

# political affairs

MAY 1952 • 25 CENTS



LOUIS FLEISCHER

- [ 1 ] The International Economic Conference

A. SOBOLEV

- [11] People's Democracy As A Form of Political Organization Of Society

JOHN SWIFT

- [30] Some Problems of Work in Right-Led Unions, II

- [41] Notes on Recent Developments in the South

WILLIAM Z. FOSTER  
and  
A READER

- [52] On a Marxist History of the North American Indians

MICHAEL BIANCA

- [61] Atomic Imperialism  
(*Book Review*)

A BARGAIN IN GOOD READING . . .



## A LANTERN FOR JEREMY

by V. J. JEROME

\$2.50

plus

**POLITICAL AFFAIRS for one year**  
(new subscription or renewal)

\$2.50

**SPECIAL COMBINATION OFFER**  
of both for only

**\$4.00**

YOU SAVE . . . \$1.00

YOU GET . . . a wealth of good reading in this outstanding novel and twelve issues of the leading journal of Marxist thought and opinion in the United States.

ACT TODAY! Send you check or money order to:

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

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

PRINTED IN U.S.A.

200

**A Theoretical and Political Magazine of Scientific Socialism**

Editor: V. J. Jerome

## The International Economic Conference

By Louis Fleischer

THE MOMENTOUS International Economic Conference was held in Moscow April 3-12, 1952. It was called by an International Sponsoring Committee, consisting of people from various countries and representing various economic interests and points of view. The rules of procedure forbade any reference to the relative merits of different economic and political systems, and this rule was enforced. The Conference was attended by 471 participants from 49 countries, as well as numerous observers and reporters. The participants were financiers, traders and industrialists, public figures, economists and trade-union leaders. About 100 of the participants were from the U.S.S.R., the People's Republic of China, and the European Peoples' Democracies, the remainder from capitalist countries, including West Germany, Japan and the United States.

There were important practical accomplishments at the Conference. Trade arrangements were made between businessmen of capitalist countries and trading organizations of the socialist countries aggregating more than two hundred million dollars. Directors of trading and economic organizations of the U.S.S.R., the People's Republic of China, Poland, and other Peoples' Democracies presented proposals for trade with capitalist countries totalling 60-80 billion rubles, \$15-20 billion, over the next two or three years. There was established a 30-man Committee for the Promotion of International Trade, which will disseminate information promoting the expansion of trade, and will determine the time and place of a second international economic conference. Oliver Vickery, U.S. industrialist, is a member of this committee.

## BACKGROUND OF THE CONFERENCE

The Conference took place at a time of growing economic and political difficulties in the capitalist world. As a result of the diversion of raw materials to armaments, and the reduction of workers' living standards to finance the armaments drive, there is a severe slump in the consumers' goods industries and rising unemployment in all important capitalist countries. The Western European countries are in a particularly difficult situation. They must import expensive raw materials, many of them from the United States or other countries of the "dollar bloc," in order to carry out their armament programs. At the same time, they are unable to market abroad sufficient manufactured goods to finance these imports.

In particular, United States markets are constantly curtailed by new import restrictions. Revived West German and Japanese competition means that more capitalist countries are competing for ever-narrowing markets. The Socialist third of the world is largely cut off by restrictions on West European trade imposed under the terms of the North Atlantic Pact. As a result, West European countries are losing their gold reserves and face the threat of a new round of currency devaluations.

In the United States also, the enormous arms program has aggravated the economic contradictions of capi-

talism.

The world peace movement is subjecting the Atlantic Pact Alliance for aggression to increasing strain. The fires of the colonial-liberation struggle flare up in one country after another, in all continents. Also in the United States, whose rulers form the spearhead of world reaction, the expressions of popular sentiment for peace become more open and more effective, albeit still insufficiently organized.

Under these pressures, rifts within the imperialist camp are becoming deeper. The conflict between the British and French capitalists and the U.S. capitalists over policy toward Germany, the Korean War, international trade, and other issues are expressed more openly. And within the United States tactical differences between groupings of the war-bent monopoly capitalists are developing. The struggles of the working class against lower living standards and unemployment are increasing in Europe and in the United States.

In the Soviet Union, the People's Republic of China, and the Peoples Democracies of Europe, on the other hand, conditions of rapidly developing peace economy continue to prevail, with expanding international trade, and visible improvements in the living conditions of the people, as exemplified by the major reduction in prices of foodstuffs put into effect in the Soviet Union two days before the Conference began.

ATTITU  
CONF

The In  
ference  
erity of  
ments th  
nobody c  
of peace  
create c  
internati  
the war  
Governm  
to the C  
of its a  
State De  
ment d  
America  
to the  
Tucker,  
ment by  
merce of  
firms.  
still und  
the tim  
delegati  
capitalis  
tive pol  
tend.

The c  
States f  
ference's  
few per  
would  
the pres  
create s  
single A  
dare to  
four di  
Chicago  
In add

## ATTITUDES TO THE CONFERENCE

The International Economic Conference provided a test of the sincerity of the claims of all governments that they want peace. For nobody denies that the development of peaceful international trade helps create conditions for relaxation of international tension, helps alleviate the war danger. The United States Government took a hostile position to the Conference from the moment of its announcement. Secretary of State Dean Acheson issued a statement discouraging attendance by American businessmen. According to the syndicated columnist Ray Tucker, Acheson organized the statement by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce opposing participation by U.S. firms. The Japanese Government, still under formal U.S. occupation at the time, refused passports to the delegation of prominent Japanese capitalists, economists, and conservative political figures planning to attend.

The commercial press in the United States freely predicted the Conference's failure, insisting that very few persons from capitalist countries would attend. The clear attempt of the press in the United States was to create such an atmosphere that not a single American businessman would dare to attend the Conference. But four did attend, from Philadelphia, Chicago, and the San Francisco area. In addition, a sizeable U.S. trade-

union contingent attended, bringing back valuable information about job possibilities through trade with the socialist world, and about workers' conditions in the U.S.S.R.

The Governments of the Atlantic Pact countries in Europe also formally opposed the conference, acting in obedience to their war-pact obligations to Washington. However, the ruling groups of the West European countries were interested in the conference. No serious obstacles were placed in the way of the large number of important businessmen who wished to attend.

Official frowns from the Churchill Government did not prevent the attendance of a British delegation of 32, including half a dozen Tory and Laborite members of Parliament, a dozen businessmen, as well as trade-union delegates and economists. Sir John Boyd-Orr, former head of the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization, played a leading role at the Conference. Joan Robinson, best-known disciple of the British economist and banker, Keynes, was another active delegate.

A number of governments of less developed and dependent countries gave official or unofficial support to the Conference, including the Governments of Brazil, Argentina, India and Iran. The rising anti-imperialist struggles in these countries force the governments to examine all possible avenues for finding markets not controlled by the United States, British, and French monopolies, and all

possible sources for the purchase of capital goods needed for independent economic development.

From these countries came important government officials, as well as leading industrialists and bankers.

The Government of the U.S.S.R. gave full cooperation to the Conference. Thus, Moscow was chosen as the conference site because only the Soviet Government guaranteed visas to all delegates from all countries. The facilities provided by the Soviet Government were praised by the most hostile observers.

#### INTERNATIONAL TRADE PERSPECTIVE

Of profound significance was the speech at the Conference of M. V. Nesterov, president of the U.S.S.R. Chamber of Commerce. He stated the consistent thesis of Soviet leaders, that "differences in economic systems need not be a hindrance to international cooperation among nations." He stated that the foreign trade of the U.S.S.R. now amounts to over 18 billion rubles a year, three times the pre-war rate in comparable prices. This is a most impressive contrast to the situation in the capitalist countries, where the volume of international trade is scarcely higher than that of 1938.

Nesterov then set forth a detailed proposal of the enlarged trade that Soviet business organizations were prepared to conduct with capitalist countries—"based upon equality of

parties and mutual advantage, that the interests of both parties are respected, and that no economic or political conditions are imposed."

Nesterov proposed to raise the total trade of the U.S.S.R. with capitalist countries to 30 or 40 billion rubles in the next two or three years, or to 10 or 15 billion rubles per year, compared with a maximum postwar volume of 5 billion rubles in 1948. He estimated that this proposed increased trade would mean jobs for 1,500,000 to 2,000,000 additional workers in the capitalist countries.

The Soviet spokesman then spelled out this proposal in terms of individual countries and areas of the world—purchases of manufactured goods and sale of raw materials to Western Europe and the United States; purchases of raw materials and sale of sorely-needed capital goods to Southeast Asia, the Near and Middle East; and increased trade with Latin America.

The Chinese spokesman advanced similar details for expanded trade with capitalist countries, envisaging about half the volume of trade spoken of by Mr. Nesterov for the U.S.S.R. The Peoples' Democracies also advanced concrete proposals for expanded trade. Poland, for example, offered to increase her exports of coal to northern and western Europe, which suffer from chronic coal shortages, from 10 million tons to 17-18 million tons per year.

The proposals brought out certain vital points:

1. The  
viet U  
as a w  
where  
the dec  
The U  
ternatio  
in the p  
systems  
Now f  
such tra  
cannot  
depend  
out gre  
socialist  
out:

The  
ments  
larly a  
country  
disappe  
tries, si  
trade, v  
merce v  
of recip

The  
ern E  
only be  
and th  
tor tow  
of We  
omy; t  
living  
Wester

2. T  
peacefu  
econon  
foreign  
sumers  
the liv

1. The economic might of the Soviet Union, and of the socialist world as a whole, has grown to the point where its commerce is potentially the decisive factor in world trade. The U.S.S.R. has always offered international trade as a main element in the peaceful coexistence of the two systems of capitalism and socialism. Now for most capitalist countries such trade is a vital necessity. They cannot maintain or restore their independent economic existence without greatly expanded trade with the socialist world. Mr. Nesterov pointed out:

The problem of balancing their payments with the dollar area is particularly acute for most West European countries. Much of its acuteness would disappear if the West European countries, side by side with their American trade, were to resume and develop commerce with Eastern Europe on the basis of reciprocal commodity deliveries.

The economic difficulties of Western Europe, discussed above, can only be eased by "East-West trade," and that trade can be a decisive factor towards a temporary stabilization of West European capitalist economy; towards an improvement in the living conditions of the people of Western Europe.

2. The growing strength and peaceful orientation of socialist economy makes possible its use of foreign trade for the import of consumers' goods, directly increasing the living standards and amenities

of life of the peoples in the socialist countries.

Prior to World War II, and during the post-war reconstruction, the U.S.S.R. restricted its imports from capitalist countries, in the main, to industrial equipment and raw materials. With limited financial resources, every ruble available for foreign trade had to go to buy those things needed to increase the economic might of the U.S.S.R., to supply the equipment vital for the long-run radical improvement in living conditions, and for the safeguarding of the Soviet Union from foreign attack.

Now the Soviet Union has much greater reserves for foreign trade. It can supply itself with all necessary kinds of industrial equipment, and a broad range of raw materials. So, Mr. Nesterov was able to say: "In contradistinction to previous years, Soviet foreign trade organizations might, in particular, if the terms and conditions are suitable, purchase textiles, leather goods, food products and other items of general consumption to a considerable value and in increasing volume."

The Polish Professor, Jozef Chalasiński, made a similar offer, and the People's Republic of China offered to buy huge quantities of textiles from Britain, towards which end some contracts were concluded at the Conference itself.

The offer to purchase consumers' goods was one of the big sensations of the Conference. It gives a perspec-

tive to the worst-hit industries of the capitalist world, particularly the idle textile mills of Lancashire. It drives another nail into the coffin of the big lie sponsored by the war makers that the U.S.S.R. is busy preparing for war at the expense of living standards.

3. The delegations from the less developed countries were stirred by the Soviet offer to supply the countries of Southeast Asia, the Near and Middle East with three billion rubles' worth of machinery and equipment in the next two or three years; and in addition to render technical assistance in the design and construction of industrial enterprises, power plants and irrigation systems. And the offer, was "based," as Mr. Nesterov said, "on respect for national sovereignty and non-interference in domestic affairs."

They could not help contrasting this with the much-advertised "Point Four program," under which the United States government spent up to the end of September of last year the munificent sum of \$15 million, with no visible effects in helping any country.

The scale of the Soviet offer gives the countries of Asia a perspective for the same pace of development now being experienced by the Peoples' Democracies and the People's Republic of China—in so far as foreign trade can contribute to such development.

4. The United States has a special stake in trade with the socialist world. Mr. Nesterov offered to pur-

chase 4-5 billion rubles of goods from this country in the next two or three years. This amounts to about one-fourth of Mr. Nesterov's total import proposals from capitalist countries, and is larger than the proposed purchases from any other single capitalist country. Considering that the Soviet proposals were equalled in total by those of the Peoples' Democracies and the Chinese People's Republic, it may be estimated that the total purchases in the United States included in the offers would come to about two and a half billion dollars in the next two or three years. Returning trade unionists envisaged hundreds of thousands of jobs from this trade. And these would be jobs in industries devoted to peace, not war.

It has been the fashion on the part of big businessmen and government spokesmen here to disdain Soviet trade possibilities. We are doing fine with armaments orders, they say in effect—and if we were to trade with the Soviet Union, then we might lose the armaments orders.

But the war economy boom has brought only hardship to the working class and the Negro people; and it is losing its attractiveness to large circles of the capitalist class. The leading financial publications are in agreement that consumer markets have shrunk, that capacity has been over-expanded, that a severe crisis of overproduction threatens, even while big war expenditures continue. Employment of factory workers has al-

ready d  
the past  
are no  
omy as  
capitalis  
than ev  
try firm  
The  
Union  
of the  
many c  
jobs "if  
EFFEC

The  
ference  
cause o  
being  
accomp  
its clea  
would  
the m  
capital  
peacefu  
standa  
bolden  
are op  
drive f

The  
belief  
gesture  
constru  
impro  
trade"  
confer  
or to s  
the ro  
In t  
West  
mous  
restric



ready dropped almost 400,000 over the past twelve months. War orders are not spreading through the economy as had been anticipated by the capitalists, but are monopolized more than ever by a handful of war industry firms.

The generous offer of the Soviet Union gives American workers part of the answer to the fears which many of them have of losing their jobs "if peace breaks out."

#### EFFECTS OF THE CONFERENCE

The International Economic Conference was a great victory for the cause of world peace and the well-being of the peoples. The practical accomplishments of the Conference, its clear offer of a perspective that would immediately relieve some of the most pressing problems of the capitalist world, its evidences of peaceful intent and rising living standards in the Soviet Union, emboldened peace advocates and all who are oppressed by the Wall Street drive for world domination.

*The Times* of London indicated belief that the Conference was "a gesture of conciliation"; that "a more constructive effort may be made to improve relations by expanding trade"; and "that the object of the conference was not to score a point or to sow dissension but to keep open the road to a better understanding."

In the wake of the Conference, the West German Parliament, by unanimous vote, demanded an end to U.S. restrictions on East-West trade. In

Italy, the Milan Chamber of Commerce denounced the U.S. limitations on this trade. Eleven countries, emboldened by the opportunity to shift to trade with the socialist world, protested or took counteraction against U.S. Government restrictions on world trade. In the United States, despite the flood of hostile official propaganda, important industrial groups began to "leak" their fears that the Europeans who attended the Conference would get the trade that they themselves desired.

The syndicated columnist Ray Tucker, writing on April 14th, notes that "many industrialists who hate and distrust the Stalin regime" question Acheson's opposition to the Conference, and fear that Acheson's "widening of the abyss between the West and East is short-sighted policy . . . they see no harm in discussing a possible exchange of goods with Moscow . . . *the business community, or a large part of it, suggest somewhat timidly that trade agreements might pave the way for a more far-reaching understanding on ideological issues.*" (Berkeley, Cal., *Gazette*)

The pro-war press raged against the Conference, and sought ways to frustrate its efforts. But they could not hide its effectiveness. *Business Week* (April 12, 1952) admitted: "Observers who tended to pooh-poo the conference as just another passing propaganda fair are now revising their estimates." The bland Soviet offers to increase business

through the Iron Curtain sounded good to many nations worried about new dollar crises and the recession in world trade, annoyed by Washington's restrictions on East-West trade and by U.S. tariff walls."

The very hostile correspondent, A. Wilfred May, executive editor of the *New York Commercial and Financial Chronicle*, attended the Conference, alone of the several Western capitalist correspondents who were invited. In his interviews he could not deny the rising living standards in the Soviet Union, or the desires of the Soviet people for peace. Nor could he deny the significance of the Conference. In an editorial for the *Commercial and Financial Chronicle* (April 17) he wrote: "In any event, let not the implications and agitation stemming from the Conference be belittled. Neither the economic strategy displayed here nor the political maneuver toward Germany are laughing matters!"

For the pro-war camp the success of the Conference is little short of a tragedy. It greatly sharpens the contradictions which beset the aggressive North Atlantic Pact alliance.

The *Wall Street Journal* reporter, Ray Cromley, quotes a State Department official as saying: "It's an even bigger threat to the U.S. than Russia's proposals for a German peace. It can do a lot of damage" (April 15).

What an unconscious revelation!

According to Cromley, the officials fear that the peoples of Europe and

Asia will be convinced that the Soviet Union is not "so warlike" as U.S. propaganda has claimed, that the Soviet trade initiative and its initiative for peace in Germany "could put the skids on rearmament in the West." They fear that Asian delegates, including conservative businessmen, will be "deeply impressed" by what they see in the Soviet Union, and that the "West's present loose unity against Russian moves would be weaker than it is now." "So far," they add, "we don't seem to be able to think of anything to do to counter it."

Since the end of the Conference the Administration has tightened up its embargo on imports from the Soviet Union, the Chinese People's Republic, and the Peoples' Democracies. The main losers from this were U.S. importers who stood to suffer millions in losses on goods coming mainly from Hong Kong, already paid for, and bought under the import rules in effect at the time. Actually, the new regulation is so designed that it will keep out a lot of goods from other countries, as well as from the ostensible targets.

