

# Political affairs

SEPTEMBER 1953 • 25 CENTS



WILLIAM Z. FOSTER

- [ 1 ] The 34th Anniversary  
of the Communist Party

ANDREW STEVENS

- [ 9 ] New Opportunities  
in the Fight for Peace

PETTIS PERRY

- [28] The Defense of the Party Is  
the Defense of the Bill  
of Rights

JAMES BURNHILL

- [41] The Mexican People  
in the Southwest

V. J. JEROME

- [53] Letters to Americans  
(*Book Review*)

**SPECIAL 31-PAGE SUPPLEMENT**

**Reader's Guide to**

**Foster's "History of the Communist Party of the U.S.A."**

## NEW AND RECENT PAMPHLETS

DANGER SIGNALS FOR ORGANIZED LABOR	\$ .10
by William Z. Foster	
THE ANATOMY OF McCARTHYISM	.10
by M. Logan and S. Douglas	
RESISTANCE IN SOUTH AFRICA	.35
by Alphaeus Hunton	
LABOR AND ANTI-SEMITISM	.10
by George Morris	
THE McCARRAN-WALTER POLICE STATE LAW	.25
by Abner Green	
WE CAN HAVE PEACE AND JOBS	.05
by Bernard Burton	
ISRAEL AND DOLLAR DIPLOMACY	.25
by Victor Perlo	
ON CHANGES IN THE RULES OF THE C.P.S.U.	.25
by N. Khrushchev	

### *On the International List*

BORN OF THE PEOPLE, by Luis Taruc	\$1.75
BROTHER BILL McKIE, by Phillip Bonosky	1.50
LABOR FACT BOOK 11, prepared by Labor Research Assn.	2.00
MATERIALISM AND THE DIALECTICAL METHOD	1.00
by Maurice Cornforth	
AMERICA OVER BRITAIN, by Philip Bolsover	1.00
ECONOMIC PROBLEMS OF SOCIALISM IN THE USSR	.25
by Joseph Stalin	
ON CONTRADICTION, by Mao Tse-tung	.35

**NEW CENTURY PUBLISHERS**

832 BROADWAY • NEW YORK 3

Vol. XXX

A T

The

By W

THE 34

Party v

Septemb

been a ti

mental

basically

general

growth

importa

connecti

he rise

omic

"cold w

struggle

U.S.A.,

some ca

Now

our Par

a new p

be a con

war" b

conditio

ment in

ing the

perialisr

conques

has su

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

Editor: V. J. Jerome

## The 34th Anniversary of the Communist Party

By William Z. Foster

THE 34 YEARS since the Communist Party was founded, August 31—September 1, 1919, in Chicago, have seen a time of many bitter and fundamental struggles. These were all basically related to the deepening general crisis of capitalism and the growth of world Socialism. The more important of these struggles were in connection with the two world wars, the rise of fascism, the greatest economic crisis, and the present-day "cold war." In all of these historic struggles the Communist Party, U.S.A., played an important, and in some cases, a decisive part.

Now there is looming up before our Party and the labor movement a new phase of struggle, which will be a continuation of the present "cold war" but under rapidly changing conditions. The most important element in the new situation confronting the world is that American imperialism, in its drive for world conquest through a great world war, has suffered a serious setback

through its enforced settlement of the Korean war. Wall Street reactionaries, through their Truman and Eisenhower governments, hoped to make of the war in Korea what Hitler and Mussolini made of the civil war in Spain, a starting point for a great world war. But overwhelming international mass pressure for peace, plus sturdy resistance of the North Korean and Chinese peoples, have shattered this plan and forced a settlement of the reactionary war.

This mass peace pressure developed in the train of the famous Soviet "peace offensive," the initiative for which was given by Stalin and Malenkov at the recent 19th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. This "offensive" so aroused and encouraged the peace-loving masses of the world that their demand for a Korean settlement became irresistible. It reached the point where, in addition to the countries of Socialism and People's Democracy, not only India, Indonesia, the Mos-

lem bloc, and other countries in Asia and Africa insisted upon a war truce, but also Great Britain, France, Italy, Australia, Canada, etc. The anti-Soviet capitalist war alliance, which the United States had spent \$50 billions to build, threatened to go to pieces if the United States Government prolonged its cherished Korean war. So the war was ended, after a last-ditch American maneuver with the war criminal, Syngman Rhee, to keep it going.

