, must lift and raise higher the banner of anti-colonialism formerly borne by the bourgeois democrats of 1898. Lacking working-class leadership and not attacking the trusts, that movement was foredoomed to defeat.

The Party must help clarify for the American working class that American capitalism is not anti-colonial or non-colonial but the capital of the world slave system, boss over the weakened empires of its rivals. Particularly is this necessary as to the Philippines. Bringing home the truth—the unjust war of 1898, seizing the Philippines and their continued actual retention despite formal independence—will remove an important obstacle to popular understanding that overall American policy is now completely reactionary and contains no progressive elements. Comrade Dennis in his farewell address on the

eve of his imprisonment referred to “the struggle to realize proletarian internationalism” and declared:

We have a special obligation to the subject people of Puerto Rico, the direct colony of Wall Street imperialism, and to the millions of workers and peasants of the Philippines, to the valiant Huk-balahaps, Communists and non-Communists who are fighting with arms in their hands for their national independence and freedom.

This struggle of the Filipino people for an end to the 50-year-old American occupation of their homeland, like the struggle of the Chinese and Korean peoples against aggression, strengthens the forces of peace.

The American working class, the Negro people, and all democratic elements must demand:

**WITHDRAW ALL U.S. TROOPS FROM THE PHILIPPINES!**

**REPEAL THE BELL TRADE ACT!**

**NO AID FOR THE PUPPET QUIRINO REGIME!**

**SUPPORT THE FILIPINO PEOPLE'S LIBERATION STRUGGLE!**

By

On  
it is  
of p  
are  
ness  
ered  
The  
Fram  
mon  
hatr  
year  
agai  
not  
agai  
over  
ern  
our  
in I  
nal  
O  
they  
and  
ing  
ern  
road  
I  
—  
\*  
gress  
April  
Part  
Cha  
week

# The Defense of French Agriculture and of the Working Farm Population\*

By Waldeck Rochet

ON OUR FARMS as well as in our cities, it is the threat of war and the policy of preparation for a new war that are the basis of the general uneasiness and of the difficulties encountered by our farm population.

The working farm population of France, together with all the common people, have always had a holy hatred of war. Nevertheless, five years after the liberation, there is again talk of war. As if France has not bled enough in its death struggle against Hitler, they are considering over again the rearmament of Western Germany, while for three years our young people have been dying in Indo-China in an unjust and criminal war.

Our farmers are troubled because they find that their present difficulties and their material conditions are being aggravated, as our unworthy government pushes our country on the road of war preparation.

In fact, as is known, since 1947 our

government's farm policy as well as our economic and financial policies have been entirely subordinated to the Marshall Plan and the Atlantic Pact objectives, that is, to a policy of preparing for war.

## CAUSES OF THE AGRICULTURAL CRISIS

We insist, the agricultural crisis is not caused by just bad luck, but is due basically to the capitalist system. The policy of subservency to American imperialism has resulted in speeding and aggravating this process.

What are actually the basic reasons for the agricultural crisis?

- 1) The workers' decreased purchasing power resulted in narrowing the domestic market.
- 2) The excessive imports imposed under the Marshall Plan.
- 3) The loss of some foreign markets which we had before the war and which now have been taken over by the Americans.
- 4) Heavy taxes and the high cost of living.

\* Selections from a Report to the 12th Congress of the Communist Party of France, held in April 1950. Waldeck Rochet, a member of the Party's Central Committee and a member of the Chamber of Deputies, is editor of the French weekly publication for farmers, *La Terre*.

While the low purchasing power of the workers is the primary reason for the agricultural crisis, the heavy foreign imports which continue to pour in under the provisions of the Marshall Plan are not a negligible factor.

Actually, for the last two and a half years, our government, acting under American pressure, has systematically used imports to maintain prices received by farmers at a lower level than industrial prices.

During the years 1948 and 1949, large quantities of concentrated and powdered milk, cheese and eggs, tobacco and other farm products, were imported. While the wine crop in France and in Algeria was enough to cover our needs during August, September and October, 1949, in other words, in three months only, almost 100 million quarters of wine were imported from Portugal, Italy, Greece, Chile, Spain and Yugoslavia, and now they are promoting "coca-cola" with all-out efforts.

The primary American objective is to organize Western Europe in preparation for a war against the Soviet Union, but within the outline of this program of war preparation the United States wants to secure markets that could be controlled by them and in which they could dump their surpluses.

In short, the Marshall Plan and the Atlantic Pact resulted in sacrificing everything to war preparation.

For instance, nine-tenths of the

applications by young farmers desiring to settle on the land, for low interest loans, have been refused for lack of credits. Subsidies for farm home improvements were cut off for the same reason. More and more, credits to finance old farm laborers are refused.

More than 600,000 farm families have no electricity because no credits are available for rural electrification. For 1950, credits going to agriculture, including investment credits, amount to less than three per cent of the budget, while credits for the war in Indo-China and war preparations against the Soviet Union amount to 30 per cent of the budget.

But this also means that agricultural rehabilitation is impossible without a complete change of government policies, without regaining our national independence, without a real peace policy.

That is why there is no other program of salvation than that offered by our Communist Party, the first point of which is the denunciation of the Marshall Plan and of the Atlantic Pact for war preparation.

#### WHO ARE THE EXPROPRIATORS?

To impose their ruinous war-preparation policy, the anti-Communist parties do everything they can to chloroform the farm masses.

They shout about the so-called Communist peril.

Accustomed to lies and slander,

this is the kind of language they use when they speak to the farmers:

Do as we tell you, accept the sacrifices that we demand from you, because if you will not accept them, the Communists will take over and they will take everything from you.

Are Communists the enemies of farm ownership?

The facts covering a long span of time show that it is the capitalists and big landowners who are reducing the working farmers to slavery, who are working toward their expropriation.

And here is the proof:

Our country had 5,705,000 farms in 1892. In 1929, 37 years later, there were only 3,942,000 small farms or 1,760,000 less. And the 1946 census shows the disappearance of 879,000 small farms, as compared with the figures of 1929.

Who expropriated these small farmers? Was it the Communists, who were never in power?

Evidently not. It is the big ones who ate the small ones.

It is only by abolishing capitalism that we could put an end to capitalist crises, with unemployment for the workers, bad prices and falling markets for the farmers.

Capitalism is the regime under which wheat is burned when families are hungry, and vines are torn out when workers cannot have wine on the table.

It is the regime of privation without abundance.

Capitalism is also the regime under which every ten or twenty years millions of men are killed in wars always more murderous, always more destructive. This permanent danger of war makes the disappearance of capitalism and the appearance of Socialism a question of salvation, a question of life and death for the whole of humanity.

While not believing the fairy tales that the capitalists have been telling for thirty years, numerous farmers are wondering what the Communists would do if they came to power.

You want to know what we will do?

It is very simple: We will put into effect a true land reform aiming at giving the land to those who work it.

#### "LAND FOR THOSE WHO WORK IT"

Here is our program:

1. *Expropriation without compensation of all the arable or fallow land of the idle big landowners, as well as of the buildings and livestock on these lands.*

It is entirely just that our land program should stress the fact that expropriation applied to the big idle landowners, to the gentlemen farmers, to the manor lords and to industrialists who have never worked the land themselves, is only a restitution of the land to those who work it.

This restitution is as legitimate as the suppression of the privileges of

the old nobility, and should not be compensated.

2. *Expropriation with compensation of the other lands owned by landlords who do not work them themselves.*

We refer to small and medium landowners, who have another occupation than farming, such as businessmen, physicians, or government workers who rent out the land inherited from their parents.

We are also concerned here with retired farmers who, in order to live, have to rent their land. If we consider that the new set up would assure to all the old farmers a reasonable pension, we see that the small and middle landowners of which we spoke would benefit in their old age and that they would have better moral and material conditions than they have now.

3. *Absolute ownership by small farmers of the land they work for themselves and their heirs.*

Thus, all the owners working their land with the help of their family would be assured in the ownership and use of the land, not only for themselves but also for their children.

4. *Transfer of expropriated land and its buildings to small tenants, sharecroppers, farm laborers and small landowners with insufficient land for efficient operation.*

By this measure, for the first time in their lives, a million tenants and sharecroppers, and as many farm la-

borers, would become owners of the land they work.