Then, on May 1, an exporter, Victor Samaan, was arrested on charges of selling machinery bearings to a Swiss company which allegedly resold them to Czechoslovakia. All this supposedly happened three years ago, but Samaan faces up to 83 years in jail and a fine of \$370,000!

Beginning on April 28, the State Department placed a ban on all travel

to the U  
ples' De  
the rest  
a numb  
already  
Moscow  
out notit  
(New Y  
Aches  
nounced  
sued to  
he didn'  
That di  
drops th  
to make  
can busi  
deal wit  
it impos  
make su  
which st  
myth us  
imports  
Howe  
ures can  
confirm  
antagon  
icy whic  
Asian c  
with the  
oppositi  
They ca  
isolation  
ship wh  
thatred c  
its atom  
its "wor  
pression  
tion.  
The i  
tion at  
Confere

to the U.S.S.R., China, and the Peoples' Democracies. "Enforcement of the restrictions seemed necessary after a number of United States citizens already abroad attended the recent Moscow economic conference without notifying the State Department." (*New York Times*, May 2.)

Acheson hypocritically had announced that passports would be issued to those who wanted to go, but he didn't think it a good idea to go. That didn't work. Now Acheson drops the mask of liberality, and tries to make it impossible for any American businessman to conclude a trade deal with the U.S.S.R., tries to make it impossible for trade unionists to make surveys in the Soviet Union which shatter the "slave labor camp" myth used as an excuse for barring imports from the Soviet Union.

However, these repressive measures cannot prevail. They can only confirm the growing suspicions and antagonisms towards U.S. official policy which are moving European and Asian countries to increased trade with the socialist world, to increased opposition to Pentagon war schemes. They can only intensify the political isolation of the Wall Street dictatorship which has already earned the hatred of hundreds of millions with its atomic bombs, its germ warfare, its "world leadership" in colonial repression and the bulwarking of reaction.

The initiative of the Soviet delegation at the International Economic Conference marks a new outstanding

contribution of Soviet diplomacy to the cause of world peace. Together with the Soviet initiative towards the peaceful unification of Germany, it demonstrates to the world who it is that stands for peace in action, not in words alone. It exposes to the world who is driving for world war at all costs, strips away the lying propaganda about "Soviet aggression" which the warmakers use to cover their evil plans. It recalls the words of Joseph Stalin: "Those who want peace and seek business relations with us will always have our support."

#### RESPONSIBILITY OF

#### PROGRESSIVE FORCES IN U.S.

The growing strength of the peace forces reflected in, and further enhanced by, the International Economic Conference gives no ground for complacency among the ruling class in the United States. The "menace" this represents to the Pentagon war plans may be seen in the vehemently antagonistic reaction from Washington.

The peace forces in the United States can take advantage of the International Economic Conference to broaden and improve the organization of the peace camp in this country. The issue of trade with the socialist world is a main link between the fight for peace and the fight for the economic interests of the people. If that link is firmly grasped, hundreds of thousands and millions of trade

unionists, large numbers of small and medium business men, can be won for the cause of peace.

In this country, we see, for example, that the Progressive Party has placed the issue of trade with the Socialist world prominently in its economic program for the 1952 election campaign. The International Union of Mine, Mill and Smelter Workers took the initiative in developing a broad movement in the Connecticut Valley to solve the problem of growing unemployment in the brass industry and other Connecticut industries. Representatives of AF of L and CIO unions, of fraternal and religious organizations, Chambers of Commerce, and the leading politicians of the State participated in a significant conference held the week of April 7th—that is during the International Economic Conference in Moscow. This Connecticut conference called for an end to the Korean War, for the reduction of armaments, for world wide trade on a peaceful basis to provide markets and solve the growing unemployment problem. Following the conference, a large delegation representative of all sections of the population went to Washington to present the conference program to Congress and Government officials.

The equivalent results can be achieved in many other places, and through the initiative of many other organizations. This applies, not only to centers of the metal industries, but to light-industry centers as well,

where unemployment is especially severe. And here also foreign trade can be a factor. Just as the United States can share in socialist orders for machinery and equipment, so can it share in orders for textiles, hosiery, and apparel, and other consumers' goods which will fit into the program of ever-rising living standards in the world of socialism.

This International Conference gives flesh and blood to the Lenin-Stalin principle of the possibility and necessity of the coexistence and peaceful competition between the capitalist and socialist sectors of the world.

Clearly of the essence of the whole peace fight in the United States is the demand for the abolition of existing barriers to normal world trade, especially between the United States and the Soviet Union, the People's Republic of China and the Peoples' Democracies in Europe.

If the problems of a given community are analyzed concretely, if the ways by which peace economy and peaceful foreign trade will make jobs are worked out in dollars and cents and numbers of jobs, it is possible boldly to raise the question of trade, and to build such broad movements as were developed at the Connecticut conference.

In the last analysis, only such people's actions right here, in the United States, can force the war makers to negotiate, to let down the barriers to trade, to reduce the burden of armaments and relax the threat of war.

Peop  
Polit  
By A.

Since  
Bolshev  
tant ar  
widely  
countri  
transla  
Affairs  
fers on  
cance  
the Ed

MARXIS  
ence. I  
riches  
new fo  
Lenin  
stresse  
ism cr  
crete p  
they v  
and ro  
in poli  
An  
struggl  
emanci  
ist-Len  
ness ar  
transiti  
ism. "I  
tie his  
future  
lution,  
ods an

# People's Democracy as a Form of Political Organization of Society

By A. Sobolev

*Since its first appearance in the Bolshevik, October, 1951, this important article has been reprinted and widely discussed in a number of countries. We present this study, translated in its entirety for Political Affairs, because of the analysis it offers on a question of major significance and interest to our readers—the Editor.*

MARKISM-LENINISM is a creative science. It develops, perfects itself, enriches itself with new experience, new formulas and deductions. V. I. Lenin and J. V. Stalin repeatedly stressed the need of applying Marxism creatively in resolving the concrete problems of the working class; they vigorously opposed dogmatism and rote in theory and trite methods in politics.

An exceedingly great role in the struggle of the working class for its emancipation is played by the Marxist-Leninist tenet concerning the richness and variety of the forms of the transition from capitalism to socialism. "Marx," wrote Lenin, "did not tie his hands, nor the hands of the future fighters of the socialist revolution, in regard to the forms, methods and means of the upheaval, un-

derstanding perfectly what a multitude of new problems would then arise, how much the entire situation would change in the course of the upheaval, how often and how greatly it would change in the course of the upheaval."<sup>1</sup>

Lenin and Stalin have shown that the forms, methods, means and tempo of the transition from capitalism to socialism might and would vary under different concrete historical conditions. Lenin stated outright: "All nations will come to socialism, this is inevitable; but they will all come to it in not quite the same features, to this or that form of democracy, to this or that variant of the dictatorship of the proletariat, to this or that tempo of the socialist transformation of various aspects of social life."<sup>2</sup>

The revolutionary creativeness of the working class of our country brought into existence the Soviets as the state form of the dictatorship of the proletariat. Lenin and Stalin have disclosed the great international significance of the Soviets, the advantages of this, the highest, most

1 V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, 4th Russian edition, vol. 32, p. 316.

2 V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, 4th Russian edition, vol. 32, p. 316.

perfect form of the dictatorship of the proletariat as against any other form of revolutionary power. At the same time Lenin and Stalin pointed out that there could be also other state forms of the dictatorship of the proletariat. "The Soviets," Stalin declared at the sixth congress of the R.S.D.L.P.\* (B.), "are the most expedient form of the organization of the working class struggle for power, but the Soviets are not the only type of revolutionary organization."<sup>3</sup>

The regime of People's Democracy in the countries of Central and Southeastern Europe is a new type of state organization of popular power. The example of the countries of People's Democracy confirms the correctness of the theoretical position of Lenin and Stalin regarding the international significance of the dictatorship of the proletariat as the essence of different political forms in the period of the transition from capitalism to socialism. Comrade Stalin teaches that the regime of People's Democracy in the countries of Central and Southeastern Europe exercises the functions of the dictatorship of the proletariat and that the People's Democracy states constitute one of the forms of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

People's Democracy as a new form of the political organization of society could and did arise in the concrete historical situation, first of all

in view of the existence of the mighty Soviet Union, in the conditions of the further accentuation of the general crisis of capitalism, the sharpening of all the contradictions of imperialism, the growth of the labor movement in the capitalist countries and the intensification of the national liberation struggle of the peoples in the colonial and dependent countries, and with the relation of forces on the international arena radically altered in favor of socialism.

The decisive role of the Soviet Union in the emergence of People's Democracy consists in the following:

First, the Great October Socialist

ing: Revolution split the world into two systems, inflicted upon capitalism a mortal wound from which it cannot recover, and ushered in the epoch of the collapse of capitalism.

Secondly, the steadfast development and strengthening of the socialist system, generated by the October Revolution, have further undermined the pillars of imperialism. The building up of socialism in the U.S.S.R. constituted a new powerful blow at world capitalism.

Thirdly, as a result of the victory of the Soviet Union in World War II and the smash-up of the aggressor states, Germany, Japan and Italy, capitalism was dealt another powerful blow. The system of imperialism emerged from World War II immeasurably weaker than it had been before the war, while the sys-

\* Russian Social-Democratic Labor Party—ed.  
3 J. V. Stalin, *Collected Works*, Russian edition,  
vol. 3, p. 178.

tem of  
powerf  
that th  
against  
Soviet  
on the  
in favor  
capitali  
tion of  
for the  
popula  
Thus  
racy as  
govern  
numbe  
Asia v  
Octobe  
buildin  
U.S.S.R  
the Sov  
fascist  
peoples  
Hitleri  
After  
many  
popula  
tries w  
severe  
imperi  
fused t  
reactio  
wish t  
reactio  
rule th  
—their  
mined  
began  
of the  
in the  
the col  
dom,

tem of socialism emerged much more powerful, notwithstanding the fact that the main burden of the struggle against fascism was carried by the Soviet Union. The relation of forces on the international arena shifted in favor of socialism and against capitalism. This signifies the creation of more favorable prerequisites for the struggle and victory of the popular masses in Europe and Asia.

Thus, the rise of People's Democracy as a new state form of popular government and its triumph in a number of countries in Europe and Asia were prepared by the Great October Socialist Revolution, by the building up of socialism in the U.S.S.R., and by the heroic feats of the Soviet people, who smashed the fascist aggressors and liberated the peoples of Europe and Asia from the Hitlerite and Japanese oppression.

After the defeat of Hitlerite Germany and imperialist Japan, the popular masses in a number of countries who had passed through the severe school of the anti-fascist, anti-imperialist, liberation struggle, refused to entrust their destinies to the reactionaries; the masses did not wish to live in the old way. The reactionary classes were unable to rule these countries in the old way—their positions had been undermined and weakened. A new round began of the liberation movement of the working class and all toilers in the capitalist countries, and of the colonial peoples for national freedom, for democracy and socialism;

the struggle developed for the establishment of People's Democracy.

The rise and development of People's Democracy must be examined in the concrete historical conditions, for People's Democracy passes through different stages, and, depending upon the stage, its class content changes.

The first stage is that of the agrarian, anti-feudal and anti-imperialist revolution, in the course of which People's Democracy arises as the organ of revolutionary power, representing in its content something akin to the dictatorship of the working class and peasantry, with the working class in the leading role. The characteristic feature of this power consists in that its sharp edge is directed against imperialism, against fascism.

The second stage is that of the establishment of the dictatorship of the working class in the form of People's Democracy and of building socialism.

\* \* \*

In the countries of central and southeastern Europe, People's Democracy was born as a result of their liberation from German fascist oppression, and as a result of the heroic struggle of the working class and all toilers, against the forces of imperialist reaction and for democracy. The Soviet Union, through its victories, created the prerequisites for the triumph of People's Democracy

and thereby assisted the toilers of these countries to overthrow the old regime and to establish a new order. What did this assistance consist of?

First, the Soviet Army was the direct liberator of these countries from the fascist enslavement.

Secondly, the Soviet Union brought to nought the designs for Anglo-American intervention with regard to the countries of central and southeastern Europe, and thus saved them from a new imperialist—Anglo-American—oppression.

Thirdly, the Soviet Army smashed the allies of Hitlerite Germany, the armed forces of Romanian, Hungarian and Bulgarian fascist reaction, and this naturally facilitated the victory of People's Democracy in these countries. The presence of Soviet troops prevented the reactionary forces from launching civil war.

Fourthly, the Soviet Union extended immense moral and political support to the countries of People's Democracy, and helped them to strengthen their international position. Of great importance was the economic aid. The Soviet government helped these countries with equipment and raw materials for industry and food supplies for the population, etc.

Finally, the Soviet Union has assisted and is assisting the toilers of these countries with its rich experience in social reformations.

Such were the external conditions of the rise of People's Democracy. Let us pass to an examination of the

internal developments in different countries which determined the victory of People's Democracy.

After occupying Europe, the German fascists deprived the European nations of their independence, introduced slave labor in the plants and workshops, restored serfdom, and commenced the physical annihilation of whole peoples. In the situation which developed as a result of Hitler's aggression the working class of the fascist-enslaved nations was faced with new tasks. The basic content of the struggle of the laboring masses in these countries was national liberation, the destruction of fascism and its consequences, the elimination of slavery and serfdom introduced by the fascists. Fascism became the main obstacle on the path of the historic development of the enslaved countries. Unless they destroyed fascism, the peoples of central and southeastern Europe could not move forward. Therefore, the defeat of fascism was the main strategic task of that period.

The struggle against the Hitlerite invaders, for freedom and national independence, merged indissolubly with the democratic struggle against the native fascists, against the native landlords and big bourgeoisie, who supported the German fascist occupationists.

In its historical significance and content, this struggle represented a popular-democratic revolution. It was directed against the imperialist oppression by German fascism and

against  
geoisic  
revolu  
the bo  
the sa  
the us  
lution,  
it was  
had a  
ist cha  
Dur  
class i  
southe  
the lea  
Work  
of im  
remna  
The  
to the  
worki  
was  
strug  
of ro  
to def  
work  
partic  
battle  
tion  
Th  
erful  
comp  
lectu  
and p  
the p  
the v  
tive  
firm  
antr  
stead  
An  
occu



against the landlords and big bourgeoisie. In the final analysis, this revolution should be classified as of the bourgeois-democratic type. At the same time, it was broader than the usual bourgeois-democratic revolution, it transcended its limits, since it was directed against fascism and had a clearly expressed anti-imperialist character.

During that period the working class in the countries of central and southeastern Europe fought, under the leadership of the Communist and Workers parties, for the liquidation of imperialist oppression and of the remnants of feudalism.

The alignment of forces conformed to the character of the revolution. The working class could be and indeed was the leader of the anti-fascist struggle; no other class was capable of rousing the masses of the people to defeat fascism. At the head of the working class were the Communist parties, which had been tested in battle and had proved their devotion to the people.

The working class forged a powerful anti-fascist coalition, which encompassed the peasantry, the intellectuals, the urban petty bourgeoisie and part of the middle bourgeoisie. In the period of the anti-fascist struggle the working class, through its initiative and leadership, brought about a firm fighting alliance with the peasantry, an alliance which became steadily broader and stronger.

Among the exploiting classes a split occurred during that period. One

part, the landlords and big bourgeoisie, lined up with the German fascists. Another part, namely, a section of the middle bourgeoisie, joined the anti-fascist coalition.

The establishment of People's Democracy signified the destruction of the supremacy of the landlords and big bourgeoisie and the transfer of power to the people headed by the working class. In its content, this power constituted something akin to a dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry, with this distinction, however, that it was born in the struggle against fascism and that its sharp edge was directed against imperialism, against fascism. The leading and guiding force of People's Democracy from its inception was the working class, headed by the Communist parties, and this imparted revolutionary content to this power and assured the subsequent transition of the countries with People's Democracy to the socialist path of development.

All of these facts, while showing the decisive role of the Soviet Union in the origin of People's Democracy, at the same time categorically refute the Anglo-American slanders about "foreign intervention."

In analyzing the anti-imperialist, anti-feudal stage in the development of this struggle, we must take account of the difference between agrarian countries (Roumania, Albania, etc.) and countries with a relatively high industrial development (as Czechoslovakia). This determined

certain specific features in the process of events in each country, but did not change their common anti-imperialist, anti-fascist content.

After the defeat of fascism and establishment of People's Democracy the working class in the countries of central and southeastern Europe was faced with the urgent tasks of liquidating the remnants of feudalism, that is, of completing the bourgeois-democratic revolution.

The tasks of this revolution were successfully solved in the first period; the agrarian reform was carried through, the feudal-serfdom vestiges were uprooted, the monarchy was abolished where it had still existed. It took a year or a little longer to liquidate the remnants of feudalism in the European people's democracies. The defeat of fascism, the overthrow of the rule of the big bourgeoisie and landlords and the transfer of the land to the peasants resulted in the strengthening of the leading and directing role of the working class in the countries of central and southeastern Europe, and the leading role of the working class, as Stalin teaches, is the embryo of the dictatorship of the proletariat, a transition step towards it. Thus was created the possibility of the transition to a new stage, the stage of the socialist revolution.

In order to safeguard and fortify the gains of the people it was necessary to inflict a complete political defeat on the bourgeoisie. Having its own parties, its press, its repre-

sentatives in the government, in the legislative bodies and state apparatus, holding commanding heights in the national economy, and abetted by the international imperialist forces, the bourgeoisie waged an active struggle for the overthrow of the People's Democracy, sabotaged all economic measures of the People's Democracy's state, hatched one counter-revolutionary plot after another, and energetically engaged in organizing disruptive saboteur groups.

In the course of a prolonged and tense struggle the working class in the Peoples' Democracies exposed the treacherous conduct of the bourgeoisie, unmasked the traitorous, undermining and spying activity of its leaders, achieved the political isolation of the bourgeoisie, fortified the alliance with the peasantry, and on this basis inflicted on the bourgeoisie a decisive defeat and dislodged it completely from power.