The uneasy Korean settlement does not end the menace of a cold war, although it very materially lessens international tension. American imperialism will not give up easily its plan of world conquest through war. It is ready for any desperate venture to this end. It will spare no effort to re-create world tension and to rebuild its tottering world capitalist anti-Soviet war alliance. In this respect, one of the most dangerous policies the peace forces will have to be on guard against is the Eisenhower-Dulles policy of so-called "liberation." The "liberation" policy, which is an expansion of the Truman Doctrine under another name and more energetically pushed, calls for the instigation of civil wars in those Socialist and People's Democracy countries that refuse to put on the yoke of Wall Street. The great danger involved in this policy was dramatically illustrated by the recent riots in East Germany, which were nothing short of an attempt to foment a civil war throughout Ger-

many—a desperate adventure that might have led to a third world war.

The truce in Korea was a great victory for the peace forces of the world. It puts these forces in a far better position to fight the war danger in general. The people in the United States, who have repeatedly shown that they are opposed to war, are sharing this uplift in their resistance to war. Another great factor that will stimulate the American workers' struggles for peace, as well as their fight for other demands, is their alarm at the advent to power of the Eisenhower Administration. This event, as the National Committee's resolution points out in the July *Political Affairs*, has come as a great shock to the workers and has very much awakened in them the determination to fight. They realize that their worst enemies now have control of the government (Truman was also a tool of big monopoly and an enemy of the workers, although this was not so manifest), and, in self-defense, they want to fight. The period ahead, therefore, will be one of greatly sharpened class struggle in the United States, and at the heart of this will be the fight for world peace.

#### THE CRISIS OF AMERICAN LABOR LEADERSHIP

On this 34th anniversary of the birth of the Communist Party, the working class and the people of this country in general are facing a very

critical  
sary to  
develo  
order  
contin  
there  
drama  
nant  
increa  
the ap  
nomic  
ace in  
leader  
L., C  
Broth  
of "c  
tively  
the gr  
the w  
to tak  
The  
cal to  
the c  
Social  
to th  
their  
Trad  
have  
skille  
pense  
worki  
War  
base  
by th  
mater  
lesser  
ism.  
The  
somet  
seems  
worki

critical situation, so it is highly necessary to utilize the new fighting spirit developing among the masses in order to improve it. There is the continuing danger of a world war; there is a growing danger of fascism, dramatized by the growth of malignant McCarthyism; and there are increasing signs on the horizon of the approach of another great economic crisis. And the greatest menace in the situation is that the main leaders of organized labor—A. F. of L., C.I.O., Miners, and Railroad Brotherhoods—are following policies of "class collaboration" which entirely unfit them either to understand the grave problems now confronting the workers and the whole people or to take effective steps to solve them.

The especially corrupted and cynical top trade-union leaders, who are the characteristic American-type of Social Democrats, look first of all to the protection and fattening of their own rich sinecure positions. Traditionally, and secondarily, they have represented the interests of the skilled labor aristocracy at the expense of the broad masses of the working class. During the World War II and "cold war" boom, their base has been considerably extended by the corruption, ideologically and materially, of large sections of the lesser skilled elements by imperialism.

The term "class collaboration" is something of a misnomer in that it seems to imply a cooperation of the working class and the capitalist class.

Actually what happens under class collaboration, however, is that the labor leaders follow out what is fundamentally a capitalist political line and they enforce this upon the unions of the workers. That is, class collaboration means the subordination of the working class to the capitalist class. The world history of this treacherous policy bears out this analysis.

The class collaboration character of the policies of the present top leaders of organized labor is too obvious to need elaborate analysis here. Actually, they have an informal united front with Wall Street monopoly capital to support the essential features of its program of world conquest. They are labor imperialists and their main job in their class collaboration agreement with big capital is, by the use of imperialist slogans cunningly disguised with labor phases, to keep the masses of workers from making an effective fight against Wall Street's program. They are the little brothers of the big imperialists and they count on sharing, by political preferment and otherwise, the imperialist loot in prospect. These misleaders of labor bear a definite responsibility for the present critical situation in our country and internationally.