Thus, the farm laborers will be through with starvation wages, unemployment during winter season, and everything that today makes them pariahs in our society. The sharecroppers would be through with sharing half or two-thirds of their harvest with the renter. The small and middle farmers would be through with the heavy rent and the threat of eviction when they are not able to pay the same. And great numbers of small farmers who subsist on seven to ten acres would see their holdings increased through the distribution of land.

5. *Prohibition of the sale of land, in order to keep it in the hands of those who work it and to prevent it from going back to speculators and capitalists.*

The working farmers' own interest, once agricultural reform is realized, should make them renounce the right to buy and sell land. If that right were maintained, in other words if the land continued to be a commodity, the richest people, including the expropriated gentlemen farmers and capitalists could grab the land of the small farmers who are in difficulty. Once more we would have in the countryside a class of exploiters. The prohibition of the sale of the land prevents this danger.

6. *Government help for the development of farm production and improvement of living conditions on the farm.*

The use of machinery and the complete electrification of the countryside, the modernization of cultivation and breeding, the intensive use of fertilizer and seed selection, the increase of experimental stations and agricultural schools, the redistribution of land and the farm reform program are some of the factors that would permit a tremendous increase in agricultural production and the improvement of the standard of living of the farm population.

7. *All out financial support of farm cooperatives, including production cooperatives, which by developing on the basis of voluntary agreement of the working farmers will open the way toward modern Socialist agriculture.*

That is what the Communists will do when they will be in power.

The great majority of French working farmers have much to gain from the application of this program which would bring into being the great dream of every farmer—secure tenure on his land.

#### THE FIGHT FOR PEACE

But in addition to having a land program, we must work out a policy whereby the working farmers can defend their living standards today, and escape bankruptcy and the horrors of war. On the eve of the great October Revolution, when Russia's millions of peasants were demanding land and peace, Lenin showed that the way to victory was in the unity of

workers and peasants against capitalists:

"Have confidence in workers, comrade peasants," said Lenin.

"Renounce your ties with the capitalists."

Our farmers must understand that the safeguarding of peace and liberty depends primarily on the action of the people and on their own, the farmers' action.

In recent peace polls, the farmers have voted en masse for peace. Many villages voted 85 per cent and some voted up to 100 per cent for these petitions. However we also have a serious underestimation of the war danger on the part of Party organizations in the farm area.

Some community peace committees exist in a certain number of villages in France, but there are too few of them. For instance, in the Cotes-du-Nord there are 250 cells of the Party, but there are only 30 community peace councils in the rural area. In Saone-et-Loire there are 200 rural cells and only six or seven peace committees.

The fact that there is no peace committee or community council in a place where there is a Party cell shows that the fight for peace has not been considered as a principal task.

And if we have that result it is because, nine times out of ten, nothing has been attempted, no serious effort has been undertaken to unite all the population who want peace around a community council or a

defense committee for peace.

In fact, our cells are too isolated from the population and sometimes they falsely think that there is nothing to do.

It is this that is dangerous.

As long as a rural cell is not able to help to create and keep alive a community council for peace, it must be considered that it does not know how to apply the policy of the Party.

No rural community without a peace council, no township without its peace committee—such must be the objective.

#### THE FIGHT FOR THE DEMANDS OF THE WORKING FARMER

But the fight against war should not make us neglect the fight for our farm demands.

In the last year the government attempted numerous evictions of farmers who could not pay their taxes, or of tenants and sharecroppers. In almost all cases these evictions were defeated by the action of the masses.

For instance, in Torsac, Charente, despite a strong police force, the farmers came 1,500 strong to prevent the eviction of a small farmer. There were 2,000 of them at Saint-Remy-de-Provence, Bouches-du-Rhone; 1,000 at Plestin-les Greves, Cotes-du-Nord; 3,000 at Saint-Jouvent, Haute-Vienne; 1,200 at Montflanquin, Lot-et-Garonne; 2,000 at Segonzac, Charente; 1,500 at Court-Cheverny, Loir-

et-Cher; 700 at Joncere, Haute-Vienne; and lastly, standing in the vanguard of all of them, it was the Landes farmers who fought day and night for six weeks against large police forces to reinstate sharecropper Darracq who had been evicted from his farm by the Special Police.

The protest movement would have taken much greater proportions if the reactionary leaders of the General Confederation of Agriculture (C.G.A.) had not put the brakes on and if, on the other hand, our comrades had resolutely put themselves at the head of the farm masses.

Lenin and Stalin have taught us that the proletariat and its Party can look to farm wage workers as its main base in the countryside. But we must also win the support of semi-proletarians, that is the part-time farmers who also get jobs away from the farm and also the great mass of small farmers. We can hope for a benevolent neutrality from the middle-sized farmers if we support their fight against big farmer and capitalist domination.

Experience shows that the large capitalist and gentlemen farmers are violently hostile to all the democratic workers' demands. They are the principal supporters of the reactionary parties. It is not just chance that we see the richest farmers putting their chateaux at the disposal of DeGaulle when he travels about the country.

We have many times noted that militant farmers, members of the

Party,  
union  
selves  
hesita  
might  
reacti  
the o

The  
way  
tion  
move  
energ  
and  
neuv  
ers.

Th  
ism  
hand  
are i  
ous  
deno  
the  
tion  
simp  
farm  
talis

T  
mus  
tena  
tion  
fens  
best  
acti  
cret  
mar  
for  
inte  
the  
pre

Party, who hold offices in farm unions, are too anxious to make themselves tolerated by the enemy. They hesitate to ask any question that might offend the big farmers and the reactionary elements who belong to the organization.

These militants forget that the only way to keep and reinforce the position of the Party within the peasant movement is to defend loyally and energetically the peasant demands and interests and to oppose the maneuvers of the reactionary big farmers.

These manifestations of opportunism are accompanied, on the other hand, by sectarian manifestations that are just as dangerous. Thus, numerous members of the Party have a tendency to abandon farm unions under the pretext that they include reactionary elements. By so doing, they simply abandon the small and middle farmers to the influence of the capitalist big farmer.

The farm members of our Party must be within the farm unions, the tenants and sharecropper organizations, the farm cooperatives and defense committees. They must be the best and most devoted and the most active, always ready to make concrete proposals that will rally the mass of small and middle farmers for the defense of their demands and for peace, by showing them in an intelligent manner the link between their present difficulties and the war preparation policies.

#### RURAL ACTIVITY OF THE PARTY

Of course, the support that a Communist must give to the development of the Partisans for Peace movement should not lead to the neglect of his other political tasks.

We must answer the enemies' lies, popularize our Party policies, the actions of its elected officials and its militants, and the inspiring successes of the Soviet Union.

Most of our rural cells do not understand that our farm weekly, *La Terre*, is not only an organ of information and education for the farm masses, but also the organizer of mass action in the farm area; that consequently its distribution and the collection of subscriptions is for every cell an essential political task.

Furthermore, our rural cells do not interest themselves sufficiently in the daily preoccupation of the farm masses.

Some of them have even a tendency to turn their back to all questions. If it is the defense of farm demands, they say it is the job of the farm union. If it is a question that has to do with rural roads, or drinking water for the community, they say it is the job of the municipal authorities. If it is a job for peace, they wait for the "fighter for peace" to do something about it.

Everything that preoccupies the population is not only the job of some particular organization in which the Communists must be the most active,

but is also the job of the Party, the job of the rural cell.

We must understand that the working farmer will be convinced that our Communist Party is not like the others—merely a party of electoral propaganda—but a party of action that defends them only if the Communists are everywhere and on all occasions on their side; if the Communists show themselves as the best defenders of the interests of the population and of peace.

What are the causes of such weaknesses?

The principal ones reside in the fact that numerous comrades do not have a clear appreciation of the situation; that they underestimate the problem of war and peace, that they let themselves be impressed by the propaganda of the enemy, that they do not see the tremendous possibilities that are before us and isolate themselves from the masses. In other words, that they do not fight for the application of the political line of the Party.

Numerous officials of the Party are not truly convinced of the importance of work in the farm areas. They behave as if the farm question were a secondary question that interests only certain comrades, the specialists. They do not do what is necessary to help in a concrete manner the organization of the Party in the farm area. They do not care sufficiently to help in the formation of good farm cadres, capable of being at the head of the farm masses.