As the forces, consciousness and organized strength of the working class increased, as it fortified its tie with the toiling peasantry, the popular-democratic revolution began to grow over into a socialist revolution. The process of growing over took up a more or less prolonged segment of time; in the political sphere the problems of the socialist revolution were definitely resolved approximately in 1947-48. This growing over was assured by the hegemony of the working class in alliance with the peasantry, by the leading and guiding role of the Communist and

Worker  
People's  
The  
Europe-  
mocracy  
conditio  
ditions  
tion of  
and ad  
The  
ples' D  
under  
nist an  
movem  
from b  
by tho  
which  
ing cla  
an inte  
that, st  
state a  
new, I  
paratu  
The  
indust  
broke  
capital  
dated  
within  
the P  
trated  
ing he  
the f  
banks,  
A v  
strugg  
ist rev  
bourge  
mover  
great  
Demo

Workers parties in the system of People's Democracy.

The socialist revolution in the European countries of People's Democracy proceeded in very favorable conditions; it took place in the conditions of a radical shift in the relation of forces in favor of socialism and adverse to capitalism.

The socialist revolution in the Peoples' Democracies was carried on, under the leadership of the Communist and Workers parties, as a broad movement of the popular masses from below, supported from the top by those links of the state apparatus which were in the hands of the working class. It was in the course of an intense struggle against reaction that, step by step, the old, bourgeois, state apparatus was scrapped and a new, People's Democracy state apparatus was created.

The nationalization of large-scale industry, the banks, railways, etc., broke the economic might of the capitalists in the cities and liquidated the material base of reaction within the country. The states of the Peoples' Democracies concentrated in their hands the commanding heights of the national economy, the factories and workshops, the banks, railways, foreign trade, etc.

A very important element in the struggle for the victory of the socialist revolution was the routing of the bourgeois agency within the labor movement. The bourgeoisie placed great hopes on the Right Social-Democrats. It is perfectly clear that

the splitting of the labor movement, the existence of a bourgeois agency within it, weakened the working class. The Communist and Workers parties smashed the ideological positions of the Right Social-Democrats and won over the rank and file members of the Social-Democratic parties and their Left leaders; thus they achieved the liquidation of the split in the labor movement and created unitary parties of the working class on a Marxist-Leninist foundation. The creation of the unitary workers parties, enhancing the leading role of the working class, facilitated the broadening and strengthening of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

As a result of the radical political and social-economic reforms, People's Democracy in the countries of central and southeastern Europe entered the second stage of its development, the stage of the dictatorship of the proletariat and the building of socialism.

Marxism-Leninism teaches that the class content of the transition period is the dictatorship of the working class. While they point out the historical inevitability and necessity of the dictatorship of the proletariat in the transition period, the classics of Marxism-Leninism at the same time stress the possibility of a variety of state forms of the proletarian power. "The transition from capitalism to communism," Lenin wrote, "cannot but bring a great abundance and variety of political forms, but with all that the essence will inevitably be

the same: *dictatorship of the proletariat*.<sup>4</sup>

The regime of People's Democracy in the countries of central and south-eastern Europe is, in its content, a state form of the dictatorship of the proletariat, a socialist state in the first phase of its development.

The basic task of this period is to suppress the resistance of the overthrown classes, organize the defense of the country against attacks by the imperialist aggressors, strengthen the ties with the proletarians of all countries and first of all strengthen the friendship with the land of victorious socialism—the Soviet Union, develop the national economy, fortify the alliance of the working class with all the toilers, urban and rural; draw the masses into the building of socialism; and create the conditions for the liquidation of the capitalist elements.

The state of People's Democracy fulfills all the functions of the socialist state in the first phase of its development. The regime of People's Democracy is the principal weapon in the building of socialism.

Of enormous significance for the countries of People's Democracy is the experience of the Soviet Union in overcoming the capitalist elements and liquidating the exploiting classes, the experiences of the entire struggle for the triumph of socialism in the U.S.S.R.

Comrade Stalin armed the Com-

munist Party of the Soviet Union with instructions concerning revolutionary vigilance, concerning methods of fighting the enemies and masked enemies, the agents of the capitalist encirclement sneaking into its ranks. These instructions of Comrade Stalin are of invaluable assistance to the brother Communist parties.

Of exceptional importance for the creation of the new social order in the countries of central and south-eastern Europe is the economic and scientific-technological assistance from the Soviet Union.

The Soviet Union is of great help to the regime of People's Democracy in the fulfillment of its external functions. The Soviet Union is that power which paralyzes the economic pressure of the imperialists on the Peoples' Democracies, destroys the political and diplomatic intrigues of the ruling circles of the United States and Britain against these countries, and brings to nought the interventionist plans of international reaction.

Such are the conditions which secure for the regime of People's Democracy the functions of the dictatorship of the working class.

A characteristic feature of the political life in the countries of People's Democracy is the multi-party system. In all European countries of People's Democracy, with the exception of Albania, not one but two or more parties share in the building of a new life. The governments in the

<sup>4</sup> V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Russian 4th edition, vol. 25, p. 385.

countries of People's Democracy comprise representatives of several parties or civic-political organizations. It has already been proven by experience that the regime of People's Democracy can fulfill the functions of the dictatorship of the proletariat when several parties exist, but with the necessary condition that the vanguard of the working class, the Communist Party, is the leading and guiding force of the State. The Communist Party leads the other parties, influences these parties and guides them in the direction of socialism.

The Peoples' Democracies in Europe have entered the period of the building of socialism, and their economy is of a transition character.

To begin with, these countries have three forms of property: national, socialist property of means of production; cooperative property, which is basically socialist; private property of means of production, which is of two types—property of toiling peasants and artisans based on personal toil, and capitalist private property based on exploitation.

The existence of several kinds of property determines the multi-system character of the national economy. In each of these countries there are three main socio-economic systems; socialist, small-commodity, and capitalist. The socialist sector has become predominant in industry and is the leading sector in the national economy. Lastly, an important characteristic feature in the economy of

the transition period is the fact that in the people's democracies there are still in existence exploiters (the bourgeoisie, kulaks), that exploitation of man by man has not yet been uprooted.

The socio-economic structure of the European Peoples' Democracies in the main resembles the socio-economic structure of the U.S.S.R. in the transition period. The people's democracies are going through a "N.E.P." period, but in different, more favorable conditions.

Regarding the question of the road of socialist construction, a bitter struggle developed in the countries of the People's Democracy. The bourgeois nationalists and Right opportunists, seeking to prevent the building of socialism, denied the importance of the dictatorship of the working class and of the role of the Communist and Workers parties in the struggle for socialism; they propounded the idea of the subsidence of the class struggle.

The C.P.S.U. (B.) and Stalin personally helped the Communist and Workers parties in the Peoples' Democracies to determine the class content of the regime of People's Democracy and the laws of the transition to socialism. Relying on the help of the C.P.S.U., using the great works of the founders of Marxism-Leninism, and assimilating creatively the experience of Bolshevism, the Communist and Workers parties routed the Right opportunists and the bourgeois nationalists. In the

course of the struggle against the Right opportunists and bourgeois nationalists it was proven that the laws of the transition from capitalism to socialism, which were discovered by the founders of Marxism-Leninism and verified in the experience of the building of socialism in the Soviet Union, operate also in the countries of People's Democracy. The specific features in the development of these countries can and do arise only on the basis of the general laws of the transition from capitalism to socialism, which are valid for all countries.

An essential condition for the building of socialism is the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat in one or another state form, since the tasks of destroying the old, capitalist system and creating the socialist system can be carried through only by the working class in possession of state power.

Marxism-Leninism teaches, and the experience of the Bolsheviks has confirmed, that the building of socialism takes place in bitter class struggle, for the capitalist elements are not willing to retire voluntarily from the scene of history. In all countries of People's Democracy, the overthrown, exploiting classes supported and directed by the American and British imperialists, seek to restore their lost supremacy, resorting for this purpose to the most varied methods of struggle. The regime of People's Democracy copes successfully with the task of suppressing

the resistance of the bourgeoisie, exposes the counter-revolutionary plots, cleans out the nests of espionage, disruption and sabotage, and carries on a vigorous struggle against bourgeois ideology.

A very important condition for the development of the Peoples' Democracies is planfulness in the national economy. The principal economic-political objective of the plans undertaken by the European countries of People's Democracy is the building of the foundation of a socialist economy. In carrying out this task, the Communist and Workers parties in these countries, guided by Marxism-Leninism and the experience of the C.P.S.U., focus their attention on the creation of socialist industry as the material base of socialism, and first of all on developing heavy industry which produces means of production.

Marxism-Leninism tells us that without the socialist transformation of agriculture the problems of the building up of socialism cannot be solved. While they point out to the peasantry the only correct path, the path of cooperatives, the Communist and Workers parties in the Peoples' Democracies at the same time warn against needless haste and insist that all organizations engaged in the work of promoting cooperatives must strictly observe the principle that peasants join the cooperatives voluntarily and must take into account the concrete conditions.

The establishment of People's Democracy, the destruction of the rule

of the  
achieve  
indu  
radica  
the to  
the n  
ploitat  
elimin  
have b  
Unem  
elimin  
cies. T  
sive a  
the ex  
the ru  
to im  
peasan  
rency  
create  
cultur  
rise in  
worke  
Lea  
tion c  
Lenin  
tant, s  
is una  
class  
lems  
Comm  
the co  
are fo  
devele  
as M  
guide  
A  
cessfu  
mocr  
ship v  
a vita  
ing s

of the exploiters, and considerable achievements in the development of industry and agriculture have assured radical changes in the situation of the toiling masses. As a result of the nationalization of industry, exploitation of the workers has been eliminated in those enterprises which have become the property of the state. Unemployment has been completely eliminated in the people's democracies. The agrarian reform and extensive aid by the state have restricted the exploitation of the peasantry by the rural bourgeoisie, and have led to improvements in the life of the peasants. The reinforcement of currency in circulation, and the increased output of industry and agriculture have made possible a tangible rise in the standards of living of the workers, peasants, and intellectuals.

Leadership for socialist construction can come only from a Marxist-Leninist party. Without such a militant, steeled party the working class is unarmed and cannot cope with the class enemy, cannot solve the problems of socialist construction. The Communist and Workers parties in the countries of People's Democracy are fortifying their positions and are developing as parties of the new type, as Marxist-Leninist parties which guide the building of socialism.

A decisive condition for the successful advance of the Peoples' Democracies towards socialism is friendship with the Soviet Union. This is a vital necessity for countries building socialism; it is a manifestation

and development of the principle of proletarian internationalism.

Reaction understands the exceeding importance of friendship with the U.S.S.R. for the fortification of the Peoples' Democracies, and it tries by all means to undermine this friendship, to separate the Peoples' Democracies from the Soviet Union, and endeavors to implant and disseminate the baneful ideology of bourgeois nationalism. Bourgeois nationalism is the main danger for socialist construction in the countries of People's Democracy. The struggle against bourgeois nationalism is a principal political task of the Communist and Workers parties.

Severance of friendship with the Soviet Union inevitably results in the liquidation of People's Democracy, as was demonstrated by the developments in Yugoslavia. The Tito-Rankovich clique of spies which ruptured the friendship of Yugoslavia with the U.S.S.R. and carried through the transition from bourgeois nationalism to fascism, has destroyed the gains of the Yugoslav people, established a fascist regime and brought Yugoslavia into the camp of the Anglo-American instigators of war.

The defeat of the bourgeois nationalists in Poland, Bulgaria, Albania, Romania, Hungary and Czechoslovakia signifies the collapse of the reactionary designs which aimed at severing the countries of People's Democracy from the camp of peace, democracy and socialism.

The working class in the Peoples'

Democracies has a mighty, socialist ally in the Soviet people, which extends to them direct support in the struggle for socialism. In the steadfast strengthening and extending of the friendship with the Soviet Union the working class in the Peoples' Democracies has a full guaranty that it will succeed in coping with all difficulties and in building up socialism.

Such are the general laws of the transition from capitalism to socialism in the European People's Democracies.

\* \* \*

Lenin and Stalin proved that capitalism has long since become overripe, that it has played out its historical role. The transition from capitalism to socialism, while identical in its content in all countries, is effected in each country in its own way, depending on the concrete historical conditions. Lenin emphasized that owing to the existence of national and state differences between various countries and peoples, it is necessary to the emancipation struggle of the working class in different countries to take account of the specific national features in different countries. The leaders of the international labor movement insist that full account must be taken of the concrete conditions, of the specific historical situation, they vigorously object to stereotypes and dogmatism in the solution of political questions, they call for exercising maximum flexibility in tactics and for utilizing in the struggle for the emancipa-

tion of the working class and all toilers all old and new forms of public activity.

It is especially important to find the forms of the transition or approach to socialism in conformity with the historical conditions.

At present, the emancipation struggle of the working class in the capitalist countries is developing in the conditions of the economic and political expansion of the American imperialists, of national betrayal by the ruling classes, of the ever mounting threat that these countries would be forcibly drawn into an aggressive war against the camp of peace, democracy and socialism. In this situation, the Communist parties in the capitalist countries consider as an urgent task the struggle against American expansion, against the aggressive policies of the imperialists, for national freedom and independence, for world peace and security.

This struggle is closely interwoven with the general democratic movement of the laboring masses against reaction, for the maintenance and extension of democratic liberties, for broad social reforms. The expansionism of the United States, the preparations for an aggressive war, the attacks on the democratic rights and liberties, the fascisation of the political life—all of these are links in a single chain. Obviously, it is impossible to liquidate national enslavement, the subjection of the Marshallized countries to American imperialism, to uphold their indepen-

dence, to  
the road  
decisive  
internal  
and lanc  
reactiona  
policies.  
The  
dence, s  
opment  
general  
tasks. F  
the Com  
talist co  
for the  
the broa  
the fight  
depende  
In con  
the poli  
uniting  
regime  
asures  
urgent  
to socia  
The  
mocracy  
question  
Britain  
of the  
"The  
The ba  
that of  
the pat  
transfo  
ist basi  
sharp  
cratic s  
leaders  
of the  
to the



dence, to preserve peace and block the road to fascism, without dealing decisive and successive blows to the internal enemies—the monopolists and landlords, who inspire the most reactionary internal and external policies.

The tasks of winning independence, securing a democratic development and preserving peace are general national, general democratic tasks. For their successful solution, the Communist parties in the capitalist countries intensify the struggle for the masses, they strive to unite the broadest strata of the people in the fight for peace and national independence.

In contemporary conditions one of the political forms for rallying and uniting all democratic forces is the regime of People's Democracy, which assures a progressive solution for all urgent questions and opens the road to socialism.

The significance of People's Democracy for the solution of basic questions for the development of Britain is disclosed in the program of the British Communist Party, "The British Road to Socialism." The basic question of the program is that of the building of socialism, of the paths, forms and methods for the transformation of Britain on a socialist basis. The program subjects to sharp criticism the so-called "democratic socialism" of the Labor Party leaders, denounces the traitorous role of the Labor government in relation to the working class and the sub-

servience of the Right laborites to the bourgeoisie. Life has demonstrated that the chatter of democracy and socialism by the Laborite leaders has in reality proved to be a fraud and deception, that the Right Laborites have nothing in common with socialism or the interests of the working people.

Exposing the reactionary character of the domestic and foreign policies of the Laborite henchmen of the bourgeoisie, the program of the British Communist Party shows that only the transition to socialism can assure a radical, truly progressive solution of the urgent social, economic and political problems of the country. Stressing the historical inevitability and vital necessity of the socialist development of Britain, the Party declares that the decisive political question in the struggle for socialism is the question of power. "The people cannot advance to socialism," the program states, "without real political power, which must be taken from the hands of the capitalist minority and firmly grasped by the majority of the people, led by the working class."

After showing that socialism alone can lead Britain to prosperity, can save it from oppression by the United States and lead it out of the war camp, can secure the free fraternal association of the peoples of the British empire, the program at the same time defines the path for the socialist development of Britain. Taking account of the experience of the

working class in the countries of central and southeastern Europe in the struggle for socialism, the British Communist Party draws the conclusion that in the present conditions the establishment of Soviet power is not obligatory for the building of socialism, that there is a different road to socialism, the road of People's Democracy, which accords more with the historical conditions of Britain. The program declares outright that Britain's road to socialism is by way of People's Democracy.

"The British Communists declare," the program reads, "that the people of Britain can transform capitalist democracy into a real People's Democracy, transforming Parliament, the product of Britain's historic struggle for democracy, into the democratic instrument of the will of the vast majority of her people. . . ."

As the program points out, the victory of People's Democracy will mean the transfer of power from the hands of a tiny section of monopolists into the hands of the immense majority of the people, led by the working class. The establishment of People's Democracy will make it possible to end the power of the monopolists by means of socialist nationalization of large-scale industry, the banks, and large landed property; it will make it possible to create a strong, free and independent Britain, to secure peace, liquidate the imperialist oppression of the colonies, transform the present Empire into a

free association of peoples with equal rights, destroy the political power of the capitalist class and effect fundamental changes in the structure of the state.

The program states that in the struggle against the arbitrary power of the capitalists the working class can win a parliamentary majority and on this basis establish a People's Government. Once the People's Government is in power, fundamental change would be effected in the structure of the state, aimed at the democratic transformation of the state institutions, at transforming them to conform to the interests of the people. Parliament is retained but will be transformed, and in this changed form will be part of the state structure of People's Democracy.

A basic condition for the establishment of a People's Democracy is the formation of a broad coalition of the laboring people under the leadership of the working class. The program declares:

"The essential condition for establishing such a people's power is the building up of a broad coalition or popular alliance of all sections of the working people; of the organized working class, of all workers by hand and brain, of professional people and technicians, of all lower and middle sections in the towns, and of the farmers in the countryside."