If there is now a war danger in the world, certainly the reactionary labor leaders have done their share to create it, with their support of all the monopolists' slogans and war plans—to the effect that there is a

Communist menace in the world which has to be fought and that a third world war is inevitable, their all-out support of the Marshall plan, Truman Doctrine, "liberation" policy, N.A.T.O., Korean war, monster war budgets, and what not. Characteristic of these labor imperialists, Walter Reuther, at the recent Stockholm meeting of the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions, went beyond even the most outspoken Wall Streeters by demanding that the counter-revolutionary forces in East Germany, Czechoslovakia, Poland, etc., be armed for civil war against their governments.

If there is a fascist danger in the United States, these bureaucratic labor leaders are also largely to blame. Being themselves inveterate Red-baiters, they have no impulse or disposition to fight against the loyalty pledges and thought-control measures that are now the beginnings of a fascist growth in the United States. They have made no fight worthy of the name against the outrageous Smith and McCarran laws, and the infamous McCarthy, Jenner and Velde purges have brought a minimum of objection from them. They have made little or no protest against the jailing of Communists under the Smith and other fascist laws, and they almost unanimously stood silent while the heroic Ethel and Julius Rosenberg were legally lynched.

If, too, there is the growing danger of a devastating economic crisis in this country, the top leaders of or-

ganized labor have done their part in bringing it about. They have refused, in a "boom" situation when the producers possessed enormous potential economic power, to fight militantly to keep up the real wages and purchasing power of the workers in the face of inflationary prices, swiftly rising taxes, and the workers' sharply increasing productive power in industry. Their general idea is that the workers must "bear their share" of the sacrifices needed to superarm the country. This accelerates the onset of an eventual economic crisis. The crisis trend is also greatly intensified by the labor leaders' reliance upon munitions-making to furnish employment; by their support of the Wall Street monopolists to cut off trade with the U.S.S.R., People's China, and the People's Democracies of Europe; and by other crisis-breeding policies.

#### SOME LESSONS FROM LABOR HISTORY

With their present reactionary policies, the top trade-union leaders are incapable of leading organized labor and the people safely out of the critical position in which they now find themselves. The labor movement suffers from a real crisis of leadership. This, of course, is nothing new for the American working class; for during the past half century, since the development of American imperialism, the trade-union movement in this country has been ex-

perien  
in var  
labor  
cape f  
decisiv  
capital  
policie  
ployer  
cialdor  
doing  
centur  
before  
To  
favore  
flicted  
capital  
which  
crisis o  
iar bey  
A few  
ued b  
groes,  
trade  
tion of  
tice of  
long fi  
ism, a  
class p  
velopin  
against  
the im  
fanatic  
the spe  
& O. pl  
of the  
against  
and th  
reactio  
ing the  
war."  
The

perceiving a chronic leadership crisis in varying forms and degrees. The labor movement, in fact, cannot escape from such a crisis so long as its decisive leaders are supporters of the capitalist system and take their basic policies from the arsenal of the employers, as the top trade-union officialdom in this country have been doing since at least the turn of the century, and in some respects, even before that.

To list the employer-inspired or favored policies that have been inflicted upon organized labor by its capitalist-minded labor leaders, and which together constitute the chronic crisis of labor leadership, would run far beyond the scope of this article. A few of them are: the long-continued barring of the unskilled, Negroes, women, and youth from the trade unions; the constant disruption of labor's solidarity by the practice of craft autonomy; the decades-long fight against industrial unionism, against independent working-class political action, against the development of class consciousness, and against Socialism; the support of the imperialist World War I; the fanatical hostility to Soviet Russia; the speed-up, class collaboration, B. & O. plan policies of the boom period of the 1920's; the persistent fight against all forms of social insurance; and the support of the complex of reactionary imperialist policies during the past several years of "cold war."

The chronic crisis of labor leader-

ship, while always a drag on labor's progress, from time to time has become so acute as to almost threaten the life of the labor movement. A specific example of this was during the post World War I offensive of capitalist reaction against the trade unions, in which the panic-stricken labor officialdom ran for cover. Many unions were wiped out completely, and the labor movement as a whole suffered the worst defeat in its history. Another example was the political debacle of the top union leaders during the great economic crisis of 1929-33, when they helplessly followed the line of the Hoover government, hoping that, in fact, prosperity, as Hoover said, "was just around the corner."