In fact, they do not consider that work in the farm area is the job of the whole Party, and that here as in all other fields the leading role of the working class must be asserted.

They forget the words of Maurice Thorez, who, in his closing speech at the Montreuil National Convention, April 9, 1949, stated:

What differentiates us on this point from socialist leaders is that they deny any possibility of revolutionary action by the farm population, whereas we believe that the great majority of farmers, in their own interest, can and must be won over to the cause of Socialism and must come into an alliance with the working class.

Our Party is marching toward and preparing for power.

It has just policies, aiming resolutely at the alliance of the working class and the working farm population in the fight for national independence, for peace, for Socialism.

Considerable progress has been made. Our Party, the Party of the working class, has now a solid position in the farm areas of France. Hundreds of thousands of working peasants today have confidence in our Party.

Hundreds of thousands of others who are looking for a way out can be won over to the great cause for which we are fighting.

We have now in the rural areas devoted, militant farmers who are fighting at the head of farm masses, alongside of the working class.

Among the numerous testimonials, here are some excerpts from a magnificent letter written to Maurice Thorez by six farmers from Landes who were jailed at Pau because they took action during the eviction of the sharecropper Darracq:

Dear Maurice:

We are here, all the six of us, the first farmers arrested on the front of liberty. We are proud to show to our comrade workers that farmers also know how to fight for their bread, for their right to work. We know that if we are jailed it is not six other farmers that take our place, but tens, hundreds and thousands of farmers whose eyes are opening and who will come to join us in the great fight of the peoples of the world against imperialism, which is crushing them and pushing them to war.

And:

Dear Maurice:

Not all of us here are Communists, but we join, all of us together, to bring to the great French Communist Party in the person of the General Secretary the fraternal and confident greeting of those who fight in the field

to assure to all the people of the earth singing tomorrows.

Since then, popular action, the action of the Landes farmers, has succeeded in forcing the liberation of these six exemplary militants. This shows that they were not wrong when they said that hundreds, that thousands of working farmers were ready to stand up and take their place. This shows also that our Party, solidly rooted in the farm area, has become a great party of the people of France.

However, we must do a lot more to keep pace with the heightened events.

So let us turn boldly toward the farm areas, let us resolutely put ourselves at the head of the farm masses, to lead them in the great battle for peace and thus, loyal to the teachings of Marx, Lenin and Stalin, we will make of our Party, under Maurice Thorez's leadership, an ever greater force in our farm area. We will realize the fighting alliance of the working class and the working farm population. We will win the working farmers for national independence, for peace, for Socialism.

# Wages in the Society of Socialist Construction\*

By Istvan Friss

TOGETHER WITH THE transformation of the economic bases of our society, our wage system, too, changes, is being transformed as a matter of course. Here, as in so many other fields, the transformation proceeds gradually and at an unequal pace. Thus, it is no wonder that our wage system at present in effect still bears the traces of several phases of our economic development that have already been transcended. Certain of its elements are demonstrably leftovers of capitalism, certain others the legacy of the wretched economic conditions of the immediate post-war period, of inflation.

The wage arrangements after stabilization aimed basically at the elimination of those abnormal phenomena which became apparent with the consolidation of prices and with the normalization of economic life.

Later, in the beginning of 1949, we carried out a mechanical fixing of norms, leaving all the basic features of our wage system untouched.

\* Reprinted from *Information Bulletin*, published by the Foreign Section of the Central Committee of the Hungarian Working People's Party, Budapest, Issue No. 30-31, August-September, 1950.

It was much too mechanical for the attainment of the desired goal: raising the productivity of labor. The diverse shortcomings of our wage system soon made themselves felt in hampering the unfolding of labor emulation and thereby retarding the upswing of production. The resolutions of the Executive Committee of our Party organization of Greater Budapest last fall and the directives given by Comrade Rákosi at that session resulted in serious improvements also in this field. Different measures of wage payment were instituted, in the first place the abolition of "ceilings," the breakdown of group wage calculations into their individual components, the extension of the system of pay according to work performed—all this contributed to bringing about the preconditions of the birth of the Stakhanov movement. Comrade Rákosi criticised sharply the excessively complicated nature of our wage system which tipped the scales unjustly against the good worker. This criticism paved the way for the introduction of the piece-rate system, our most important step toward instituting a socialist wage system.

### INTRODUCTION OF PIECE-RATE SYSTEM

This Spring we began the introduction of piece-rates and completed it, by and large, by the middle of July. By stating in advance what wages are due for a definite job on a definite piece of work, that is the wage for a definite type and quantity of work, we make it easier for the worker to calculate and control his earnings. With the old system he often learned how much he earned only after he received his pay envelope. Many cases of gross injustice will be eliminated in our plants by fixing wages exclusively according to the quantity and quality of work performed, and not according to the classification of the worker, higher or lower according to whether the work is more or less difficult. With the old system a worker classified in a higher category received for the same work more than a worker in a lower category. The same worker earned more or less according to the percentage by which he fulfilled the norm prescribed for the job, regardless of whether the job itself was difficult or easy, simple or complicated. Many workers tried to do work requiring a lower skill than their own, for in this way they were able to overfulfill the norm without earning less. The introduction of piece-rates put an end to this odd situation. On the other hand, to change over to piece-rates was pos-

sible only where a system of pay according to work performed, based on some sort of norms, existed previously. Only about half of our industrial workers are paid on a piece-rate basis.

The institution of piece-rates meant, without doubt, important progress in our wage system. However, it only partially eliminated the existing shortcomings and difficulties. The further change and improvement of the wage system not only remained on the order of the day but recently became a burning question, a central topic of debate. Its timeliness is proven by phenomena that arise in different areas of our economy, seemingly independent of each other, yet in reality intimately linked with each other and hampering our healthy development. These are mainly the following:

### SHORTCOMINGS AND DIFFICULTIES

First: in the past months, wages in our industry have increased faster than productivity. As is well known, Comrade Gerö dealt with this fact exhaustively in his report at the meeting of our Central Committee on May 31. Comrade Gerö pointed out, among other things, that nominal wages have increased in the first four months of this year by 12.7 percent, and real wages have increased by 17.5 percent, while production rose by 11 percent; the value

of production per hour by 9 percent; the value of production on every hundred forint paid out in wages fell by more than 2 percent. "It is clear," added Comrade Gerö, "that this situation, in the long run, is untenable lest there be serious relapses in our economy."

Second: numerous complaints have come from our factories that lax norms and wage frauds have spread to an alarming extent. As Comrade Gerö said in his report: "... while we were occupied with other questions, the enemy succeeded in opening up a new front against the People's Democracy, the front of mass wage and norms frauds." It is clear that such a situation is intolerable, both from the standpoint of the whole economy and from the standpoint of every decent worker.

Third: a great part of the norms is bad, even where no explicit wage frauds occurred. They are bad because they are out of date, surpassed by the workers and by technical development. The obsolete norms become in turn hindrances to the establishment of correct norms for newly introduced work processes; they become brakes on our efforts to raise work competition, production and productivity.

Fourth: the too rapid rise of wages inevitably disturbs the equilibrium of production and consumption. This phenomenon, even if not to a considerable degree, was observable in some cases, in certain foodstuffs.

While the population of Budapest consumed considerably more meat and butter in the first months of this year than before the Second World War or even than last year, or at any time, the considerably increased supply of meat and butter was still unable to keep pace with the demand for meat and butter which increased at an even faster pace.

Fifth: even though the introduction of piece-rates eliminated the worst hardships within the plants, it did not change, or only slightly changed, the incorrect and unjust proportion of wages between the different crafts. Comrade Gerö mentioned in his report and quoted figures to prove it, that average earnings in the rubber and leather industry are considerably higher than in the iron, metal and machine industries, that the miners performing the heaviest and, from the standpoint of our national economy, one of the most important jobs, stand as far as earnings go in eighth place, behind the workers of the garment industry. It is clear that under such conditions the workers will prefer not to go into the mines and that even those already in the mines will try to get some other, better paying jobs. It is likewise clear that it is not enough to stress ad nauseam the particular importance of the iron, metal and machine industries: if higher wages are paid in the leather industry, then workers will go there and we shall have difficulties in

provid

indu

Sixt

give s

skilled

worke

develo

indust

introduc

hourly

lowest

basic

is the

Let u

gener

catego

passes

can b

vious

eighth

cated

know

indep

ordin

in th

respo

risk

are g

feren

is in

that

are r

first

unju

conte

work

Se

tuati

distr

to th

providing new forces for the metal industry.