The need of building a broad popular coalition is referred to in a number of documents of the Com-

munist p  
Our p  
"stemm  
necessity  
tion of  
structure  
claimed  
of accor  
by mean  
of vario  
currents  
The e  
People's  
result of  
cratic f  
under t  
class. S  
carrying  
in the  
culture,  
the han  
tioning  
dom a  
ment o  
ing cla  
ing of  
only o  
struggl  
who sp  
weaker  
Peop  
people  
portan  
movem  
penden  
that a  
ian, an  
lution  
tries u  
a Peop

with Communist parties of France and Italy. Our policy, Togliatti declared, "stemmed from the conviction of the necessity of a profound transformation of the economic and political structure of our country, and it proclaimed at the same time the need of accomplishing this transformation by means of the broad collaboration of various social groups, ideological currents and parties."

The establishment of a regime of People's Democracy is possible as a result of the victory of a broad democratic front of all laboring people under the leadership of the working class. Such leadership insures the carrying out of fundamental reforms in the sphere of industry and agriculture, the shifting of power into the hands of the people and its functioning effectively, and national freedom and independence. Enhancement of the leading role of the working class presupposes the strengthening of its unity, and this is possible only on the basis of a consistent struggle against the Right socialists, who split the working class and thus weaken it.

\* \* \*

People's Democracy as a form of people's power is of present-day importance for the national liberation movements in the colonial and dependent countries. The facts show that at the present time the agrarian, anti-feudal, anti-imperialist revolution is developing in these countries under the banner of fighting for a People's Democracy.

The Chinese revolution is an example of the transformation into living reality of Lenin's and Stalin's tenets concerning the policies, strategy and tactics of the Communist parties in the agrarian, anti-feudal and anti-imperialist revolutions in the colonial and dependent countries. The victory of the Chinese people was prepared by the whole course of the historical development.

The Great October Socialist Revolution weakened the capitalist system as a whole, undermined the dominion of imperialism in the colonial and dependent countries, ushered in the era of colonial revolutions carried on in the oppressed countries of the world under the leadership of the proletariat, and showed to the peoples of these countries a realistic, effective path for their liberation from imperialist and feudal oppression. "The salvos of the October Revolution," Mao Tse-tung wrote, "brought us Marxism-Leninism. The October Revolution helped the progressive elements of the world, and of China as well, to apply the proletarian world outlook in determining the fate of the country and in reviewing their own problems. The conclusion they reached was that we must advance along the path taken by the Russians."<sup>5</sup>

Of exceptional importance for the Chinese revolution was the victory of the Soviet Union in World War II. Owing to the defeat of the Ger-

<sup>5</sup> Mao Tse-tung, *On People's Democratic Rule* (New Century Publishers, 1950), pp. 3-4—ed.

man-fascist and Japanese aggressors, the system of imperialism was further weakened, its positions in the colonies were still more undermined, the forces of the Chinese revolution were strengthened and the liberation struggle intensified in all colonial and dependent countries.

Mao Tse-tung wrote:<sup>6</sup>

Had there been no Soviet Union, had there been no victory in the anti-fascist Second World War, had Japanese imperialism not been defeated (which is particularly important for us), had there been no People's Democracies in Europe, had there been no growing struggle of the oppressed countries of the East, had there been no struggle of the masses in the United States, Britain, France, Germany, Italy, Japan and other capitalist countries against the ruling reactionary cliques—had none of these factors existed, then the pressure of the international reactionary forces would, of course, have been much stronger than it is today. Would we have been able to achieve victory in these circumstances? Of course not. So, too, it would have been impossible to consolidate victory after it had been achieved.

The Chinese revolution is of an agrarian, anti-imperialist, anti-feudal character. It is directed against the foreign, imperialist oppression, against Chinese feudalism and against the Chinese big bureaucratic, compradore bourgeoisie, which has close ties with the foreign imperialists.

As Stalin pointed out, the Chinese revolution, while it is bourgeois-

democratic, is at the same time a revolution of national liberation whose sharp edge is directed against the foreign imperialists, an anti-imperialist revolution which merges with the world-wide revolutionary movement of the working class against imperialism. Thanks to the leading role of the working class, it transcends the limits of a bourgeois-democratic revolution.

In the course of the anti-imperialist and anti-feudal revolution the working class built up a united front of the democratic forces, comprising the working class, the peasantry, the urban petty bourgeoisie, the intelligentsia, and the national bourgeoisie. The organizing, leading and directing force in the united front is the working class, headed by its vanguard, the Communist Party, the unshakable foundation of the united front is the firm alliance of the working class and peasantry.

Viewing the Chinese revolution as the confluence of two streams of the revolutionary movement — against feudal remnants and against imperialism, Stalin predicted the character of the power which would be established as a result of the victory of this revolution.

"I believe," Stalin said in 1926, "that the future revolutionary power in China will, in its character, resemble the power of which we spoke in our country in 1905, i.e., a dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry, but with this difference, that it will be predominantly an anti-im-

<sup>6</sup> Cited work, p. 7—ed.

perialist  
of tran  
to be  
opment

The  
ceed pr  
The re  
in Chi  
of the a  
revolut  
thing a  
workin  
Chinese  
of Peo  
stage o  
ple's D  
exercise  
ship of  
socialist  
immed  
effect.

future.  
that on  
econom  
built u  
requisit  
in con  
people,  
tasks o  
At pr  
ple's D  
toward  
bourge  
One of  
that of  
imperia  
in virtu  
feudal  
China

J. V. S  
tion in  
p. 31—

perialist power. It will be a power of transition to a non-capitalist, or, to be more exact, to a Socialist development of China."<sup>7</sup>

The developments in China proceed precisely as predicted by Stalin. The revolutionary power established in China as a result of the victory of the anti-imperialist and anti-feudal revolution is, in its content, something akin to a dictatorship of the working class and peasantry. The Chinese People's Republic is a state of People's Democracy in the first stage of its development. The People's Democracy in China does not exercise the functions of a dictatorship of the proletariat. In this stage, socialist tasks are not projected as immediate tasks and are not put into effect. They are a question of the future. Mao Tse-tung pointed out that only after a flourishing national economy and culture will have been built up, when the essential prerequisites will be extant, China will, in conformity with the will of its people, turn to the solution of the tasks of socialist construction.

At present the activity of the People's Democracy in China is directed toward the consummation of the bourgeois - democratic revolution. One of the tasks of this revolution, that of national liberation, the anti-imperialist task—may be considered as virtually achieved. But the anti-feudal tasks are not yet fully solved. China is now engaged in the broad

unfoldment of the agrarian revolution, in the process of liquidating the landlord property and establishing the peasant ownership of the land.

Since taking the path of People's Democracy the Chinese people have recorded momentous achievements. They have defeated and forced out the foreign imperialists and their Kuomintang henchmen. China has won its national freedom and independence. They have put an end to the political despotism of the big monopolists and feudals, and to the disfranchisement of the laboring masses; the power is now in the hands of the people. As a result of the agrarian reform, based on the principle that the land should belong to the tillers of the soil, the economic foundation of the existence of the landlord class is being liquidated.

The People's Democratic government confiscated the property of the foreign imperialists and of the Chinese compradore, bureaucratic bourgeoisie which has close ties with the foreign imperialists, and took into its own hands their factories, workshops, banks and commercial enterprises. As a result of this confiscation, China now has a state sector in its economy. At the same time the People's Democratic government is drawing in private capital for the rehabilitation and development of the national economy.

The successful solution of these tasks, which are of a general democratic character, will take up a more

<sup>7</sup> J. V. Stalin, "On the Perspectives of the Revolution in China," in *Political Affairs*, Dec. 1950, p. 31—ed.

or less considerable historical period of time and will produce all the essential conditions for the transition to the next stage, the building of socialism.

The experience of the Chinese revolution, the experience of the development of People's Democracy in China, is of great importance for the struggle of the working class and all working people in the colonial and dependent countries for their national independence, for the transition to the democratic road. The experience of the Chinese revolution is evidence that it is possible to win national freedom and independence, to put an end to the remnants of feudalism, only by means of the unification of all the democratic forces of the country under the leadership of the working class and that the most expedient form of State structure after the victory over the imperialists and feudalists is People's Democracy.

The tasks of the revolution in the colonial and dependent countries are indicated in the Program and election manifesto of the Communist Party of India. These programmatic documents formulate the fundamental task in the present stage of India's historical development, the realization of the anti-imperialist and anti-feudal revolution. As these documents point out, the enemies of the Indian people are the imperialists, the Rajahs and landlords, the big monopolists, financiers and big speculators, who are tied up with the

foreign exploiters.

The Communist Party of India has addressed a call to all the laboring sections of the population, the working class, peasantry, working intelligentsia, and to the middle classes and national bourgeoisie, to unite in a single democratic front in order to defeat the Anglo-American imperialists, win national freedom and independence, put an end to feudalism, and replace the present reactionary government with a government of People's Democracy.

The Communist Party points out that at present the tasks of socialism are not on the order of the day in India. It is necessary first of all to put an end to imperialist oppression and feudalism, to transfer the land to the peasants, to put an end to the anti-people's activity of the monopolists, big financiers and speculators, and to transfer the power into the hands of the people. Only after the accomplishment of these primary tasks, which will require considerable time, will it become possible to pose the question of the next stage of development. The program declares:

In the present stage of our development, the Communist Party is not demanding the establishment of Socialism in our country. In view of the backwardness of the economic development of India and of the weakness of the mass organizations of workers, peasants and toiling intelligentsia, our Party does not find it possible at present to carry out Socialist transformations in

our coun  
quite ma  
present at  
Governm  
People's i  
sis of a c  
feudal an  
country,  
seeing th  
ing land  
ecting o  
the comp  
of insuri  
country,  
of living  
ding the  
thus pla  
road to  
and inde  
In its

Political

our country. But, our Party regards as quite mature the task of replacing the present anti-democratic and anti-popular Government by a new Government of People's Democracy, created on the basis of a coalition of all democratic, anti-feudal and anti-imperialist forces in the country, capable of effectively guaranteeing the rights of the people, of giving land to the peasants gratis, of protecting our national industries against the competition of foreign goods and of insuring the industrialization of the country, of securing a higher standard of living for the working class, of ridding the people of unemployment and thus placing the country on the wide road to progress, cultural advancement and independence.<sup>8</sup>

In its essence, the Program of the

<sup>8</sup> *Political Affairs*, September, 1951, p. 60—ed.

Communist Party of India is an example of an immediate program for the struggle of colonial peoples in present day conditions. The realization of this program, the establishment of People's Democracy in India will open to the peoples of India the road to progress.

\* \* \*

The idea of People's Democracy has acquired great attractive force. It penetrates into the minds of the popular masses in the capitalist and colonial countries, rouses and rallies them to the struggle against the American imperialist enslavers and the native reactionaries, for national freedom, for the development and consolidation of democracy, for world peace, for Socialism.

## Some Problems of Work in Right-Led Unions, II

By John Swift

*The first installment of this two-part article appeared in Political Affairs in April—the Editor.*

The present situation in the labor movement makes it quite obvious that the movement for unity of action must first take form in the ranks of the workers themselves through a *united front from below*. This is true because only by moving the rank-and-file, only by getting them to grip the hands of their fellow workers in solidarity, can they consciously press for unity of action all along the line, local with local, union with union, culminating in organic unity itself.

But while stressing this as central and decisive, in fact, in order to best facilitate its success, we also must warn against a one-sided, mechanical over-simplification of this tactic of the united front from below. Such over-simplification arises from seeing the contradiction between the rank-and-file and the labor bureaucrats, but failing to see that these opposites also form a unity, without which the Right-wing led unions could not continue to exist. In other words, what we are saying is that

there is no hard and fast line that divides the leadership from the ranks.

In the first place, the leaders in order to remain leaders, dare not forget the class nature of the union they head and constantly must appear to be the champions of the workers' interests. This means that they endeavor to conceal their betrayal policies, indulge in militant speech-making, now and then denounce the "heartless avaricious profiteers," and periodically "lead" strike struggles. And these demagogic talents are needed by the bourgeoisie, even if at times it may think that its "boys" are going "too far," for how otherwise could these fakers continue to stay at the head of working class unions?

The other side of this coin is that the workers in large numbers also get sucked in by this deception. Nor should we idealize the workers. As long as their outlook is not influenced by the party of socialism, the Communist Party, so long is it inevitable that this outlook should tend to become petty, with narrow craft interests overshadowing general class interests. We must not forget that

this is  
a trad  
of the  
object  
of the  
to abo  
as obj  
formis  
sions,  
by cl  
credit  
ing"  
to the  
This  
taken  
for un  
rank-  
toward  
class  
leader  
think  
ers."  
to un  
tivate  
tions  
sale  
becom  
mind  
ciple  
The  
rank-  
must  
ment  
mand  
needs  
progr  
must  
in th  
dema  
ers.  
boliz



this is inherent in the very fact that a trade union, although a product of the class struggle, has but a limited objective, namely, to improve the lot of the workers *under* capitalism, not to abolish capitalism. Thus, so long as objective conditions enable the reformist leaders to "get" some concessions, the workers, too, are affected by class-collaboration ideas, giving credit for victories to the "bargaining" of their negotiators instead of to their own organized strength.

This actual state of affairs must be taken into account in the struggle for unity. It means that, while the rank-and-file workers are impelled toward unity of action by their very class conditions, even despite their leaders, they are not yet ready to think of unity as against their leaders. This means that any approach to unity which smacks of being motivated by anti-leadership considerations and which indulges in wholesale condemnations of leadership, becomes suspect immediately in the minds of the workers as unprincipled "power politics."

Therefore the movement of the rank-and-file for progressive policies must start out as a *positive* movement for something, for a *single* demand stemming from the immediate needs of the rank-and-file or for a *program* of demands. The fight must develop, not over individuals in the leadership, but around the demands and program of the workers. Of course, individuals may symbolize one side or the other in this

struggle, but always uppermost must be the program. Any failure to pursue such a policy can only prevent unity on the broadest basis and can only give to the labor fakers a weapon with which to combat the rank-and-file movement.

It is for this reason that we believe that a recent heading over a story in an outstanding progressive labor magazine was unfortunate because it was inaccurate. This heading read: "Anti-Reuther Forces Unite To Fight Lay-Offs, Speed-Up." In our opinion this heading puts the emphasis in the wrong place. The rank-and-file movement in auto cuts across the pro- and anti-Reuther lines. And it must do so to register its maximum effectiveness. If this movement comes into collision with Reuther, as it has and must, this is because Reuther stands in opposition to this program, and not the other way around. The rank-and-file movement must not permit the leadership to shift the issue to "for, or against, Reuther." Unless this is kept in mind, the rank-and-file movement can be wrecked. If it is kept in mind, the exposure of Reuther which is so necessary will be concrete and convincing and not mere name-calling.

\* \* \*

Another error customarily made is to assume that because a given union leadership is generally reactionary, that *all* of its proposals and actions are likewise reactionary. Were this the case, things would indeed

be simple. For then these fakers would be doing a good job of exposing themselves. But they are not that kind.

Things are much more complicated. Even reactionary labor leaders are forced to take progressive stands on one or another issue and for one or another reason. In the first place they must consider the rank-and-file. Then, periodically some of them become frightened that the fascist bell may toll for them, too. In still other instances, their position may reflect the *special* interests of that section of the bourgeoisie with which they have the closest contact. And lastly, their actions may be impelled by inner and inter-union careerist politics.

All these must be taken into account in determining tactics. But in so doing it must be remembered always that one progressive position does not make a progressive leader, any more than one or a dozen apples make an apple orchard. If this is remembered it will lessen the tendency to re-evaluate labor leaders every time they make a statement.

Our basic evaluation must rest on a solid foundation. This today is determined by the central issue, the issue of war or peace. A labor leader is a progressive to the degree that he stands for peace, not abstractly, but concretely—that is, for peace and co-existence with the Soviet Union. He is a reactionary to the extent that he stands for war—that is, supports the war drive of U.S. imperialism

and its anti-Soviet foreign policy.

No matter how militant a trade-union leader may sound on other questions, to the extent that he supports the war drive, he is a reactionary. This may not be evident at first sight but, in the last analysis, the position one occupies on this central question will determine his position on most other questions. It will determine how far he goes in fighting the wage freeze, what attitude he takes toward strikes, with what determination he fights for Negro rights, how seriously he approaches the emasculation of the Bill of Rights, what approach he takes to such things as speed-up, taxes, the high cost of living, corruption in government, red-baiting, etc.

It makes no difference how militantly he sounds off against the phony wage-stabilization and price-control programs (and there is not a labor leader who does not do so), this is all plain hogwash to the extent that he supports the so-called "defense program." For the thorns which labor reaps are of this tree. And when it comes to a showdown one must either take his stand for high war expenditures and a lower standard of living, or the other way around. This is one fence that cannot be straddled, and those who are trying to do so ought to be knocked off by the lance of the workers' ire.

All this is by no means obvious to the millions. Therefore when the reformist leader of a given union speaks up for smashing the wage

freeze  
take  
crite  
agree  
ceed t  
be do  
words  
propo  
in air  
to con  
portan  
worke  
sense  
and p  
motio  
in mo  
scious  
only s  
who s  
drag  
This  
union  
port  
the w  
have  
a few  
Presid  
ciation  
correct  
million  
incom  
are th  
Hayes  
that t  
which  
govern  
wages,  
becaus  
into a  
on the  
clusio

freeze, it would indeed be foolish to take the floor and call him a hypocrite. Instead, one should heartily agree with this need and then proceed to indicate what can and should be *done* to bring it about. In other words, progressive statements or proposals must not be left hanging in air. They must be pinned down to concrete, specific *actions*. The important thing is not to permit the workers to be lulled into a false sense of security by fancy words and promises, but to put them into motion. For only when masses are in motion, only when they are *consciously* heading somewhere, even if only short range, can they ascertain who stands in their way or tries to drag them back.

This means that progressive trade unionists must not hesitate to support proposals in the interests of the workers simply because others have initiated them. For example, a few months ago, A. J. Hayes, President of the International Association of Machinists, A. F. of L., correctly observed that forty-four million Americans now pay federal income taxes and that few indeed are the workers that escape them. Hayes went on to observe further that the B.L.S. cost-of-living index, which is the yardstick used by the government to determine the level of wages, is a "snare and a delusion" because it fails to take income taxes into account. He proposed a fight on the part of labor to force an inclusion of taxes in the cost-of-living

index and a corresponding increase in wages for the workers. This would range from ten to twenty percent on an average.

This proposal was immediately attacked by the *Washington Post* and by other big business periodicals who quoted President Truman's "Economic Report" to the effect that the government would consider it unpatriotic "for any group to seek to adjust its income upward, to counteract the higher taxes which the defense program is making necessary," for this, said Truman, "would tend to relieve that group from its share in the cost of achieving national security." To which Hayes replied that business always has relieved itself of its tax burden by passing it along in higher prices to the consumers and that therefore his proposal to shift the workers' tax load to the employers would not be any less patriotic, for after all, what is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander.

Now it is quite evident that Brother Hayes' proposal is not the most important plank in a progressive wage program, for it does not challenge the phony "national emergency" which is the *root* cause for the high taxes and high prices. Nor does it challenge the very *right* of the government to use this hot-house "emergency" to freeze wages *at any level*.

But it is likewise true that millions of workers who are not yet convinced that the emergency is phony are nonetheless incensed at the ex-

orbitant taxes that are gnawing at their family incomes and at the cynical refusal of the B.L.S. to consider this in its cost-of-living tabulations. Therefore the struggle for this *partial* wage demand is important. A militant, consistent fight for it would bring labor into collision with the war program and the Truman Administration as well as with the war profiteering monopolies.

\* \* \*

Just as progressive workers should support every partial demand which improves the lot of the workers, so should they take pride in whatever partial victories are won. It is a mistake to believe that such victories cannot and are not being won even in reactionary-led unions. Of course, every such victory has two sides to it: the positive side, that is, the improvement in the conditions of the workers; and the negative side, that is, the illusions that are cultivated in the minds of the workers that it may be possible to solve all their problems through such partial improvements and under Right-wing leadership.

Under no circumstances, however, can progressives counter-act this latter negative aspect by adopting a negative attitude either toward the struggle for partial demands or toward the victories won. Nor should they minimize the importance of these victories in the eyes of the workers, for contained within them

are the seeds of much greater victories. But such greater victories can come only if the workers learn the main lesson: the need for militant *struggle*, and for *united* struggle.

Unless such an approach is taken, the progressives will only facilitate the attempt of the Right-wing leaders to hog for themselves the full credit for the victory, ignoring the *decisive* role of the rank-and-file. Furthermore, such an error would only enable the reactionaries in the union demagogically to charge the Communists and progressives with being "agin' everything" just because they are not in leadership. Frequently this charge is made in unions in which the Left-wing did at one time hold leading positions. And yet, whatever gains the Currans and Quills win even today, are more due to their fear and the fear of the bosses of the influence of the Left-wing among the rank-and-file, than to their own militancy. For like Banquo's ghost, it still haunts them, but unlike this ghost, it is far more than an apparition.

The same careful approach is necessary when the progressives take the initiative in proposing partial demands and actions themselves. Just as a farmer does not raise *crops in general*, but very *particular crops*, related to his particular soil, climate, implements, experience and market demand, so workers do not support *demands in general*, but *particular demands*, best suited to their particular concrete needs. To switch meta-

phor  
the s  
not s  
Th  
try a  
econ  
rial t  
the in  
of u  
etc. C  
quent  
nism  
circum  
such c  
portur  
need f  
of gen  
a con  
uation  
rout o  
are th  
concea  
genera  
more  
cause  
the w  
standi  
and p  
which  
pressio  
We  
worker  
cost-of  
reading  
stantial  
the w  
true in  
ever, it  
ducing  
produc  
orbitan

phors, we must always be sure that the shoe fits the particular foot and not some other foot.

This means knowing one's industry and trade, knowing the concrete economic trends, the human material that make up the workers in the industry, their background, level of understanding and experience, etc. Of course, opportunists do frequently try to conceal their opportunism with pleas about "exceptional circumstances." But while rejecting such excuses and all excuses for opportunism, this does not deny the need for specific concreteness instead of general abstractness. In fact, only a concrete examination of every situation can effectively expose and rout opportunism. For great indeed are the specific opportunistic crimes concealed in the elephantine body of generalities! And concreteness is more necessary today than ever, because of the uneven development of the workers' experience and understanding, and because of the special and peculiar economic situation in which conditions of boom and depression live side by side.

We know, for example, that the workers are restive about the high cost-of-living and have shown a readiness to battle militantly for substantial wage increases and against the wage freeze. This is certainly true in general. In particular, however, it is more true in the war producing industries, where maximum production, full employment and exorbitant profits are all factors that

create the most favorable conditions for a mass break-through on the wage front.

This explains the mood of the steel workers. And while at the time this article is being written it is not yet certain as to what will happen in the steel wage dispute, one thing is certain: the workers in this industry have the strength, if they use their strike weapon, to smash the wage freeze and to compel the steel barons to give them a very substantial wage increase, even more than what they have asked for. But the only thing that prevents such an outstanding victory and will most likely result in a much smaller settlement which ties a wage increase to "productivity," that is, to increased speed-up, is Murray's class collaboration outlook in general and his support to the war program of monopoly capital in particular.

This mood for militant wage struggles also can be seen in what is shaping up in the oil industry. Here, on November 24-25, an unprecedented event occurred. Eighteen separate unions, including the C.I.O., A. F. of L., and a number of independent unions, gathered in national conference and worked out a "joint strategy to be pursued in current wage disputes," and "pledged that no union would settle for less than a 25 cents an hour general wage increase." Whether this agreement is strictly adhered to or not remains to be seen. What is clear, however, is that only the militant fighting

mood of the workers has made this united front possible.

At the same time, it would be mechanical, for example, to expect the workers in the textile and hosiery industries to react to the wage fight in the exact same way. For these industries are suffering from over-production, and the workers face mass unemployment and widespread part-time work. This of course, does not in any way exonerate the Rieves for their failure to demand a wage increase from the mill owners when the wage-reopener came up. For by bowing before the woolen and cotton magnates, they have since received the kicks asked for—in the form of arrogant ultimatums demanding wholesale wage-cuts and increased work-loads, or an abrogation of contracts.

But while having nothing but contempt for the miserable Rieve and his other Social-Democrats in leadership, one would be light-minded, indeed, not to see the concrete difference between the depression conditions in textile and the boom conditions in the war producing industries. If Rieve were a real fighter for the workers and not a lickspittle of the bosses, he would, of course, organize the workers for a militant fight against the war economy which is lowering living standards and thereby accentuating over-production and crisis in the consumer goods industries.

In industries such as textile, the fight against unemployment, for a

shorter work week *without reduction in weekly wage*, for \$60 a week unemployment insurance benefits, must be coupled with the fight against the high cost-of-living, for wage increases, for organizing the unorganized and for the preservation of the union.

Not even in a single industry like auto will the same demands receive the same response. In Detroit where unemployment has reached proportions which have brought soup kitchens into existence for the first time since the '30's, unemployment is, of course, a paramount issue. In other parts of the industry, where war contracts abound, however, there is a tight labor market and unemployment does not appear as the principal issue. Even in Detroit, in a plant such as Ford, the conditions of the highly skilled tool and die workers are quite different from those of the foundry workers, and therefore their demands will likewise vary.

Hence concreteness is essential to correct leadership. And this is true not only on economic issues, but on the questions of the struggle for Negro rights, for political action, or for peace.

Let us take the latter. It may not be possible to get a Right-wing led local union to take a stand in favor of a Big Five Peace Pact. But it may be possible to get the local to express itself in favor of a top level meeting of the big powers which the Gallup Poll shows 70 percent of the

An  
tia  
ver  
che  
bor  
and  
sity  
I  
affi  
pea  
to  
pea  
the  
or  
dut  
on  
is n  
ther  
ciou  
nin  
wor  
of p  
brea  
syste

W  
ther  
sepa  
and  
all,  
lead  
ers a  
a lo  
all t  
mon  
bure  
feren  
the r

American people want. Such an initial step forward on peace would be very important. It would begin to *change the atmosphere* inside the labor movement, making discussion and action on peace a patriotic necessity for a labor union.

Difficulties in the way of getting affirmative action on one or another peace proposal or issue cannot be used to excuse the failure to fight for peace. *Difficulties and obstacles are there to be overcome.* If one method or one proposal does not work, we are *duty bound* to try others and to *keep on trying*, until a positive beginning is made from which to move to further progress. And the same tenacious approach must be taken to winning jobs and upgrading for Negro workers and to finding the forms of political action that will begin to break labor away from the two-party system of monopoly capital.

\* \* \*

We have stressed the fact that there is no insurmountable wall that separates the leaders from the ranks and the ranks from the leaders. After all, where do the ranks end and the leaders begin? For there are leaders and *leaders*—a top, a middle and a lower stratum of leaders. While all these have something in common, that is, they are part of one bureaucracy, they also have their differences. Those who are closest to the ranks and most recently from the ranks feel more the breath of the

class struggle and pressures from the rank-and-file. They therefore form something of a transitional bridge from the ranks to the top leadership.

Hence, just as it is a mistake to see a Right-wing led union one-sidedly, so also is it a mistake to see the leadership one-sidedly. As the ranks struggle and exert pressure, so fissures, rifts and even chasms are created in the leadership. A close study of the leadership of nearly any Right-wing led local union, no matter how united and solid it may appear from a distance, will show that it is nevertheless torn by its own inner dissensions and differences. Even if from a subjective point of view, these rifts often appear as unprincipled personality clashes and factional struggles, objectively, however, they constitute a distorted reflection of the basic antagonism in the union—that between its class character and the needs of its membership and the class collaboration policies and bureaucratic caste interests of the top leadership.

Thus a *concrete* study of these differences is important, and individuals should not be lumped together for anything but purposes of general classification. It should be understood that many honest, progressive fighters and future Communists will come from the ranks of present-day local leaders of Right-wing led unions. For in many of these unions there are plenty of local leaders who "go along" with official policies be-

cause they see no practical effective alternative program. But they do not like it.

The same kind of a concrete approach must be taken toward different unions. It is a mistake to treat all unions and all union leaderships alike because they all voted for the same reactionary resolutions at an A. F. of L. or C.I.O. convention. Between such unions there may be great differences which are determined by many factors such as the nature of the industry, the composition of its workers, the percentage of skilled workers, the role of the Negro workers, the history and tradition of the workers, the structure of the union and its leadership, the composition of the leadership and particularly the role and influence of our Party.

There are, then, reactionary-led unions of varied levels and degrees. The leaders of one union are heading up the war parade, drumming up war hysteria, tooting their anti-Communist horns, and shrilly vying with the monopolists for the "honor" of being the most anti-Communist and anti-Soviet. There is, for example, the despicable act of William Green who outdid McCarthy by asking for no less than the expulsion of the Soviet Union from the United Nations!

But then there are the less vociferous paraders, the "shamefaced" go-alongers, the men with much "doubts" but little guts, who would like to be out of the parade but at the same time "in step" with the powers that be.

These differences frequently find their expression in the policies of different unions, on such questions as the degree of support for the war drive, whether to conduct a witch-hunt in their own union, how much rank-and-file expression is to be permitted, how militantly to fight economic grievances, etc. These, too, must be taken into account.

It must be recognized that just as there are no hard and fast dividing lines in nature and just as there are intermediary forms in both nature and society, so are there bound to be such gradations and shadings in the trade union movement. And these are of immense importance. The key thing for every Communist and progressive trade unionist to remember is to evaluate concretely every given situation *in all its process of motion*, with an eye precisely to grasping these elements in the situation which can *help* the process of change in a *progressive* and forward-moving direction.

To see unions statically is fatal, for nothing in life stands still, neither a Right-wing led union nor a Left-wing led union. If in a Right-wing led trade union there develops a "live and let live" attitude, one which enables greater freedom of action on the part of the rank-and-file, one which enables Left-wing and Communist workers to contribute their part to the union and its echelons of leadership, then this is a step forward, a break from the extreme Right-wing position and, therefore,

a wo  
If, h  
suc  
in N  
a "li  
the b  
this n  
ward  
Ob  
Righ  
wher  
and  
tions  
and  
chan  
quan  
its ex  
a dep  
expre  
in ar  
ment  
expre  
and n  
ness  
ers a  
leade  
the f  
loose  
and l  
Th  
that  
transi  
mean  
the s  
union  
  
To  
part  
ment  
comp



a welcome move to be encouraged. If, however, a progressive led local, such as the Warehouse Local No. 65 in New York City, comes forth with a "live and let live" creed toward the bosses and the warmongers, then this represents a dangerous step backwards, and more than a step.

Obviously also, in unions where the Right-wing has dictatorial power, where the victory of outright Left and Communist forces in local elections only results in head chopping and charter lifting, the process of change at the bottom will be more quantitative at first. It will first find its expression in a greater unity on a department and shop level. It will express itself in less rabid control and in an inclusion of more honest elements in the local leadership. It will express itself in greater democracy and militancy and in a greater awareness of the needs of the Negro workers and their fuller inclusion into leadership. It will express itself in the formation of a coalition, at first loosely formed, including progressive and Left-wing workers, etc.

The main problem is precisely that of finding the forms to this transition, the *concrete* ways and means by which to begin to change the situation in local by local and union by union.

\* \* \*

To achieve unity of action on the part of the American labor movement, does not require a leap from complete Right-wing to complete

Left-wing leadership. It must be achieved before then. Its requisite is not ideological unity. What it requires first and foremost is a readiness to put ideological differences aside in order to work together in behalf of a *single immediate objective* or a *number of immediate objectives*. Not even labor unity, in the sense of a single trade-union center, requires ideological unity. What it requires is the agreement that there is room *within one labor movement* for different ideological currents and for the conflict of views between them. It further requires that no individuals or unions should be excluded from the labor movement because of ideological differences and that the workers be given the *freedom to choose* between conflicting tendencies. And it requires above all, the recognition that *despite* ideological differences, the unions must work together and fight together around a minimum common program agreed upon.

The initiative shown by the I.L.W.U. and the Mine, Mill and Smelter Union, in the examples pointed out in the first installment of this article, indicate the decisive role which can be played by existing Left-led unions in the struggle for unity of action of all workers around a common program.

The struggle for unity of action on the part of workers in Right-led unions would be immeasurably strengthened if Communist and Left-progressive forces in the Left-led un-

ions would see their role as the most consistent fighter for unity in the entire trade-union movement.

If these Left-led unions would establish more effective co-ordination among themselves and project common programs of action reflecting the needs of all workers, and combine this with a day-to-day struggle for united action with workers in the C.I.O. and A. F. of L. on all levels, a new stage would be reached in the cause of labor unity.

Toward such labor unity every Communist must work with skill, determination and confidence. One thing is certain. The *changing* objective conditions will more and more favor the struggle for unity of action and labor unity. The monopolistic position of American imperialism in the post-war capitalist world has made it possible for it to continue to bribe a considerable section of workers with its immense super-profits. Thus the material basis for opportunism has continued in this country longer than anywhere else.

If the workers have thus far gone along with the armament drive and war program, even if passively, it was because of the illusion that material benefits in the form of full employment and a higher standard of living would be derived from it. Now, however, it is *beginning* to dawn on a larger mass of workers that this very war program is producing the opposite results—is the cause for high prices and high taxes, for speed-up, for growing unemployment and for lower living standards. Even the labor reformists cannot entirely hide this truth. Thus the material conditions of life will henceforth and at an increasing pace, help teach the workers the need for class solidarity and unity at home and for world labor unity.

But objective conditions, while primary, are not enough. What is needed is *conscious* and *skillful* struggle and guidance toward this end. This must start in the first place with every Communist worker, in his shop and in his local union.

lit  
ou  
co  
ar  
up  
fu  
of  
gi  
19  
ve  
the  
L.C.  
C  
wa  
So  
res  
ste  
Str  
tru  
wh  
the  
the  
tion  
felle  
con  
Mel  
are  
wea

## Notes on Recent Developments in the South

We present to the readers of Political Affairs these notes from various parts of the South on current conditions and developments in that area. The communications focus upon several important aspects of the fundamental Report,\* "The Effect of the War Economy on the South," given by Comrade James Jackson, in 1950, at the Fifteenth National Convention of the Communist Party—the Editor.

### LOUISIANA

One of the major objectives of the war economy, as applied to the South, is to lay bare the vast natural resources of this area to a merciless, stepped-up exploitation by the Wall Street monopolies. Especially is this true of a State such as Louisiana which is the second-largest oil and the largest sulphur producer in the nation. The Humble Oil Co. (a Rockefeller subsidiary); the Anglo-Dutch-controlled Shell Oil Co.; and the Mellon-Rockefeller-owned Texas Co. are tightening their grip on the wealth of the famous "tidelands" oil

area of Louisiana. Meanwhile, the Freeport Sulphur Co. gains more and more complete monopoly over the mining of that chemical, so important to the production of fertilizer, munitions, etc.

Local governments and chambers of commerce are offering Northern finance-capital all kinds of "incentives" to "locate in the South." For example, the State government recently granted the Kaiser Corporation a 150 million-dollar property tax exemption for its aluminum plant, which will not be completed until mid-1953.

This policy of slavish capitulation to Wall Street compels local and State governments to shift ever-greater tax burdens upon the backs of the workers, the rural poor, the middle class and small-business people.

The economic consequences to the masses of this policy is seen, in part, in a report issued by the Public Affairs Research Council of Louisiana. This report stated the average per capita income of Louisiana citizens in 1950 was \$1,002. This is identical with the 1948 figure! For the Negro people, the figure would be about 60 per cent less. *While Louisiana*

\* Published in *Political Affairs*, Feb. 1951, pp. 106-23.