Sixth: our wage system does not give sufficient incentive to the unskilled worker to become a skilled worker and to the skilled worker to develop his knowledge. In the iron industry, for instance, after the introduction of piece-rates the basic hourly rate for the first, that is, the lowest category is 1.90 forint; the basic hourly rate for the eighth, that is the highest category, is 3.30 forint. Let us add that according to the general characterization of these categories the first category encompasses the simplest operations "which can be performed without any previous training and experience," the eighth category "those very complicated operations requiring expert knowledge, experience and complete independence and entailing extraordinary responsibilities." Of course, in the eighth category, both the responsibility of the workers and the risk he runs of spoiling the work are greater. It is clear that the difference between the two categories is in no way reflected by the fact that the wages of the eighth category are 1.7 times higher than those of the first category. This wage system is unjust and rightly provokes discontent among the highly skilled workers.

Seventh: the relatively great fluctuation of labor power and its faulty distribution is to a great part due to the effects of the wage system.

In 1931, Comrade Stalin ascribed the then considerable fluctuation of labor power in the Soviet Union to the faulty wage system, to the incorrect system of pay schedules, to the "leftist" policy of equalization in the field of wages. Partially, this is also the reason why in some of our plants there are too many workers, there is "unemployment within the gates," which hampers the upswing of labor competition and of production, while in other places production is being stalled by labor shortage. In some places, skilled workers do unskilled work while in other places even the most intricate operations are performed by semi-skilled workers.

#### THE PRINCIPLES OF OUR WAGE SYSTEM

It is mainly these phenomena that placed the further change and improvement of our wage system on the order of the day. The emergence of certain phenomena disturbing our healthy development, at the same time, in most cases points to the ways and means of their solution. We already referred to this. However, the many-sided nature of these questions makes it necessary to clarify also the principles of the wage system in our society of socialist construction. This is the more necessary because not even those who deal with the question, our trade union and Party functionaries

are always clear about the fact that the idea of wages covers entirely different relationships today than it did a few years ago.

Bourgeois economics considers its own categories having eternal validity. In reality, however, these categories are "socially valid, that is, objective expressions in thought of the historically determined social mode of production." (Marx, *Capital*, Vol. I.)

This holds, of course, equally for wages.

The economic basis of our society has changed. However, this change is as yet reflected only to a small extent and only inadequately in the minds of people and even less in language, in vocabulary. Words often survive that which they originally serve to denote; they remain but the meaning changes. However, in the case of wages, not only the word remains, but also the money form of wages as well as, to a far-reaching extent, the methods of computation and payment. Thus, the worker sees that—just as before—he receives his pay envelope on Friday or Saturday, containing his wages, which have been computed, just as before, on the basis of hourly rates, or piece-rates, etc.

Yet the change that has occurred is fundamental. Formerly, wages were the price of a commodity, of labor power. Labor power as a commodity: this contained the whole system of the complicated interrela-

tionships of the capitalist social order. It entailed, first of all, the simple yet basic fact that the worker lacks the means of production and hence is constrained to sell his labor power in order to live. It contained further the fact that the value of labor power is determined by the labor embodied in labor power, that is, the quantity of wages is determined in essence by the price of life necessities food, shelter, clothing, etc. It entails likewise that even though, as distinct from other commodities, historical and moral elements enter into the determination of the value of this particular commodity, the profit requirements of capital set an upper limit to the absolute quantity of wages; which means that the capitalist employs the worker only if the worker will produce correspondingly more than he receives in the form of wages. The above definition of wages also entails the fact that it is the cyclical movement of capitalist production that determines the fluctuations of the average wage, its rise over a shorter or longer period and its unavoidable fall thereafter. It entails the fact, that with the unfolding of capitalist production the mass of unemployed emerges and becomes permanent, the industrial reserve army which in the period of the general crisis of capitalism encompasses a considerable part of the working class, even in the brief phases of the upswing. Finally, as a summary of all other circumstances,

as it v  
lative

of the

In s

produ

ing pe

cooper

also b

—

\* The

class, i.e.

working

while th

to an ex

the indiv

of the i

now that

The s

absolute

argument

even tho

is getting

Neverthe

of Marx

working

chapter

chapter

Jurg

on the

developm

in France

in the U

in the h

day, com

Ther

workers

lengthy

one: the

of work

ditions

small nu

Almost

creasing

and crisi

over a c

on a loc

a pred

comes a

class of

from on

of this

increase

newly ad

is possib

United S

than dur

the spec

capitalist

tries dur

America

no argu

of the v

given co

deteri

as it were, it entails the gradual relative and absolute impoverishment of the working class.\*

In socialist society the means of production are owned by the working people—by their state or by the cooperatives. The products of labor also belong to the working people.

\* The relative impoverishment of the working class, i.e. the fact that the relative share of the working class in the national income diminishes, while that of the capitalist class increases, that the income of the individual worker diminishes to an even greater extent compared with that of the individual capitalists—this is, even on the basis of the inadequate statistical data, so obvious by now that there is scarcely anybody denying it.

The situation is different in the question of absolute impoverishment. Here seemingly no arguments and facts can be adduced to prove that even though the relative position of the workers is getting worse, their actual position is improving. Nevertheless closer examination confirms the thesis of Marx on the absolute impoverishment of the working class as expounded in the twenty-fifth chapter of the first volume of *Capital*.

Juergen Kuczinski, who in several books shows, on the basis of ample statistical material, the development of the conditions of the working class in France since 1700, in Great Britain since 1750, in the United States since 1789, in Germany and in the British Empire since 1800 to the present day, comes to the following conclusions:

"There is no doubt that for some groups of workers labor conditions have improved over a lengthy period—to mention the most important one: the labor aristocracy. There are some groups of workers who live under capitalist working conditions and yet are well off—for instance, the small number of highly skilled diamond cutters. Almost all workers are better off in years of increasing trade activity than in periods of depression and crisis. A change in the distribution of industry over a country may bring a definite improvement on a local scale—for instance for day laborers in a predominantly agricultural district which becomes an armament center. The whole working class of a country may benefit temporarily—even from one trade cycle to another—if the capitalists of this country are able, at the same time, to increase their profits from special exploitation of newly acquired countries or spheres of interests. It is possible, for instance, that the workers in the United States were better off from 1915 to 1929 than during the preceding fifteen years because of the special exploitation facilities the American capitalists had in other American and allied countries during the war—and in Europe and other American countries after the war. But all these are no arguments against the fact that the conditions of the workers employed by the capitalists of a given country have been and are, on the whole, deteriorating. . . ."

There is no unemployment and everybody works, not as yet because work itself "has become the principal life necessity," but because the principle holds sway that "whoever does not work, neither shall he eat." However, labor power has ceased to be a commodity and hence wages

Well, in what, then, does the deterioration of the conditions of the workers consist? In what respects is a British worker of today worse off than his forefathers at the beginning of the industrial revolution? When he sits down to his meal today, his more civilized surroundings usually give him the appearance of enjoying a higher standard of life than was theirs of the eighteenth century. His room will very likely be lighted by electricity, his crockery will be less rough and crude, his chair will, at any rate, look more comfortable, his kitchen utensils may in some respects be more convenient. He may be able to listen to the wireless during his meal; a newspaper may be at his elbow (in 1750 even a weekly paper was an unheard of luxury).

All this, unfortunately, although not without importance, is negligible compared with another point. And upon this vital point it is possible to speak both accurately and emphatically. The following table needs to be studied with care, for it is truly eloquent.

The Diet of a Worker

Nutrient	Diet of English 19th Century	Diet of Over 15 Millions People in 1935	Modern Requirement
	Laborer		
Calcium (grms.)	1.2	0.5	1.0
Iron (mgrms.)	23	9.6	15
Vitamin A (Internat. units)	6600	1220	5000
Vitamin B1 (Internat. units)	1300	350	500—700
Vitamin C (mgrms.)	110	55	75

(Quoted from Sir John Boyd Orr, "Food and the People," London 1943.—Juergen Kuczinski, "A Short History of Labor Conditions in Great Britain, 1750 to the Present Day," third edition, London 1947, p. 182.)

Kuczinski quotes the following from the book by Sir John Orr:

"As a result of this deterioration in the nutritional value of the diet of the working classes the physique of the people deteriorated. . . . The average stature fell. . . . This deterioration in the nutritional state and physique of the people was masked by the reduction in the death rate which followed the elimination of epidemic and endemic diseases, such as cholera, enteric and typhus fever, through the application of modern sanitary principles." (*Ibid*, p. 185.)

are no longer the price of labor power. Wages are that part of the social product allotted to the personal, individual needs of the workers in the framework of the socialist economic plan, according to the quantity and quality of work performed by them. The volume of wages is no longer limited by the profit possibilities of capital but only by the dimensions of that part of the social total product which in accordance with the plan serves the satisfaction of the individual personal needs of the workers. It is the economic law of development of socialist society that the total social product constantly increases and with it the wage fund grows accordingly. Thus while the law of capitalist accumulation is the impoverishment of the working class, the law of socialist accumulation is the constant rise of the living standards of the workers.

#### THE LAW OF SOCIALIST ACCUMULATION

In our society which is not yet a socialist society but a transition from capitalism to socialism, the commodity character of labor power is not yet everywhere and not yet completely abolished. However, the overwhelming part of the means of production is in the hands of the state of the working people; all the means of production of manufacturing, employing the bulk of the in-

dustrial workers, of mining and of transport are in the possession of the state. In our society the economic laws of socialism increasingly assert themselves. There is no exploitation in socialist industry; labor power cannot become a commodity and generally, the same laws hold for wages as in a socialist society.

It holds also for the socialist sector of our society that the product of labor, of the total labor of society, belongs in its entirety to the workers. Of course, this does not mean that the workers distribute the total product among themselves and consume it. Marx dealt with the question of how great a part of the total social product can be distributed in a socialist society among the individual producers and came to the conclusion that from the total social products the following items must be deducted:

*“Firstly,* cover for replacement of the means of production used up.

*“Secondly,* additional portion for expansion of production.

*“Thirdly,* reserve or insurance fund to provide against mis-adventures, disturbances through natural events, etc.

“These deductions from the ‘undiminished proceeds of labor’ are an economic necessity and their magnitude is to be determined by available means and forces, and partly by calculation of probabilities, but they are in no way calculable by equity.

“There remains the other part of

the to  
as n

“Be  
individu  
from

“Fi  
minis  
ductio

“Th  
be ve  
comp

and i  
the n

“Se  
for t  
needs

vices,  
“Fr

sidera  
with  
crease  
societ

“T  
work  
under

today  
“O

‘distr  
the n  
divid  
ducer

Be  
plem  
Marx

social  
distr  
that  
stren

—  
\* Ka  
lishes,

the total product, destined to serve as means of consumption.

"Before this is divided among the individuals, there has to be deducted from it:

*"Firstly, the general costs of administration not belonging to production.*

"This part will, from the outset, be very considerably restricted in comparison with present-day society, and it diminishes in proportion as the new society develops.

*"Secondly, that which it destined for the communal satisfaction of needs, such as schools, health services, etc.*

"From the outset this part is considerably increased in comparison with present-day society and it increases in proportion as the new society develops.

*"Thirdly, funds for those unable to work, etc., in short, what is included under so-called official poor relief today.*

"Only now do we come to the 'distribution' . . . namely that part of the means of consumption which is divided among the individual producers of the cooperative society."\*

Before we proceed we must supplement the items mentioned by Marx to be deducted from the total social product. Obviously, before distribution one must deduct also that which serves the defense or the strengthening of socialist society.

Marx does not speak of that for—as is well known—he as well as Engels were of the opinion that socialist revolution will be victorious at the same time at least in all the leading industrial countries of Europe. In their epoch this supposition was correct; however, the situation has radically changed in the epoch of imperialism.

Obvious as it is that if society wants to live and to develop at all, the whole of the total social product cannot be distributed among and consumed by the working people, but only the part of the total product remaining after the above deduction, it is likewise obvious that the producers are not deprived of anything by these deductions. "Accordingly the individual producer receives back from society—after the deductions have been made—exactly what he gives to it. . . . The same amount of labor which he has given to society in one form he receives back in another."\*

As can be seen, the quantity of wages is here not determined by the price of life necessities such as food, clothing, shelter, etc. The quantity of wages is determined exclusively by the part of the total social product that remains, after the diverse deductions, for direct distribution among the producers. Thus in the final analysis only the extent of the total social product sets a limit to the volume of wages. The bigger the

\* Karl Marx, *Selected Works*, International Publishers, New York, Vol. II, p. 562.

\* *Ibid.*, p. 553.

total social product, the greater the wages. The worker is directly interested in increasing production, the worker works for himself. It is precisely the sum total of these conditions that express the fact that labor power has ceased to be a commodity.

Marx also expounded that the principle of distribution noted above does not hold for communist society.

"In a higher phase of communist society, after the enslaving subordination of individuals under division of labor, and therewith also the antithesis between mental and physical labor has vanished, after labor has become not merely a means to live but has become itself the primary necessity of life, after the productive forces have also increased with the all-round development of the individual, and all the springs of co-operative wealth flow more abundantly—only then can the narrow horizon of bourgeois right be fully left behind and society inscribe on its banners: from each according to his ability, to each according to his needs."\*

This, however, holds only for communist society having developed on its own basis. In socialist society having scarcely left behind capitalism and of course, even more in our society just now evolving from capitalist society, the principle "equal value for equal value" still reigns,

\* *Ibid* p. 566.

*i.e.*: "The right of the producers is *proportional* to the labor they supply; the equality consists in the fact that measurement is made with an *equal standard*, labor."\*

The same thought is expressed also in the Constitution of our People's Republic which states in Article 9: "The Hungarian People's Republic strives to put into effect the principle of socialism: 'from everybody according to his ability, to everybody according to his labor.'"

Article 45 of our Constitution, dealing more directly with the payment for labor, returns to the same thought: "The Hungarian People's Republic secures for its citizens the right to work and payment according to the quantity and quality of work performed. This right is being realized by the Hungarian People's Republic through the planned development of the productive forces of the national economy and through the economic utilization of manpower reserves according to plan."

In Marx' analysis and in the above quoted articles of our Constitution we find the fundamental principles on which our wage system must be based. Of course, these principles do not give an answer to every question that emerges in practice. These principles give only a foundation, proceeding from which and based on which we must build up our wage system. Let us examine what

\* *Ibid.*, p. 564.

conclusions we can draw from the above, taking into consideration also the experiences of the Soviet Union.

### THE FUNDAMENTAL PRINCIPLE

First of all, we must grasp the thought of planning. Our system differs fundamentally from capitalist economy by the principle of planning. We have seen that in socialist society labor power is not a commodity, that the volume of wages depends on the volume of total social product or rather on the items to be deducted from this total social product, partly for the maintenance and expansion of production, partly for objects that, even though serving consumption, do not serve individual consumption but rather certain needs of society. The remaining part is being distributed among the individual producers. Allowing for a certain simplification and assuming that in our society every individual income is income based on labor, we can consider this part as the wage fund from which all wages have to be paid. Hence we must plan not only production, not only investments serving different objectives, not only reserves serving different purposes,—we must also plan the wage fund.

The planning of the wage fund is important not only in order to be able to plan in advance the volume of wages but also because we have

to plan the production of certain consumption goods in harmony with the wage fund. In other words, while planning the production of consumption articles we must take into account what quantities and what kind of consumption articles all those sharing in the wage fund are going to buy according to the volume of their income.