*rates 39th in per-capita income, its population pays the highest per-capita tax in the Nation!*

## INDUSTRY

Lay-offs took place early last year at the huge Ethyl Corporation plant in Baton Rouge and, later in the year, in the cotton compresses and rice mills throughout many parts of the state. This unemployment was due to the introduction of machinery to replace manual labor at the unskilled stages of production, and thus speed-up total production. The Negro workers bore the brunt of this policy.

The period which Comrade Jackson calls the "plant relocation and construction phase" of the war-mobilization program, began about March of last year with the groundbreaking for the new Kaiser aluminum-reduction plant in New Orleans which, though yet incomplete, turned out its first "pig aluminum" in mid-December. Simultaneously, a 7½ million dollar expansion of the aluminum-ore extraction plant in Baton Rouge was started. This plant "feeds" the one in New Orleans and the "pig-aluminum" produced in the latter is then shipped to Baltimore to be used in the manufacture of airplane frames.

During the same period construction began on the Chrysler tank-engine plant and the International Harvester twine mill, both located in New Orleans. Chrysler will produce 750-horse-power tank engines

under a \$100 million war contract and the war-created scarcity of baler twine for the cotton industry has brought International Harvester to Louisiana. Likewise production is expected to start this year in Swift Company's new adhesive plant in New Orleans and in the Ethyl Corporation's new unit for the manufacture of insect poison (for agriculture) whose current war-inflated price will bring bigger profits to this Morgan-owned Company.

With regard to employment, Comrade Jackson observed that the re-conversion to a war-economy in the South could be accomplished by absorbing "the unemployed and semi-employed and those workers in 'non-essential' industries, without calling up the great manpower reserves among the Negroes, women and youth."

The accuracy of this observation is confirmed in the following statement by the New Orleans Chamber of Commerce: "New plants established brought to this area a total of some 8,385 new jobs" (*New Orleans States*, January 3, 1952). In an article on industrial tax exemptions the *New Orleans Times-Picayune* lists 15 companies whose new plants, worth \$9 million, provided the workers of Louisiana with a grand total of two-hundred and ninety new jobs! (*Times-Picayune*, January 10, 1952). Compare these with the announcement by the Louisiana Unemployment Compensation Board last April that 39,000 people were drawing

unem  
the i  
T  
perie  
leans  
Natio  
major  
raw  
and i  
stock  
"exp  
to K  
Th  
limite  
tion"  
World  
today  
the n  
tions  
statist  
Produ  
These  
of De  
totale  
sylvan  
than  
sippi  
pansio  
relocat  
area h  
drive.  
Senat  
siana,  
Senate  
recent  
ton C  
leans,  
crimme  
presen  
rather  
ports"

unemployment compensation, and the implication is clear!

The so-called "trade-boom" experienced by the Port of New Orleans (the second largest port in the Nation) arises from its role as a major importer of such strategic raw materials as tin, rubber, bauxite and iron, in American imperialism's stock-piling program; and as an "exporter" of tanks and ammunition to Korea and Western Europe.

The Wall Street strategy for the limited and lop-sided "industrialization" of the South, adopted during World War II, is being carried out today. This is evident not only in the names of the billionaire corporations referred to above, but in recent statistics released by the Defense Production Administration for 1951. These statistics state: "the expansion of Defense industry in Louisiana has totaled \$80,306,000." However, Pennsylvania alone had a total greater than Louisiana, Arkansas, Mississippi and Texas combined! Both expansion of existing industries and relocation of new industries in this area have been dictated by the war-drive.

Senator Allen J. Ellender of Louisiana, Dixiecrat Chairman of the Senate Agricultural Committee, in a recent address to the National Cotton Council meeting in New Orleans, campaigned against "big-government" and advised the delegates present to "cut production costs rather than press for farm-price-supports" and the Council President, in

a Press interview, stated the outlook for future mechanization was "grim" due to the "scarcity of copper, steel and other strategic materials" (*Times-Picayune*, January 29, 1952).

This should be quite embarrassing for the "liberal" bourgeois "experts" who have been busily making grandiose predictions concerning the future prosperity of the farm masses due to the further "mechanization" of agriculture by American capitalism!

#### SOCIO-POLITICAL RESULTS OF WAR ECONOMY

One of the more glaring, negative social consequences of the war economy is the obvious crisis in the building-trades industry. Despite the war-inspired plant construction and expansion program, "the total value of construction in New Orleans in 1951 was 35 per cent *less* than in the peak year 1950—and the outlook for '52 is a 60 per cent reduction compared with 1950. During the first eleven months of 1952 only 6 apartment buildings were constructed [in New Orleans] compared with 35 apartment buildings and one apartment hotel in 1950" (*New Orleans States* January 3, 1952).

Meanwhile, the rent in certain "low-income" housing projects has been increased by 35 per cent as of January of this year!

Old, worn-out school buildings are being patched-up when new ones are needed. This is especially true of the schools for Negro youth and

is the concrete reason behind the local N.A.A.C.P. petition to the Orleans Parish School Board for abolishing the jim-crow school system.

Upon this socio-economic background, the rat-race for the Governorship enters its second phase. I doubt if anywhere in our country does the fraudulent, class nature of bourgeois democracy express itself so obviously as in Louisiana. For who are the candidates in this "free" election? They are: *Carlos Spaht*, mouthpiece of the incumbent, tax-happy, Long machine; *Kenyon*, a judge from oil-rich Minden, who several years ago stated, in a radio address, that he "didn't want any n—r votes"; *Lucille Grace*, the candidate for the Dixiecrat Party; *McLemore*, a cattleman from Alexandria, who was tried for peonage in Federal Court in 1946; Congressman *Hale Boggs*, who boasts of the support given his candidacy by the Wood-Rankin Un-American Committee; *Dudley Leblanc*, a plantation landlord and owner of the "Hadacol" racket; *Dodd*, incumbent Lieutenant Governor under Long whose only claim to the governorship is that he has been in office for the past 4 years! The only person whose candidacy held any progressive meaning for the Southern masses was that of *Kermit Parker*, first Negro gubernatorial candidate since Reconstruction. Although Mr. Parker's campaign was rather poorly conducted, he received some 5000 votes, including votes in some of the two

dozen Parishes (Counties) where the Negro people have not yet won the right to register and vote!

As is to be expected, chauvinism is rampant. The most faithful peddlers of the "American Destiny" line are the hierarchy of the Roman Catholic Church. Every aspect of American imperialism's war program receives the blessings of these clerical-fascists, in the name of "patriotism" and "divine Providence." They are feverishly working to organize the peace sentiments among the Catholic masses (who are a majority here in Louisiana), divert them from the main stream of struggle for peace in our country into "safe" channels, and disarm them with demagoguery and obscurantist slogans.

The special demagogic approach made to Negro Catholics is the bourgeois-cosmopolitan line which emphasizes "we are all partners" in this "Crusade" to save the "free world and Western Christian Civilization."

The real status of the Negro people in this "partnership" is shown, to some degree, in the following notation which appeared on all tickets (except some 500) to the January 1, Sugar Bowl game in New Orleans: "This ticket is issued for a person of the Caucasian race and if used by any other person it is in violation of State law. Such persons shall be ejected without penalty or refund."

The Southern Bourbons of Louisiana, as elsewhere, have not neglected to back up their class-rule with armed force. Hundreds of thou-

san  
int  
tio  
Ch  
TK  
de  
Da  
flo  
TR  
T  
take  
con  
this  
such  
hap  
nific  
T  
conc  
won  
Dist  
Wor  
(Loc  
Leat  
Shell  
summ  
for t  
to a  
turn,  
work  
to jor  
cal—  
since  
tant l  
strug  
Ou  
cent  
yard v  
after  
month  
the R

sands of tax-dollars have been soaked into the construction of new National Guard Armories in Lake Charles and New Orleans last year. *The Armory in New Orleans was dedicated on "Confederate Memorial Day" and the Dixiecrat flag was flown alongside the American flag!*

#### TRADE UNION STRUGGLES

This report, brief though it is, must take note of the significant struggles conducted by certain trade unions in this State, during the past year. Two such struggles are unequaled, perhaps, for their militancy and significance, anywhere in the South!

The first we refer to is the strike conducted jointly by the Negro women shrimp-pickers (Local 209, Distributive, Processing and Office Workers) and the white fishermen (Local 6, International Fur and Leather Workers) at the Southern Shell Packing Plant in Gretna last summer. This strike not only won for the white fishermen their right to a contract but these fishermen, in turn, organized the white shrimp workers in the Southern Shell Plant to join the predominantly Negro local—which they had resisted doing since 1946. There are many important lessons for us to draw from this struggle.

Our second reference is to the recent victory won by the 1400 shipyard workers at the Todd Dry Docks after being on strike almost four months! They are all members of the Right-led Industrial Union of

Marine and Shipbuilding Workers, C.I.O. *Speaking of "busting the wage-freeze" these southern workers won 32c an hour wage increase!*

Who could seriously argue that these struggles are not the workers' reaction and resistance to the war-economy?

#### ON THE PARTY

Our District has taken note of the many political, organizational and ideological weaknesses referred to in Comrade Jackson's report and with the assistance of the Southern Regional Commission of our Party we are actively working to correct these weaknesses.

F. Y.

#### ALABAMA

Comrade Jackson in his report at the Fifteenth National Convention dealt with the question of the effects of the war economy on the South in great detail. His report was outstanding and comprehensive. I have read and studied it and would suggest that every comrade read and reread it, especially the comrades responsible for work in the South. For the tempo of the war drive by the bipartisan Truman Administration and the Wall Street war-mongering ruling class with their huge military expenditures in preparation for an all out war against China and the Soviet Union have proven Comrade Jackson's report to be correct and sound.

Since December 1950, the tempo

of the war drive has brought untold economic misery to the Negro and white sharecroppers and tenant farmers and workers in the South. This is seen in the increasing unemployment among the Negro workers in many of the basic industries in the South. For example, the Reynolds Metal Company in Listerhill, Alabama, and the huge Tennessee Coal & Iron Co. of Bessemer and Ensley of that State, are working around the clock on war allocation orders for steel but are not hiring any of the unemployed job hunters, especially Negroes. Part of this, in relation to Negroes, is because of the jim-crow policy and terror that is carried out by the white supremacist landlords with their organized K.K.K. This is to drive the Negro worker back to the rural farmland.

Their policy has the support of the Truman war government. The nearly two-year old war in Korea and the huge military preparation for an all-out war have not given to the masses of Negro and white workers in the South employment but have intensified exploitation of workers in the plants that are producing for war. This has increased their struggle against job discrimination and segregation. These attacks against their living standards through greater tax burdens have intensified their struggle against war and the fascist-like terror taking place in the South. Also the Truman war program would slam the door to any and all further social and political progress if it is

not arrested by the masses of Negro and white workers and particularly the masses of workers, farmers and sharecroppers in the South.

The rural masses are the hardest hit by the Wall Street-Dixiecrat government. Their policy is to take over, drive the rural masses off the land. The greater portion of this land is being used today to raise white-face cattle for government purposes to supply the armed forces at home and overseas. The landlords are renting the land to the government. The landlords have moved to small towns and cities, opening small business establishments which do not employ Negroes and only employ a small number of whites. Others are working in plants that are producing war material. These landlords are leaving on the land a few Negroes to take care of the property. In some cases these few Negroes are given the right to grow some crop.

Another factor is the importation of Puerto Ricans and Mexicans in that part of the country to work on the farms for \$30 a month with room and board. These factors have created conditions where hundreds and thousands of small tenant farmers and sharecroppers no longer have the right to rent or work on farms as sharecroppers but are searching for and taking jobs in saw mills where the pay is \$6 a day. This has caused unrest among the rural masses and resentment against the Puerto Ricans and Mexicans. This unrest must be organized and the

rese  
mus  
the  
Tru  
with  
the  
econ  
porte  
work  
Ou  
thes  
to fi  
Puert  
work  
farm  
and  
urban  
their  
the  
struct  
area  
masse  
ers' u  
ership  
in or  
woul  
war a  
in the  
strugg  
place.  
sound  
tempo  
their  
with  
organ  
Louis  
This  
hundr  
Its le  
sional  
that t



resentment against the newcomers must be eliminated by explaining to the Negro farm workers that the Truman Wall Street war program with its white supremacy policy is the cause of the worsening of their economic conditions and not the imported Puerto Rican and Mexican workers.

Our comrades' attitude toward these conditions in the rural area is to fight for unity of Negro and Puerto Rican and Mexican farm workers and to unite all the poor farmers and sharecroppers, Negro and white, with the workers in the urban centers, in the struggle for their economic needs and against the Truman war program of destruction. Our comrades in the rural area feel that the majority of the masses can be organized into a farmers' union. Our Party must give leadership and help to our comrades in organizing any movement that would advance the struggle against war and fascism. Great opportunities in the South are opening up for mass struggle far beyond what has taken place. This will take place with good sound leadership with the rising tempo of the Negro masses as in their struggle for the right to vote, with the Voters League a growing organization in Alabama, and in Louisiana, Georgia, Tennessee, etc. This Voters League consists of hundreds and thousands of Negroes. Its leadership comes from professionals and this must be changed so that the leadership will be of the

working class. Our comrades must not isolate themselves from these movements but become a part of them and play their vanguard role.

N. J. R.

### TEXAS

The drive toward World War III and the resulting war economy in the United States has brought more industrialization to Texas than to any other Southern state. As of January 20, 1952, the Defense Production Administration had approved certificates of necessity to 208 firms in Texas, allowing rapid tax amortization on new industrial construction totaling \$1,076,145,000. At the end of September, 1951, some \$286,585,000 of this new construction was completed.

In addition to new industrial construction, World War II enterprises, particularly in aircraft and synthetic rubber, have been brought back into production and enlarged.

The industrial effects on the war economy can be broken down as follows:

*Aircraft:* In the Fort Worth-Dallas area 47,000 are working in aircraft production. Only Chance Vought, with 9,700 workers, is organized (U.A.W.-C.I.O.). In addition, two large plants are under construction: a General Motors plant at Arlington, near Fort Worth, to employ 6,000 workers, and Bell Aircraft, in the Fort Worth-Dallas area, to employ 3,000. In Dallas, a new Collins Radio

Company plant will employ 3,000 workers when finished.

**Chemicals:** Texas' chemical industry added \$250,000,000 in new facilities during 1951 and plans more for 1952, newspapers report. This will mean that the Texas chemical industry by the end of 1952 will be a billion-and-a-half-dollar industry. Sales of Texas chemicals are reported at more than one billion dollars annually. The great bulk of this industry centers around petro-chemistry, utilizing petroleum hydrocarbons as raw materials.

Five synthetic rubber plants, producing 71 percent of the nation's synthetic rubber, almost doubled their rated capacity during 1951. The new investment in Texas synthetic rubber plants was 75 percent of the total national new investment in synthetic rubber.

**Metals:** About \$500,000,000 was the investment in metal-industry expansion either brought into production or construction started during 1951, not counting fabrication plants. The two major metal enterprises are steel and aluminum.

New construction in aluminum will bring the total aluminum production in Texas to above 250,000 tons annually. The new investments are as follows: Aluminum Company of America, \$115,000,000 at its Point Comfort and Rockdale plants; Reynolds, \$125,000,000 at Corpus Christi.

Steel production in Texas will reach the 2,000,000-ton annual figure as the

result of expansion by two companies: the Lone Star Steel Co., will produce 500,000 tons a year at its Daingerfield plant on the completion of its \$78,000,000 expansion program; and Sheffield Steel Co., Houston, will produce 1,000,000 tons a year shortly and will increase this by 50 percent. The latter company's workers are organized into a militant local of United Steel Workers, C.I.O.

Magnesium production will be greatly increased by the expenditure of \$50,000,000 by the Dow Chemical Co. at Freeport and Velasco.

**Oil industry:** The war economy plus the situation in Iran resulted in increased production in Texas' number one industry—oil.

Crude oil production in 1951 is estimated at \$2,500,000,000 (978,010,000 barrels). The barrel production was 21 percent above that of 1950.

Oil industry employment—drilling, production and refinery — reached 195,000. This was an increase of 2,200 in refineries and 10,300 in drilling and production.

A *Dallas Times Herald* tabulation showed that various refining and processing companies announced or started construction during 1951 of \$415,000,000 in new facilities. There are 46,100 workers employed in Texas refineries and a minority of them are organized into the Oil Workers, C.I.O. Several large refineries have entrenched company unions.

The effect of the war economy on

the Sou  
given  
of U.S.  
These  
have re  
fense o  
only So  
15, and  
was 3  
were sl  
dollars.  
Louisia  
200 mil  
ders.  
It w  
that inc  
under th  
is essen  
tural re  
in a rou  
No mac  
from th  
War II,  
as aircr  
strictly  
role in  
zation  
Texas  
standar  
retail sa  
change)  
figure.  
AGRIC  
Texas  
tal of  
but res  
since W  
unprece  
in a fu  
farmers

the South is highlighted by figures given in the January 28, 1952, issue of *U.S. News and World Report*. These figures show that 15 states have received 87 percent of all defense orders so far. Texas was the only Southern state included in the 15, and the state's share of the orders was 3 percent. Texas war contracts were slightly in excess of a billion dollars. Tennessee, Alabama, and Louisiana were shown as receiving 200 million dollars each in war orders.

It will be seen from the above that industrial development in Texas under the impact of the war economy is essentially that of processing natural resources and does not result in a rounded industrial development. No machine building is involved, and from the experience of post World War II, we know that such industries as aircraft and synthetic rubber are strictly war babies and play a small role in peace time. This industrialization did not prevent the people of Texas from suffering a reduced standard of living in 1951. Total retail sales volume (adjusted to price change) fell 6 percent from the 1950 figure.

#### AGRICULTURE

Texas agriculture brought in a total of about \$2,000,000,000 in 1951, but resulted in the lowest net return since World War II. Costs soared to unprecedented heights and resulted in a further squeezing out of small farmers.

Cotton is still the top money producer for Texas agriculture. The figures are: cotton, \$785,953,000; cattle, \$541,870,000; dairying, \$218,009,000; sheep and goats (including wool and mohair), \$106,594,000; poultry, \$79,045,000; and lesser amounts from rice, etc. Grain income fell sharply because of drouth.