Secondly: in conformity with the laws of the socialist economic system both the total social product and the wage fund must increase year by year. They must increase partly because the number of workers increases and partly because the living standards of the workers must increase year by year. The yearly increase of the living standard of the workers is based on the steady increase of the productivity of labor. If throughout a longer period wages rise faster than productivity this means that the part of the total social product destined for the individual distribution grows faster than the total product itself. In this case, however, that part of the total product serving the satisfaction of social needs, among others, the part necessary for the increase of production, no longer assures the appropriate development of society. This important consideration was expressed in the plenum of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union in August 1924, when it was stated that the increase in the tempo of the productivity of labor must precede

the rate of increase in wages.\*

Thirdly: the socialist wage system must be designed so as to give the greatest possible incentive to accomplish that which is most important from the standpoint of the final victory of socialism: the increase of the productivity of labor. Hence, wages must be fixed so as to give the maximum incentive to every individual worker to raise the productivity of his labor, to produce more and better in the same time and, with the same effort, to devise new, more rational processes of work. One of the guarantees that socialism by far surpasses capitalism in this field is precisely the fact that the broad masses of the workers are interested in raising the productivity of labor.

Fourthly: the socialist wage system must, at the same time, help to solve certain particularly important tasks and to overcome certain temporary difficulties of the economy. This is to say that in places where there exists temporarily a so-called bottleneck of the economy, either because sufficient labor power is lacking or because there are not enough machines or some other difficulty arises, wages must be fixed

so as to give a particularly strong incentive for reaching a certain goal in a definite case, such as for instance an increase in production or an improvement of quality or economizing with certain raw materials, or any other particular set objective. In all these cases the determination of wages must be oriented toward the extremely important directive of Lenin, that the worker himself must also be made materially interested in the results of his work, that one must find the way of correctly harmonizing individual and social interests.

All these principles do not change, of course, the fundamental principle of socialist distribution, that everybody gets his share of the social total product according to his work. The viewpoints listed complement the fundamental principle and facilitate its application.

It is clear that our present wage system is not yet adequate for the requirements of a consistently socialist wage system. Nonetheless, while stating the shortcomings we must, at the same time, point out, that since liberation we have achieved very serious results also in this field, that in spite of all its defects, our present wage system still stands high above that which capitalist Hungary bequeathed to us as well as high above that which prevails today in the capitalist countries.

[The concluding section of this article will appear in the next issue.]

\* The resolution on "wage policy" says: "The increase in the productivity of labor must surpass the increase of wages. Only under this condition can the material basis be created and the material means be gathered, which are necessary for securing the increase of wages as well as for the extension of production requiring an increase in the means of circulation, for the renovation of the depreciated and obsolete machinery, for satisfying the ever rising cultural needs, for the education of the young generation and for the administration and defense of the state." [C.P.S.U., *Resolutions and Decisions*, Part I, p. 627 (Russian)]

THE

By V

Peckish  
Conc

PE

the ey  
heroic  
disper  
the m  
the o  
lums  
days4, 19  
amph  
wher  
had g  
Amer  
RobeTh  
toric  
histo  
reach  
the A  
extre  
SKIL  
ing  
repor  
offer  
"Cor  
vesti  
ocati  
aims  
PEE  
Th  
that

## Book Review

### THE EPIC OF PEEKSKILL

By William L. Patterson

*Peekskill, U.S.A.*, by Howard Fast, Civil Rights Congress, New York, 1951. \$1.00.

*PEEKSKILL, U.S.A.*, as seen through the eyes of Howard Fast, one of today's heroic Americans, is a timely and indispensable book. It is a true story of the memorable people's struggles against the onslaught of fascist-inspired hoodlums which marked those now historic days of August 27 and September 4, 1949, in and around that little amphitheatre in Peekskill, New York, where lovers of democracy and culture had gathered for a concert by that giant American fighter for freedom, Paul Robeson.

This book not only analyzes the historic events of Peekskill—it makes that history live. Its inclusion of findings reached in investigations conducted by the American Civil Liberties Union is extremely fortunate; for Fast's *PEEKSKILL, U.S.A.* gives clarity and meaning to those findings. The A.C.L.U. report, exceedingly well-documented, offers proof that Peekskill was no "Communist provocation." Yet that investigation does not reveal whose provocation it was, nor does it expose the aims and purposes of the provocateurs. *PEEKSKILL, U.S.A.* does this.

The findings of the A.C.L.U. reveal that "the local press bears the main

responsibility for inflaming the residents of Peekskill"; but it does not expose the sinister part played by the forces of county, state and Federal governments which incited that press.

The A.C.L.U. report spells out the forms of terror directed "against all who advocated freedom of speech, freedom of assembly, and the preservation of constitutional rights." But the role of the pogromists of Peekskill is not brought forth, nor do we see in that report their relation to the national plans of the fascist-minded reactionary forces in high places. That connection is supplied by *PEEKSKILL, U.S.A.*

The A.C.L.U. report shows that the American Legion was at Peekskill a weapon of terror; but it does not show what social force has molded and used the Legion as a weapon of terror. That report does not show how the K.K.K. dupes, the Roman Catholic hierarchy, the American Legion, and the screeching press that lusted for blood, were linked together; how their spokesmen afforded one another protection, or what this unholy alliance meant. *PEEKSKILL, U.S.A.* does this for you.

*PEEKSKILL, U.S.A.*, for the first time in preservable form, gives the far-reaching political significance of the facts and events leading up to and em-

bracing Peekskill—facts that no press in the United States could fully ignore and retain the slightest semblance of objectivity. But that press concealed the intrigue and machinations behind Peekskill's "rioting."

Howard Fast portrays those events, in which he took an active and heroic part, graphically and in the clearest outline. The county, state, and Federal administrations appear on the stage represented by their various agents from the attorney-general's office, by the county and state police forces, by numerous minor thugs clothed with authority to do violence, and by "law and order" officials. All of them are seen organizing or leading the storm-troopers engaged in the violence which they hoped would culminate in murder. Fast makes them live as vividly as they do at a Kefauver Committee hearing, and as viciously.

The "gentlemen" from the government are there, fronting for the gangster-element they had incited to force and violence and the community people whom they had incited to force and violence and the community people whom they had duped and misguided and, through their successive waves of hysteria, provoked to a murderous hatred against the Negro people, the Jewish people, progressive trade unionists, and Communists.

Democratic and Republican leaders, as bi-partisan as in Congress halls, are shown acting as political directors of the mobsters, finding justification for their filthy language which has become so commonplace to our administrative and legislative branches of government.

The role of the Federal Bureau of Investigation in the Peekskill riots,

which so many seek to conceal, is presented by the author of *FREEDOM ROAD* in *PEEKSKILL, U.S.A.* J. Edgar Hoover's agents are among the mobsters, notebooks in hand. They do not intercede to protect the peaceful men and women who have gathered to hear a concert. They are not there to prevent murder and terror. They are there to reassure the evil forces that the sanction and blessing of a bi-partisan administration has been placed upon the evil cause they espouse and the vile deeds they contemplate. Hoover has learned from Himmler, and Hoover's men are as quickly learning from Himmler's Gestapo.

\* \* \*

Howard Fast applies the lessons of Germany—the Germany of Hitler created through the financial aid of leading American monopolies—to the conclusions that he draws from the experiences he went through. The major conclusion must never be forgotten by anyone. It is that this monstrous thing could not have happened without government support. Peekskill is a crime of government. True, Howard Fast cannot place physically at Peekskill any of the Wall Street men behind the scenes, the prototypes of those whom Hitler so skillfully concealed in Germany. But those who are there act with the assurance which indicates that they know the real powers behind the scene will be responsible for them before the law. Their actions show what careful preparation was given to this criminal orgy.

The kind of thinking that went into "Murder, Inc.," and into "Operation

Kille  
Thi  
impl  
coulo  
Engl  
Ho  
and  
we s  
and  
Peek  
writ  
dare  
passi  
corre  
U.S.  
whic  
grou  
with  
and  
wan  
fuse  
that  
plan  
deve

B  
grea  
of t  
Neg  
Fast  
sent  
Am  
they  
the  
hole  
but  
tion  
be  
high  
play  
dry  
Fas  
in

Killer," went into the Peekskill orgy. This is brought out so explicitly and implicitly by Howard Fast that it could escape no one who reads the English language.

Howard Fast dares to clarify the role and relationship of the various forces we see under control of government and engaged in acts of violence at Peekskill, while the A.C.L.U. and other written investigations in the main have dared to mention these forces only in passing. The reports Howard Fast so correctly makes a part of *PEEKSKILL, U.S.A.* hide the conspiratorial action which brought these diseased hate groups together on those dates. Thus, with or without intention, the A.C.L.U. and other reports confuse those who want the reality of Peekskill. They confuse democratic Americans who want that clarity which will enable them to plan successfully to prevent the further development of such horrors.

\* \* \*

But *PEEKSKILL, U.S.A.* has other great merits. It is in the presentation of the heroes and heroines, white and Negro, Jew and non-Jew, that Howard Fast does a magnificent job. He presents these people—white and black Americans—in action, outnumbered as they were on the first occasion *holding the line*, and knowing why it had to hold. He shows the forces, now small, but ever growing, whose unity in action alone guarantees that fascism can be stopped in the United States. A high standard of craftsmanship is displayed here. *PEEKSKILL, U.S.A.* is no dry tract. It is fascinating reading. Fast expresses in every word his faith in progressive America.

In reading this memorable volume, one wonders where Mr. Ralph Bunche was on September 4. He knew what had taken place August 27, and he knew true Americans were going back September 4. One wonders where such heroes of the phrase as Messrs. Walter White and A. Philip Randolph were—but in their significant absence the figure of the giant Robeson looms large through the events of which Fast has written. Their absence and Robeson's presence supply the reason why reaction was out to get that mighty man while it stands ready to promote those others to high places.

Labor—white labor—mobilized by the progressive section of the trade union leadership which the government is persecuting, stands forth heroically in these pages. The progressive unions were forging the unity of labor and the Negro people in struggle at Peekskill.

The Communists are there, defending the Constitutional, democratic and civil rights of the masses who had gathered there. There is the Party the bi-partisan government seeks so desperately to outlaw.

The significance of Peekskill to the trial and persecution of the Communist leaders is stated dramatically by the author:

"Peekskill was one among many incidents of 'force and violence' against the *left* and not by the *left*. A similar study of any one of a hundred other incidents of a provocative nature would yield much the same results. For example, Henry David's *History of the Haymarket Affair* illustrates this point well, as did my own study of the af-

fair at Republic Steel. In each case, a careful inquiry established the fact that force and violence were introduced not by the *left* but by the *right*. To support this, it must be noted that not a single incident of like nature in the past can be laid, in terms of force and violence, in the camp of the *left*. The most exhaustive research, intelligence and study on the part of the Department of Justice, backed by their mighty financial resources, has failed to produce *one single instance* of force and violence on the part of the *left*. It becomes particularly meaningful, therefore, that during a trial of eleven Communist leaders on charges of 'advocating the teaching' of certain philosophical concepts which, in the language of the indictment, led to 'force and violence,' the *Peekskill* affairs should occur. What a boon it would have been to the prosecution if they could have introduced *Peekskill* at the trial as evidence in their case! And what exemplary witnesses the three calm, neutral F.B.I. agents could have been!"\*

*PEEKSKILL, U.S.A.*, Civil Rights Congress, New York, 1951, pp. 95-96.

This is the picture painted by Howard Fast in such unmistakably splendid terms. It does not, could not, cover all of Peekskill—but it paints an historic picture.

\* \* \*

Lastly, the monumental service that Howard Fast has performed in *PEEKSKILL, U.S.A.* is that he shows to those who have eyes with which to see, that the terror at Peekskill was not an accident—that "Operation Killer" is not only a matter of foreign policy, or that it applies only where Negroes are concerned, but that it is being incited daily by county, state and Federal governments here in the U.S.A.

Those who read this volume have only to go back to the story of Germany, 1932, to see the deadly parallel.

Yet I could not end here. Howard Fast shows how we can advance the line we held at Peekskill. The answer is our UNITY.

Read *PEEKSKILL, U.S.A.*—and, if you are wise, pass it on to your friend, shopmate, fellow trade-unionist or neighbor.

A C  
PSY

Dear  
In t  
kind  
of Po  
chel  
exam  
reacti  
psych  
to ha  
dor"  
Marto  
staten  
"says  
A  
Fenic  
is a  
psych  
contr  
ities  
child  
and  
Far  
Siski  
critic  
passa  
by Si  
Th  
coun  
but c  
impr  
niqu  
the c  
sente  
open

## Correspondence

### A CRITICAL COMMENT PERTAINING TO THE ARTICLE ON PSYCHOANALYSIS

Chicago, Ill.

Dear Comrade Jerome:

In the article on psychoanalysis by Siskind and Martel in the Dec. 1950 issue of *Political Affairs*, a passage from Fenichel is quoted in some detail as an example of "the stark mystical, deeply reactionary and fraudulent character of psychoanalysis," which Fenichel is said to have revealed "in a moment of candor" without "camouflage." Siskind and Martel present the passage with the statement that this is what Fenichel "says of psychoanalytic technique."

A turning to the actual context in Fenichel reveals that the entire passage is a description by Fenichel, not "of psychoanalytic technique," but on the contrary, of "an old technique of authorities and educators . . . to subjects or children, who are dependent on them and who are begging for protection." Far from endorsing this technique, as Siskind and Martel imply, Fenichel criticizes it both before and after the passage describing it which is quoted by Siskind and Martel.

The entire passage quoted is an account by Fenichel not of psychoanalysis, but of "psychotherapeutic transference improvements" based on the "old technique" of giving love and protection on the condition of obedience. In the very sentence with which the quotation opens, Fenichel specifies in a first part

of the sentence, which Siskind and Martel omit: "Psychotherapeutic transference improvements may be achieved in the same way: . . ." These "transference improvements" are defined by Fenichel (p. 559)\* as improvements achieved not by psychoanalysis, but merely by "the doctor's very presence." In his discussion of such improvements, Fenichel explicitly disavows them in the words (p. 561): "It is clear that transference improvements are not trustworthy." Far from being pragmatic about such improvements, he extends his criticism to all treatments of patients where it has been found that "dependency was the condition of their being better." He points out that precisely, "This was the reason that Freud gave up hypnosis as a means of treatment. It turned out that the improved patients remained improved only as long as they remained on good terms with the doctor."

In the course of the passage quoted by Siskind and Martel, it is specified once more by Fenichel that it is the psychotherapist "of this type" that he is referring to. The delimiting phrase "of this type" is omitted by Siskind and Martel without the omission's being indicated by dots.

Immediately after the passage quoted,

\* Otto Fenichel, *The Psychoanalytic Theory of Neurosis*, New York, 1945.—Ed.

Fenichel again calls attention to the "decisive limitation" of such treatment and of "any recovery" achieved by it. He refers to "magical power, projected onto the doctor" as not psychoanalysis, but a usage of both cathartic and prohibitive techniques of suggestion. He disavows it as requiring the patient to stay "passive-dependent" and "immature," in the following words (p. 562): "However, any recovery achieved in this way remains dependent on the patient's passive-dependent attitude toward the doctor. The patient's ego instead of being enabled to mature is definitely established as immature. This is the decisive limitation of cathartic treatment."

What psychoanalytic technique consists of, and its emphasis on developing the rational powers by confronting them with all evidences of irrationality, and promoting "the active mastery of diffi-

culties" (p. 561), are sharply contrasted with mere "transference improvements" by Fenichel, in numerous passages, none quoted by Siskind and Martel.

Some readers may feel intimidated to call attention to this bit of gross misrepresentation. I do not. Without prejudice to other points set forth by the article, self-criticism on this point can serve only to raise the level of further Marxist criticism of psychoanalysis. What experience teaches us to fear most of all is timidity about calling for self-criticism from our leaders. I know for a fact that intimidation exists in the minds of many Communists about expressing their views freely on psychoanalysis. For my part, as in cases like the present, I consider it a responsibility to do so.

W. ROXBURY

## THE AUTHORS' REPLY

We are grateful to W. Roxbury for calling our attention to the regrettable error in our article, "Psychoanalysis: Ideological Instrument of Imperialism,"\* in the manner in which we used a quotation from O. Fenichel's book, *The Psychoanalytic Theory of Neurosis*. As we presented it, the quotation\*\* gives the definite and wrong impression that Fenichel, "in a moment of candor," exposed the unscientific and mystical nature of psychoanalysis by stating that its therapy does not differ from the techniques employed by priest-doctors of

ancient times or of various religious healers today. The truth is that Fenichel makes this charge against schools of psychotherapy other than psychoanalysis. For the latter, he in fact claims a scientific basis.