No figures are available on the situation in the Black Belt area of eastern Texas, but one report showed that farms were decreasing in number and increasing in size everywhere except in the eastern region, where government figures give the number and size of sharecropping units instead of plantations as a whole.

The *Dallas Herald Times* reported that "Many marginal producers, particularly in the peanut industry (West Texas) put bankers back in the farm implement business and sold their farms to seek employment in industry." Another report commented on the shortage of protein supplements for cattlemen and declared that very little protein supplements are "finding their way into the hands of small producers." Thus, the war-induced high costs and shortages are tending to force small farmers out of business.

There has been some increase in mechanization on the cotton fields of West Texas, but the use of migratory labor, mainly Mexican workers, is still very great. Lubbock, Texas, reported that up to 120,000 migratory workers came through that area dur-

ing 1951. Texas big farmers are busy now trying to get a contract renewed with Mexico for the use of as many as 250,000 Mexican nationals as farm laborers.

#### SOCIO-POLITICAL RESULTS OF WAR DRIVE

A sharp increase in discrimination and open terror against the Negro and Mexican peoples in Texas can be noted. On the job front, few of the new "war" jobs are open for either Negroes or Mexican-Americans. This is particularly true in the aircraft plants of the Fort-Worth-Dallas area. In the oil refineries, workers report that a policy of replacing Negroes with whites is growing. Police brutality has increased in all major Texas cities against Negroes and Mexican-Americans. The frame-up of a Negro worker, Johnny Lee Morris, who defended himself against a white bus driver, stirred a major campaign in the Houston area that has saved his life, but so far a sufficient mass struggle to free him from a prison sentence has not developed.

The effect of the wage freeze, high cost of living and high taxes plus speed up, has resulted in mounting strike action in Texas. Shipyard workers at Galveston and Beaumont struck and won a straight 14 cents-an-hour, across-the-board wage raise. The long distance truckers are on strike as this is being written and are militantly picketing truck firms. A

rash of small strikes in such places as Waco, many of which get no publicity, are occurring throughout the state in many types of small industry. At the Chance Vought aircraft plant near Dallas, the more than 9,000 workers voted overwhelmingly for a strike. The Navy stepped in and a "secret" settlement has been accepted by the workers, but the company is balking. Among the demands of these workers was recognition of their right to collect poll tax payments in the plant itself. Unemployment, brought about by war industry shifts, has hit hardest in the Beaumont-Port Arthur and Galveston areas.

On the political front the outspoken candidates so far are all campaigning on a Dixiecrat, stronger pro-war line. This is particularly true of Attorney General Price Daniel, who is campaigning against Senator Tom Connally, and Governor Alan Shivers, who is running for re-election for the avowed purpose of playing a leading role in Dixiecrat maneuvers during the 1952 presidential campaign. However, a tremendous campaign of poll tax payments has resulted in the largest electorate in Texas history. It is clear that the people are not satisfied and want to do something about it in 1952. The danger is that Dixiecrats and Eisenhower politicians will mislead this sentiment if there is not a fighting alternative. Many "liberal" forces are being maneuvered into a Trumanite position.

The  
in Texa  
ity in  
large  
qualific  
which  
ton, pa  
carefull  
Negro  
booths  
well a  
Discuss  
civic o  
area fo  
and th  
see mo  
than a  
Primar  
mass  
and H  
of Mr  
It is  
sus sho  
of Ne  
ures a

The Negro liberation movement in Texas has shown growing maturity in organized campaigns to get large numbers of Negro voters qualified in the poll tax campaign which ended January 31st. In Houston, particularly, the campaign was carefully organized throughout the Negro community and included booths in Negro business firms as well as house-to-house canvassing. Discussion is underway in several civic organizations in the Houston area for Negro candidates in 1952, and the likelihood is that Texas will see more Negro candidates this year than at any time in recent history. Primaries are in July. City-wide mass meetings were held in Dallas and Houston protesting the murders of Mr. and Mrs. Harry T. Moore.

It is significant that the 1950 census shows a decrease in the number of Negroes in Texas since 1940. Figures are: 886,000, 1950; 927,279, 1940.

(The *Texas Almanac* explains this by the fact that many Negroes went to California during World War II.) The Mexican-American population in Texas is growing. Although the 1950 census did not make a study of this question, a survey made under a Rockefeller grant indicates that there are about 1,500,000 Mexican-Americans in Texas. They are predominantly rural and make up the bulk of the migratory farm workers. Their economic standards are held down by discrimination. An organized campaign was carried out for more Mexican-American voters in 1952 and there is a possibility for Mexican-American candidates in a few places.

Thus we see that the war economy is driving down the living standards of the Texas people, is cutting down their democratic rights.

P. G. F.

# On a Marxist History of the North American Indians

*A Reader's Letter and a Reply from*  
WILLIAM Z. FOSTER

TO THE EDITOR:

I have just finished reading William Z. Foster's great weapon for struggle against the "history" of the capitalist class and for socialism in our time entitled *Outline Political History of the Americas*. There are a few weaknesses, I think, which seem to crop up in most, if not all, writings on American Indian history in our country. Let us examine a few in Mr. Foster's important contribution to American history just mentioned.

He says: "At first, like everywhere else in the hemisphere, the Indians greeted the strange white man from across the sea in a friendly manner. . . . It was only later, after many deceptions, robberies, and oppressions had been practiced upon them, that the Indians began to defend themselves and their homes" (p. 52). On the contrary, it seems that the Indians on some sections of the coastlines of the country defended their country in a most unfriendly manner from the very beginning of white in-

trusions. For example, the history of the Calusa, an important tribe of Florida, begins in 1513 when, with a fleet of 80 canoes they boldly attacked Ponce de León, who was about to land on their coast, and after an all-day fight compelled him to withdraw. De León was later allowed to land by the Timucua Indians at St. Augustine.

The history of inside tribal struggles throughout Indian-white relations show a consistent friction between Indian leaders opposing any subjection by any white advance and those leaders who would favor one or the other side of colonizers or white settlers in the frontier advances. The bourgeois historians make out such Indian chiefs as Massasoit, Uncas, Tecumseh, Cornplanter, Red Jacket, Pontiac, Brant, American Horse, Little Turtle, Black Hawk, Keokuk, Gall, Spotted Tail, and others as "heroes" because of their selling-out tendencies to the whites in history. They were not "heroes" by the measurements of even these "historians" but were quislings instead. Massasoit was opposed by his own son; attempts were made on the life of

Uncas b  
seh coul  
joining  
and fou  
Cornpla  
Brant  
cause o  
not in f  
Little ?  
opposed  
Blue Ja  
desert  
white  
quisling  
necessa  
sors in  
The  
those  
whites  
whethe  
Dutch  
those i  
militar  
Such  
wa);  
headc  
Big  
(Sioux  
Spotte  
own l  
-kille  
Boma  
(Cher  
feated  
Corbi  
and t  
called  
Crazy  
by m  
he w

Uncas by patriotic Indians; Tecumseh could not unite the Indians by joining the British white oppressors and found opposition to his policies; Cornplanter, Red Jacket, Pontiac, and Brant were opposed violently because of their British leanings but not in favor of the Americans either; Little Turtle's peace policies were opposed by the truly great patriot, Blue Jacket, because he wanted to desert Indian struggles against the white advance; and many other quislings were opposed. This was necessary for liberation from oppressors in later times. . . .

The true Indian patriots were those who died in battle against whites wherever they could be found, whether British, French, Spanish, Dutch, or American colonists; and those half-starved great warriors in military prisons of the "bluecoats." Such patriots were Big Tree (Kiowa); Annawan (Wampanoag), beheaded by the "Christians" in 1676; Big Foot (Sioux); Big Mouth (Sioux)—shot by the notorious Spotted Tail at the entrance of his own lodge; Black Kettle (Cheyenne)—killed in attack on Sheridan's guns; Bomazeen (Abnaki); The Bowl (Cherokee); Cochise (Apache)—defeated by howitzers of Carleton; Corbitant (Massachuset) — caught and tried to kill Squanto, whom he called the tongue of the British; Crazy Horse (Sioux)—shot in back by military guard who alleged that he was escaping but better known as

lynching; Dull Knife (Cheyenne)—helped defeat the scum of the post-Civil War military under Custer and shot "as he tried to escape Ft. Robinson"; Crazy Medicine (Seminole)—hanged by "blue-coats"; Kintpuash (Modoc); Red Bird (Winnebago)—died in prison; Red Cloud (Sioux)—a warrior who never tasted defeat by any white forces; Sitting Bull (Sioux)—shot by Sgts. Red Tomahawk and Bull Head of "Indian police"; and many others too numerous to mention here. The "heroes" of bourgeois historians did not enjoy the deep respect of their people and were forgotten soon but there were some old grizzled warriors that are even today spoken of by Indians with dignity, pride and affection. They know the answers to historical events and it will stay with them as it is difficult for the white man to gain knowledge from them. Some answers are their secret.

I think that Mr. Foster missed the very important task of pointing out the real Indian patriots and played too much with the "heroes" of bourgeois historians. Some were correct but many mentioned in his book were not "heroes."

Much work, of course, with a Marxist-Leninist outlook, needs to be done in the history of the American Indian and I am now trying to contribute a little in that direction in the book I am writing.

Today the Indian lives in tents and log cabins under conditions of pov-

erty without steady year-round jobs in sight. There is no industry at hand to employ Indian workers. Their representation in political matters is still in the hands of quislings who believe that Big Business can solve their plight. They have not, in any considerable number, as yet learned of socialism as the scientific method of solving their situation in the most safe and sane manner. Discrimination is the rule in their lives—even on the reservation in many respects. They are “free” to leave the reservation as they wish—good riddance say Government “treaty” bigwigs. However, the Indians are stirring up a batch of struggle nevertheless against their imperialist masters and will win the victory which will be recorded in the history of our times. Mr. Foster’s book will be a weapon for this victory.

Sincerely,  
C. C.

REPLY BY  
WILLIAM Z. FOSTER

To the EDITOR of *Political Affairs*:

C. C.’s letter brings the good news that he is writing a Marxist history of the North American Indians. Such a history is long overdue. There is at hand an enormous mass of written reports and general historical material about the Indians. Some of the latter stuff is of real

value—such as the works of Morgan, Radin, and others—but for the most part it suffers from the usual shallowness and class bias of bourgeois historians. The true story of the Indians of this general area and their three centuries of struggle in defense of their lives, homes, and liberties will never be told until Marxists do the job. It is an obligation of the Communist Party, the champion of all the oppressed, to see to it that this task is undertaken.

In my book, *Outline Political History of the Americas*, I was able to devote only relatively a few pages to the Indians of the United States. This was because the Indians of this country, for all their importance, comprise only a very small detachment of the many millions of Indians in the Western Hemisphere generally, and an even smaller fraction of the whole vast civilization of which I was writing. A full history, therefore, of the Indian peoples of the United States would be most timely.

The writing of a Marxist history of the North American Indians is a complex and difficult task, presenting many unique problems of analysis. The very starting point of such a history must be a complete break with the current historical misrepresentation and slander of the Indians. The bourgeois historians have falsified the history of the Indians almost as badly as they have distorted that of the Negro people. They have falsely pictured the Indians as sav-

age, tre  
childlike  
brutal  
made j  
justify  
policies  
the Ind  
There a  
romanti  
sider th  
seum p  
liquidat  
against  
Obvius  
to outli  
that co  
of the  
a few  
They i  
widely  
the Ind  
Indians  
revolut  
the for  
fruitles  
pressor  
whole  
tween  
ples, a  
dian v  
of the  
outline  
policie  
States  
gram  
etc. A  
of the  
the In  
invad  
The



age, treacherous, indolent, stupid, childlike, dishonest, and incredibly brutal in warfare—while they have made just as elaborate efforts to justify or obscure the genocidal policies of the whites to exterminate the Indians by any means possible. There are tendencies in our times to romanticize Indian history, to consider the Indians somewhat as museum pieces, but this trend has not liquidated the time-worn slanders against these peoples.

Obviously, this letter is no place to outline all the problems and tasks that confront the Marxist historian of the Indian peoples; but at least a few of these may be indicated. They include: an analysis of the widely varying social structures of the Indians, the trade relations of the Indians with the colonists and the revolutionary effects of these upon the former's primitive cultures, the fruitless attempts of the white oppressors to enslave the Indians, the whole story of the relationship between the Indian and Negro peoples, an evaluation of the many Indian wars, an estimation of the role of the various Indian leaders, an outline of the numerous robbing policies of the French, British, United States governments, a practical program for the Indians of today, etc., etc. And all this within a framework of the general, evolving attitudes of the Indian peoples towards the white invaders.

The Indians' cause, in view of the

existing forces at work, was historically a lost one, so far as their holding the continent was concerned. The more primitive social regimes of the Indians could not withstand the impact of the higher civilization of the whites. The Indians' tribal divisions and mutual enmities, which prevented their developing a solid united front, plus the greater numbers, better arms, and more effective discipline of the Europeans, also helped to seal the fate of the Red Man in the face of the ruthless and never-ending pressure of the ocean-like waves of white invaders.

A Marxist history of the North American Indians must be fundamentally an analysis of the Indian peoples' reactions to the ever-increasing flood of European colonists, and of the tactics and strategies used by the Indians in order to shield themselves from the engulfing deluge. The relations between the Indians and whites, during the long struggle, were very complex, and often changing, and they require careful analysis. They are not to be disposed of by wave-of-the-hand generalizations. There never was, at any time, a settled and uniform "policy" of the Indian towards the invaders—tribal divisions and a natural lack of national consciousness preventing such unified thought and action. Consequently, while some Indians took an attitude of alarm and undying hostility towards them, others tried to live at peace with the greedy

and on-pushing settlers. The relations between the two groups varied widely, in different times and places.

At the outset, contrary to C. C.'s letter, the Indians as a rule met the earliest white colonists in a friendly spirit. That was not strange, for they could not possibly have foreseen the enormous masses of whites who were to follow the first small group of pioneers, the ruthless genocide policies they would develop, and the ultimate disaster to Indian life that all this would imply. Moreover, primitive peoples, in spite of bourgeois lies, have almost always had a hand of greeting for strangers arriving upon their shores. And these particular strangers had a special lure for the Indians in the shape of the many objects of trade—beads, cloth, guns, metal tools, whiskey, etc., which were previously altogether unknown to the Indians. It was only after bitter experience with the newcomers that the Indians became disillusioned with them and took up arms to defend themselves. It is naive to think that the early Indians could have been united in a realization of the dreadful menace of the colonists and could have met the first white invaders at the water's-edge, arms-in-hand. A few Indians, it is true, did show armed resistance, but they were the exception, not the rule.

A friendly reception was the pattern that confronted the colonists along the Atlantic Coast—on the St. Lawrence, on Massachusetts Bay,

and on the Hudson, Delaware, and James Rivers. It was only later, after many hardships and injustices at the hands of the invaders, that the Indians realized something of their dangerous situation and started to make war systematically to protect their land and homes. Thus, in Massachusetts, first settled in 1620, it was not until 1635 that Sassacus engaged in the important Pequot war, and only in 1675, after the death of Massasoit (a long-time collaborator with the colonists), that King Philip, his son, with the Wampanoags, Nipmucks, and Narragansetts, was able to carry on his celebrated, but ill-fated war. In New York, similarly, the first Indian war broke out about thirty years after the earliest Dutch settlements, and in Virginia it was in 1622, fifteen years after the formation of the colony and four years after the death of Powhatan, who worked with the colonists notwithstanding their injustices, that the first serious Indian war in that area, under Chief Opechancanough, was waged. In the Pennsylvania colony, there was a similar pattern, with a long initial peace before "Indian troubles" began.

One of the disastrous reactions of certain of the Indians to the newly-arrived colonists, in various instances, was to try to use the newcomers as allies against traditional tribal enemies. Thus, Massasoit, at his very first meeting with the Pilgrims (whom he could have wiped out easily had

he been  
them to  
they m  
the col  
allianc  
bitter  
The w  
major  
divisio  
the ol  
Cortez  
with c  
dian  
When  
tezum  
dians  
of the  
in the  
chieft  
must  
tende  
such  
An  
North  
the st  
the M  
lyze  
long-  
in th  
other  
sides  
tive  
Fran  
wars  
(177  
State  
the  
and  
rests  
nari

he been so disposed) agreed to give them the food, seeds, and land which they most urgently needed, only on the condition that they make a war alliance with him against his tribe's bitter enemies, the Narragansetts. The whites everywhere utilized this major Indian illusion; bred of tribal divisions and hostilities. They used the old rule of divide and conquer. Cortez and Pizarro also exploited it with devastating effects upon the Indian regimes in Mexico and Peru. When Cortez marched against Montezuma, he actually had more Indians in his own army, tribal enemies of the Aztecs, than there were men in the forces of the opposing Aztec chieftain. The Marxist historian must evaluate this whole division tendency, which everywhere played such a tragic role in Indian history.

Another decisive development of North American Indian strategy in the struggle against the colonists that the Marxist historian must also analyze and evaluate was the Indians' long-continued practice of joining in the white men's wars against each other, in alliance with one or both sides. Thus, the Indians took an active part in the several wars between France and England, and in the two wars of England against her colonies (1776), and against the United States (1812). With such alliances the Indians largely strove to protect and advance their own tribal interests. They were not mere mercenaries, as the bourgeois historians

would like to make them appear.

The general direction of the Indians' blows in these struggles was against their two main enemies: at first against Great Britain, and later on, above all, against the United States, which was the most virulent, of all anti-Indian influences. These war alliances with the whites, in the long run, worked out disastrously for the Indians. For the important Indian tribes were on the losing side in these big wars and they suffered catastrophically. Such Indian disasters followed the Seven Years War, ending in 1763, in which France lost Canada to England; the American War of Independence of 1776, and in the U.S.-English war of 1812. To make the defeat of the Indians in these wars all the more complete, their white allies, France and England, both completely abandoned and betrayed them at the peace table. These war alliances of the Indians with France and England must be soberly analyzed and evaluated by the Marxist historian. They cannot be dismissed simply on the grounds that the Indian chiefs who participated in them were all traitors to their peoples.