We could allude to mitigating circumstances, such as the abnormal conditions under which the article was prepared, to explain the error. But that of course would not obviate the seriousness of the error. A keen sense of responsibility to scholarship and the most thoroughgoing verification of material is the first requirement of Marxist writing. Anything misrepresenting in any way the position of a cited authority or

\* *Political Affairs*, December 1950.

\*\* O. Fenichel, *The Psychoanalytic Theory of Neurosis*, New York, 1945, p. 562.

source is unpardonable, even though entirely unintentional.

Apart from our error in presenting the quotation, we feel obliged to deal at some length with the objective merits of Fenichel's position, in view of W. Roxbury's exposition of the question of "transference." It must be stated at the outset that our deeply-regretted misuse of the quotation does not in any way contradict either the basic line of the article or any of its ideas or conclusions.

The transference phenomena, Fenichel maintains, are implicit in any form of psychotherapy, including psychoanalysis. Briefly, the "transference phenomena" represent to Fenichel the directing toward the analyst of the patient's previously acquired attitudes, a reliving of "infantile conflicts," mainly of an instinctual sexual character long buried in the "unconscious." These "unconscious" emotional reactions originally directed toward parents or parent figures are supposed to be diverted by the transference toward the therapist.

The main distinction between psychoanalysis and other forms of therapy, according to Fenichel, lies in the *manner* in which the therapist handles the transference phenomena. "Non-psychoanalytic" therapists are described by him as relying upon the patient's awe of the doctor in order that he may by suggestion or authority exorcise the irritating behavior or thoughts. Fenichel scorns this practice and points out that the use of this method, while resulting in some temporary relief from pressures which the patient feels, can only further intensify his original basic disorder. The use of the method of authority and suggestion is ascribed by Fenichel to a wide range of non-psychoanalytical

therapeutic methods, of which he says:

"The methods of psychotherapy, therefore, have remained the same since the times of the earliest witch doctors; the results were perhaps not bad, but they were not understood and thus were unreliable. You never could tell whether or not they would be achieved at all."\*

But Fenichel himself makes clear that psychoanalysis makes use of fundamentally the same transference devices as other therapies and that the above quotation therefore applies to it as well. He says:

"The 'analytic atmosphere' that convinces the patient he has nothing to fear in tolerating impulses formerly warded off seems not only to be a pre-requisite for any transference interpretation; *it is also the decisive means of persuading the ego to accept on trial something formerly repulsed.*"\*\* (Italics ours—G.S. and H.M.)

"Any psychotherapeutic method makes use of transference, but only in psychoanalysis does this use consist in *interpretation* of the transference, that is, in making it conscious. The analyst makes this interpretation effective by not reacting emotionally to any of the patient's emotional wishes, to his love, hatred, or anxiety; he remains the 'mirror' that does nothing but show to the patient what he is doing."\*\*\*

The "utilization" of "positive transference" and "transitory identification

\* *Ibid.*, p. 565.

\*\* *Ibid.*, p. 580.

\*\*\* *Ibid.*, p. 571.

with the analyst" cannot, in the true meaning of these terms, conceivably be interpreted to connote anything but the use of prestige and mystical powers which the analyst possesses in the eyes of the patient.

The analyst is thus placed in the position of making use of the very non-rational attitudes which brought the patient to analysis. This acceptance of the "analytic atmosphere" (dependence on the judgment of the analyst) is not only a prerequisite for analysis, but is the decisive means of persuading the ego (individual) to accept "what was formerly repulsed." (The analyst's conception of how the patient should think and act.)

"Positive transference," "transitory identification," "analytic atmosphere" or "persuading the ego," certainly do not bespeak an objective "mirroring" of the patient's life and mind by the analyst, but rather his active intervention to convince the patient of the existence within himself of "unconscious forces."

What have we here but the same passive-dependence on the analyst, the same reliance on the patient's awe of the doctor, the same authority of the psychoanalyst to manipulate the thinking and feelings of the patient for the purpose of exorcising the so-called neuroses? Except perhaps for dragging out the transference process over a longer period, and for more skillfully disguising its methods, psychoanalysis differs in no essential respects in its methods of psychotherapy from the schools which Fenichel accuses of having remained "the same since the times of the earliest witch doctors."

How can the so-called psychoanalytical techniques for effecting the transference of neuroses differ basically from those Fenichel berates, if the very psychoanalytic concept of that which is to be transferred is so irrational, so grossly fantastic, so anti-scientific and mystical!

Fenichel defines neurotics as "persons who in their unconscious instinctual life have either remained on an infantile level or have regressed to it, that is, persons whose sexuality (or aggression) has retained infantile forms. . . ."

In relation directly to the psychoanalytical transference hocus pocus which he advocates, Fenichel, after analyzing the first type of therapy, namely, "the old-fashioned suggestion-hypnosis," goes on to say:

"The second type, the treatment [of the neurotic conflict] by means of full annulment of the repression, is represented by psychoanalysis, in which the undoing of the repression enables the infantile sexual strivings to participate in the development of the personality and to turn into satisfiable adult sexuality."\*

Fenichel's own definition of neurotics leaves no doubt of his complete attachment to Freud in his pansexualism: in his over-riding emphasis on infantile sexuality as the all-determining factor in shaping personality, in the formation of neuroses, in motivating human behavior, despite his occasional recognition of social factors.

GEORGE SISKIND  
HARRY MARTEL

\* *Ibid.*, p. 571.

\*\* *Ibid.*, p. 556.

## PAMPHLETS FOR PEACE

WHO WANTS WAR? — WHY THE SOVIET UNION BUILDS FOR PEACE, <i>by Joseph Clark</i> . . . . .	\$ .03
MARXISM AND NEGRO LIBERATION, <i>by Gus Hall</i>	.10
BONUS FOR MURDER: WASHINGTON'S PLOT TO RE- ARM WESTERN GERMANY, <i>by Arthur D. Kahn</i>	.10
PEACE — AND PRICE CUTS, TOO!, <i>by Felix Baran</i>	.05
ON GUARD AGAINST BROWDERISM, TITOISM, TROTSKYISM, <i>by John Gates</i> . . . . .	.05
CAN EVERYBODY BE RICH AND STILL BE HONEST? <i>by Jim West</i> . . . . .	.05
PEACE CAN BE WON! <i>by Gus Hall</i> . . . . .	.25
THE NEGRO PEOPLE IN THE STRUGGLE FOR PEACE AND FREEDOM, <i>by Benjamin J. Davis</i>	.05
WHAT IT MEANS TO BE A COMMUNIST, <i>by Henry Winston</i> . . . . .	.05
THE NEGRO IN HOLLYWOOD FILMS, <i>by V. J. Jerome</i>	.25
THE DEPORTATION DRIVE VERSUS THE BILL OF RIGHTS, <i>by Abner Green</i> . . . . .	.05
WHAT'S HAPPENING IN KOREA, <i>by Richard Morris</i>	.05
PEOPLE'S CHINA STANDS FOR PEACE, <i>by Wu Hsiu-chuan</i> . . . . .	.10
AN AMERICAN LOOKS AT RUSSIA — CAN WE LIVE TOGETHER IN PEACE? <i>by Claude Lightfoot</i> . . . . .	.05

**NEW CENTURY PUBLISHERS**

832 BROADWAY

NEW YORK 3, N. Y.

MAY 28 1951  
DARTMOUTH COLLEGE LIBRARY



LLOYD L. BROWN

## **IRON CITY**

gives one strength, hope, exaltation. It is grounded deep in the life of the Negro folk, with unforgettable, moving, heart-stirring people. This is a book that moves to action in struggle for peace, liberation and a decent America. Thanks to one of our finest writers."—PAUL ROBESON

## **IRON CITY**

is a novel that fights for you and I believe it is a book for which you will want to put up a fight. The book will be issued in June. To make a go of this independent publishing venture we need advance orders. We urge you to order your copy now, and to ask your friends to join you."—SAMUEL SILLEN

## **IRON CITY**

a novel by Lloyd L. Brown  
Popular edition, \$1.50; cloth, \$3.00. An autographed copy will be sent to all pre-publication subscribers. Send your order, together with payment, to:  
MASSES & MAINSTREAM, 332 Broadway, New York 3, N. Y.

r  
o  
e  
r

r  
at  
o  
d  
r.  
N

n  
y  
r  
f.