Of especially great importance to the Marxist historian of the Indian peoples must also be a careful study and appraisal of the various attempts of Indian leaders to surmount the paralyzing weakness of tribal divisions and to develop a broad many-tribe unity and policy. In such move-

ments, of which there were several, Indian political and military strategy was to be seen at its highest development. Among the most important of these wide-embracing efforts, despite the serious weaknesses of some of the leaders involved, are to be noted the wars and unity movements of King Philip (1675), Pontiac (1763), Theyendangea (Joseph Brant) (1776), and Tecumseh (1811). The role of "Prophets" or "Messiahs" in such broad Indian movements also deserves attention. They were men who rose up, claiming that they were divinely inspired to lead their peoples from the bondage of the white man.

The Marxist historian must also pay much attention to the policies of corruption practiced upon the Indian leaders, often all too successfully, by the white officialdom. This was akin to present-day employer policies of corrupting official working class leaders. Indian history is thickly spotted with cases of Indian chiefs who were thus bribed. Even outstanding Indian chiefs, such as Pontiac and Little Turtle, who in their time conducted bitterly-fought and effective major wars against the whites, in the end fell victims of the white man's blandishments. So great a danger was this corruption that not infrequently when chiefs went into negotiations with the whites, their peoples warned them beforehand that they would kill them if they allowed themselves to be cor-

rupted or deceived into yielding up sections of the tribe's territory. And more than once such executions of traitor chiefs were actually carried out. A well-known instance of this was that of the Cherokees who killed three of their chiefs who, in treaty conference, allowed themselves to be bribed or cajoled by President Jackson's emissaries. To explore this question of Indian corruption and of rank and file Indian opposition to faithless chieftains will be very valuable. It will also require a lot of solid research work.

An evaluation of the role of the many noted Indian leaders should also be undertaken by the Marxist historian. C. C. says that in my book I paid too much attention to the Indian "heroes" publicized by bourgeois historians. This is unjustified criticism. For in the limited scope of my general treatment of the North American Indians, it was impossible for me to bring forward the lesser-known figures and to analyze closely the complete roles of the respective central leaders. At most, I could interpret only the general course of events with but passing references to individual chieftains. In evaluating the Indian leaders, it must be said, we should not be perfectionists and expect them to possess qualities of clear-sightedness which, under the circumstances, they could not have. It is not the task of the Marxist historian to write an idealist, leftist book which would largely rob

the In  
tory.  
An  
wars a  
of coun  
ian his  
of. Th  
task as  
The r  
and t  
those  
and di  
Indian  
actual  
chiefs  
lived  
an un  
were  
They  
to an  
persec  
tion o  
stealin  
cuttin  
tions  
rageou  
were  
phase  
in ger  
Spe  
too, t  
white  
"The  
India  
turies  
again  
fough  
and  
actua  
ous g

the Indian peoples of their real history.

An analysis of the many Indian wars and the causes for them must, of course, be a basic part of a Marxian history such as we are speaking of. This is by no means as simple a task as it appears to be at first glance. The relations between the whites and the Indians, although always those of oppression by the whites and discontent and resistance by the Indians, were not those of constant actual warfare. Even the boldest chiefs and the most vigorous tribes lived during long generations under an uneasy peace. The Indian wars were desultory and spontaneous. They developed usually in response to an accumulation of unbearable persecutions, such as the perpetration of particularly outrageous land stealings from the Indians. A deep-cutting study of these war provocations by the whites and of the outrageous treaties by which these wars were concluded, is a much-needed phase of American history writing in general.

Special attention must be given, too, to the genocide policies of the white colonists. Their slogan was: "There is no good Indian but a dead Indian." They anticipated by centuries Hitler's genocide program against the Jews. The colonists fought to exterminate the Indians, and in the case of many tribes they actually succeeded in their murderous goal.

The struggle of the Indian peoples for survival was a centuries-long battle against hopeless odds. Already by the time of King Philip's war in 1675, the Indians of New England were outnumbered and out-gunned locally by the colonists, and by the end of the Seven Years War in 1763 the whites were at least three times more numerous on a national scale than the Indians. Small wonder, then, in the face of the ever-swelling tide of settlers, that all Indian wars were eventually lost wars and that the Red man was pressed relentlessly from East to West.

The essentially impossible position of the Indians, both locally and generally, was early sensed by their most thoughtful leaders, and this realization had very important consequences upon the struggle of the Indian peoples. For one thing, it stimulated the many attempts, remarked earlier, made by the Indians to unify into a common multi-tribal front. For another, it inspired the Indians to wage the most desperate struggles when they went on the warpath. No people ever fought more bravely in self-defense than the Indians, down to the last heroic forty years' struggle of the Sioux tribes throughout the last half of the 19th century, under Crazy Horse, Sitting Bull, Red Cloud, etc., These final wars were fought against completely impossible odds. Vestal says (*Warpath and Council Fire*): "Three times in our history an

American military force has been utterly wiped out by its enemies. Every time these enemies were "Sioux." Unfortunately, too, the desperate position of the Indians' struggle in general also had the negative effect of increasing the tendency of many chieftains to take the easy way out by yielding to the bribes of the victorious white conquerors.

A Marxist history, besides chronicling and interpreting the life story of the Indian people, especially their epic struggle to defend themselves against the ruthless white invaders, must also provide a program to meet the present severe plight of these tragic peoples. This program, besides containing urgently needed economic measures, must deal with the establishment of elementary political rights for Indians, and also with the

fundamental question of national self-determination.

The terrible poverty, illiteracy, disease, and jim-crow discrimination under which the great bulk of the Indians now suffer is a burning disgrace to our country. Organized labor, which throughout its entire history has almost completely ignored the injustices done to the Indians, bears a large share of the responsibility for this outrageous situation. The Communist Party must take up the cudgels in defense of the rights of the Indian tribes, as it has done with regard to the Negro people. To this end a Marxist history of the North American Indians would be a splendid contribution.

Comradely yours,  
WILLIAM Z. FOSTER

Atom

By Mi

Atomic  
InterTHE EC  
perialis  
can life  
or new  
tion in  
are no  
strated  
and mIt is  
of "me  
this in  
fashion  
ments  
known  
indust  
guaran  
about  
GradeYet  
is no  
one. I  
ment  
one of  
tions  
and ag  
and d  
Wi  
menta  
aside  
tation  
have  
public

## Atomic Imperialism (Book Review)

By Michael Bianca

*Atomic Imperialism*, by James S. Allen.  
International Publishers, \$2.90.

THE ECONOMIC and political laws of imperialism govern every sector of American life, every sphere of production, old or new. These laws and their elaboration in political and foreign policies are nowhere more strikingly demonstrated than in the United States' newest and most modern "industry."

It is typical of imperialism, the epoch of "moribund, dying capitalism," that this industry should be one devoted to fashioning the most devastating instruments of death the world has ever known—atom bombs. The atom-bomb industry has been shrouded with FBI-guaranteed secrecy, and everything about it has been given the quality of a Grade B cloak-and-dagger film.

Yet every scientist knows that atomics is no secret, nor has it ever really been one. But one thing which the government has worked mightily to conceal is one of the biggest public looting operations in the whole history of the brigandage which has characterized the rise and decline of American capitalism.

With painstaking care and solid documentation, James S. Allen has torn aside the pious and hypocritical protestations that the billions for A-bombs have been appropriated for the sake of public welfare and "peace." In his new

book, *Atomic Imperialism*, Allen piles fact on fact to deliver a powerful indictment of the atom profiteers and their spokesmen in Washington and the UN.

Allegedly we have here an industry owned and controlled by the government. But the fact is, as Allen shows, the state is merely the political instrument of the trusts working to guarantee Wall Street's phenomenal profits. It is an industry whose capital assets are larger than General Motors and U.S. Steel combined. "Owned by the government and operated by the private corporations, the enterprise represents the merger of state and monopoly at the very highest level," Allen points out.

As Allen puts it, "A working partnership is still to be invented in which one member (in this case, the government—M.B.) makes all capital investments, supplies the funds for current operations, bears all risks, and covers the partner for all losses, while the latter without investing a single penny runs the entire enterprise, appropriates all current profits, accumulates for his own use a multitude of new techniques, and into the bargain, reserves for himself the exclusive domination of the undertaking for the present and future" (page 78).

Atomic development has been placed in the hands of the top monopoly

groups — Morgan, duPont, Mellon, Rockefeller. The process by which it has been done makes the mink coat and deep freezer scandals look like petty, candy-store pilfering. The projects have been built at a cost of billions in taxpayers' money and in each case handed over for profitable operation by the trusts. One of the latest instances, announced since publication of this book, is the billion-dollar development in the Ohio River Valley, to be built by the government and operated by duPont.

Allen unravels all the skeins by which the state has obligingly performed this service for monopoly, naming the projects and the companies which took over, most of them in the Morgan sphere, such as General Electric, which has become one of the kingpins of atomic development.

Lenin long ago proved that when monopoly becomes dominant there inevitably takes place all along the line a drive toward political reaction at home and aggression abroad. The aggression seeks world domination and control of sources of raw materials and cheap labor power. This drive is intensified many times over in an industry whose avowed aim is the production of a super instrument of war, and which, from the very beginning, has been controlled by the most powerful monopolists in the world.

The imperialists and their spokesmen, however, seek to cover their sinister aims with fraudulent, "noble" phrases. Thus, the drive to world domination is undertaken in the name of "aiding the underdeveloped nations"; the gutting of the Constitution proceeds in the name of "safeguarding democracy"; war plots and provocations

come under the heading of "peace."

It is a primary task for Marxists to uncover the real facts and trends, to expose the real purposes of the imperialists. And this is especially so today when, as Stalin pointed out: "Peace will be preserved and consolidated if the peoples will take the cause of preserving peace into their own hands and will defend it to the end. War may become inevitable if the warmongers succeed in entangling the masses of the people in lies, in deceiving them and drawing them into a new World War."

Allen performs a real service for the peace camp by digging beneath the surface of pious phrases and coming up with fact upon fact to prove that the atom-bomb enterprise is completely controlled by the top, freebooting monopolists, that the government operates in this field to dictate a strike-breaking, jimcrow labor policy that has many elements of fascism, that one result has been a drive toward fascism and the virtually complete militarization of science, and that the effort to build a world atomic cartel, with Wall Street at the peak, presents a dangerous threat of war with the monopolists seeking to grab up the world sources of uranium ore, the raw material of atomics.

Huge profits, Allen shows, are not only guaranteed for monopoly by the state handing over the atomic enterprise. Equally, if not more, profitable, is the role of the trusts in supplying uranium ores. It has opened up a new world-wide scramble in which again the U.S. trusts are squeezing out their competitors, particularly the British. The most profitable sources are Canada and the Belgian Congo.



In Canada the struggle between British and American trusts continues with the Americans already holding the upper hand. One of the most interesting sections of the book is the description of the struggle for control in Africa and what this has meant for the Africans who have been forced to mine the ore for the greater glory of Wall Street. The section on "Forced Labor in Katanga" (Belgian Congo) tears the hypocritical mask from the apologists for Wall Street who claim that the government's interest in the "backward" areas is "philanthropic."

But, as Allen states: "The Belgian Congo cannot remain padlocked for long against the colonial liberation movement of the African peoples. Even this fortress of ancient colonial looters, now joined by the overbearing barons of Wall Street, is challenged from within by the Negro working class . . . with their dream of a free Congo which the enslaving 'supermen' are utterly incapable of understanding" (page 210).

Allen traces the penetration of U.S. monopoly interests into Africa. He shows that "about 70 percent of American investment in Africa was in the regions well within the British sphere" (page 214). This has sharpened Anglo-American antagonisms but with American capital holding the upper hand and repeatedly forcing the British to back down.

"As a result of the growing American corporate and strategic expansion into Africa, the United States monopolists and the Washington government partake on an increasing scale in the extreme exploitation of African labor, and in the maintenance of oppressive, super-white regimes. We now find the American government currying favor with

the aggressive white-supremacist Malan regime of the Union of South Africa, and seeking alliances with the local fuhrers of the Rhodesias and other colonies. To help break into the resources of Mozambique and Angola and control these important outlets for the interior mineral regions, the decrepit Salazar regime of Portugal is aided and abetted. Franco of Spain becomes a favorite son of American diplomacy for his aid in establishing United States positions in the Mediterranean and Northwest Africa. The Wall Street bankers now have a powerful vested interest in preserving the entire colonial structure of Africa, favoring only those changes which will increase their share of the spoils" (page 215).

In effect a nearly complete world cartel in uranium ore has been established, backed by the U.S. government and with Wall Street at the peak. It is complete with one major and infuriating exception for the trusts. That major exception is the fact that some of the richest uranium ore fields are in East Germany, the Peoples' Democracies and the Soviet Union. That is something the imperialists will never be able to control. But it does cast new light on why the State Department has constantly rejected Soviet proposals for elimination of the A-bomb and why the U.S. delegation to the UN keeps pushing the Baruch plan, which provides for Washington control and ownership of atomic developments and resources all over the world. As Allen writes:

"Baruch of the Guggenheim-Morgan copper empire, Dulles of International Nickel, Osborn of the Phelps-Dodge family, Searls of Newmont, Hancock of Lehman Bros., Strauss of Kuhn,

Loeb and later with the Rockefellers—these are the 'American' spokesmen for an atomic energy 'control' scheme which is but a feeble front for the atom bomb business. When these and others like them orate on the 'humanitarian' motives of the Baruch Plan and hurl their accusations against the Soviet Union, it is well to remember that they represent the corporate interests straining to corner world uranium."

As regards the possibility of using atomic energy for peaceful purposes, Allen shows in the section on the "Militarization of Science" how the trusts and the government have taken over science and have perverted it into an instrument for perfecting weapons of mass destruction and increasing profits of the corporations, how free scientific investigation and progress have been virtually banned from the universities and laboratories.

In contrast, Allen points to the Soviet Union's efforts to turn atomic energy to useful pursuits, something which the monopolists oppose for fear of impairing their original investments in other means of power and because war production is the most profitable of capitalist undertakings.

Allen warns of the danger to democracy which this merger of the state and monopoly capital represents: "The advanced coalescence of state and monopoly capital is the central material condition for the open and aggressive dictatorship of big capital, which is the essence of the fascist form of state."

Within a relatively few pages Allen marshals the data to support his con-

clusions. So many facts are put forth, however, without sufficient and continued explanation of their connection with the central theme of the work, that it is often difficult for the reader to grasp the full significance of this wealth of material.

No student of politics and economics can afford to be without this book. Fighters for peace and democracy will find it necessary to refer to it repeatedly to answer the lies and expose the aims of the warmongers.

It is not a book that merely lists the facts and lets it go at that. It indicates, as a Marxist work should, what needs to be done. And this includes the struggle for elimination of the atom-bomb, with controls and inspection to guarantee that it is done, as the Soviet Union has proposed.

Allen does not reduce his analysis to the superficial theme that war can be prevented merely by "taking the profits out of" atomic enterprise. On the contrary, atomic profiteering is shown to be an essential part of the monopolists' drive for super-profits and war. The atomic profiteers, Allen makes clear, can be stopped only through a united struggle for peace.

More, Allen demonstrates that humanity's fate hinges upon the outcome of the struggle for peace and proving in life that world war is not inevitable. "The monopoly forces are afraid of peace. They will not swerve from their present course unless the people make the cause of peace their own. In the struggle for peace, the people must assure their own future" (page 271).

Two New INTERNATIONAL Books

## ATOMIC IMPERIALISM

by James S. Allen

"A valuable contribution to anyone concerned with understanding American imperialism."

—ROB F. HALL, *Masses & Mainstream*

\$2.90

## IN DEFENSE OF PHILOSOPHY: PRAGMATISM AND POSITIVISM

by Maurice Cornforth

A polemical critique of empiricism, pragmatism, semantics, etc.

\$2.50

### Recent and New Pamphlets

- |  |     |
|--|-----|
| DEFEAT THE ANTI-LABOR SMITH ACT  | 5c  |
| by William Z. Foster   |     |
| THE STEEL WORKERS AND THE FIGHT FOR LABOR'S RIGHTS                             | 10c |
| by William Z. Foster   |     |
| ON INNER-PARTY STRUGGLE, by Liu Shao-chi                                       | 25c |
| THE BIG LIE OF WAR "PROSPERITY", by Bernard Burton                             | 10c |
| NAZI ARMY OR PEACEFUL GERMANY?, by Alan Max                                    | 5c  |
| STAND UP FOR FREEDOM: THE NEGRO PEOPLE VS.<br>THE SMITH ACT, by Lloyd L. Brown | 5c  |
| NEGRO REPRESENTATION, by Pettis Perry  | 10c |
| THE SOVIET UNION BUILDS FOR PEACE, by L. P. Beria                              | 10c |

NEW CENTURY PUBLISHERS

832 Broadway, New York 3, N. Y.

*A Great Publishing Event!*

## **HISTORY OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF THE UNITED STATES**

*By William Z. Foster*

"How have the American Communists used their theories and Marxist-Leninist teachings to promote the advance of the American working class to leadership in the nation? What policies and programs of action have they produced and applied to build the alliance of the working class with the Negro people, the working farmers and city middle classes? How is the Party being built, how does it function, what is its role in the daily struggles of the masses, what is the content of its inner life? How does the Party fight opportunism and bourgeois influences in its midst?

"Foster's book gives the answers. Prepare to learn, study and popularize the *History of the Communist Party of the United States* and its great lessons for today and tomorrow."

—ALEXANDER BITTELMAN in *Political Affairs*, Jan., 1952

•  
*A New INTERNATIONAL Book Scheduled for June Publication*  
•

**NEW CENTURY PUBLISHERS**

832 BROADWAY, NEW YORK 3, N. Y.