The American labor movement has grown and progressed largely in spite of its ultra-highly paid official misleaders. The latter have chronically failed to carry out even the most elementary needs of the movement. The constructive work, historically, has in the main been done by the Left wing and by rank and filers generally. The only period when the top leadership has actually set out energetically to build the unions was during the middle and later 1930's, in the Roosevelt years. And then, only part of the labor leadership took a progressive course—the Lewis-Hillman group—while the rest—Green, Hutcheson, Woll, *et al.*—actually split the trade-union movement in a desperate effort to prevent the organization of the trustified indus-

tries. Significantly, the division in the trade-union bureaucracy at that time corresponded pretty much with the current split in the bourgeoisie—the Lewis-Hillman group especially going along with that group of capitalists who were willing to fight against fascism and aggressive German imperialism.

There was a sound political ground for organized labor, the Negro people, and other democratic strata, to cooperate with the Roosevelt government in the great struggle against Hitler fascism, and the Communist Party (despite the Browder opportunism) was correct in supporting such cooperation. But this cooperation should have been upon more of an independent basis. That is, organized labor should have developed its own political organization and set up a coalition relationship in the Roosevelt government, instead of, as was done, merely “supporting” that government. When Roosevelt died and the war ended, and when Truman began his anti-Soviet orientation and to develop the “cold war,” then organized labor should have broken with him and taken up a position of opposition, as was done by the Communist Party and the progressive unions. But, instead, the top leadership, true to its bourgeois character, developed a pro-war class collaboration with the Wall Street forces, with the present critical consequences to the working class and the American people.

### THE LEADERSHIP ROLE OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY

The Socialist Party (or more properly, its Left wing) in the first dozen years of that Party's life, its period of militancy, gave much of the leadership to the working class that the corrupt Gompers officialdom was altogether incapable of doing. But especially the Communist Party, ever since its foundation 34 years ago, has made major contributions in this general respect. Among the most outstanding examples of leadership given labor by our Party were: its rallying of the workers during the big employer-offensive of 1918-22, with its slogans of organize the unorganized, amalgamation of the craft unions, labor party, and recognition of Soviet Russia; its bitter struggle during the “boom” of the 1920's against the B. & O. plan, labor banking, “higher strategy of labor,” and the other paralyzing types of class collaboration; its militant leadership of the unemployed during the great economic crisis of 1929-33; its fight against fascism and to unionize the basic industries in 1933-39; the intense efforts to help win World War II; its brave fight against the Korean war and the other reactionary imperialist policies of the “cold war” period to date—1945-53; and, throughout the entire period, our Party's fight for the economic, political, and social rights of the Negro people. These many struggles



were not without important effect in substantially strengthening the general labor movement.

In the present period, with the elementary danger of war, fascism, and economic crisis confronting the workers, our Party is again called upon to exert the maximum of its constructive leadership—for the policies of the top official leaders of labor can only intensify the grave dangers now facing the working class and the people as a whole. It is precisely to prevent our Party from exercising this needful leadership that the Government is so ferociously persecuting its leaders and members under the Smith Act and other pro-fascist laws, without any regard for justice or democracy. The fight our Party has been making these past five years for a legal existence, and in general defense of the Bill of Rights, is one of the most heroic chapters in the whole history of the American labor movement.

In this period of sharp danger of war, fascism, and economic crisis, and also of a rising spirit of struggle in the working class and among the peace forces generally, the main objective to be achieved, so far as the labor movement is concerned, is to shift this movement's main policy away from an acceptance of Wall Street's line that a third world war directed against the U.S.S.R. is inevitable and necessary and to lead it to the adoption of the proletarian policy of the peaceful co-existence of the capitalist and Socialist worlds.

The progressive independent unions have a big role to play in this respect. The success of the whole fight against the dangers of fascism and economic crisis is inextricably bound up with the basic fight for peace. The National Committee's resolution in the July *Political Affairs* detailed the specific issues around which to develop this fight, so there is no point in repeating them here.

The basic policy necessary for this mass fight is essentially that of the united front from below. The great masses of the workers, plus considerable sections of the lower union officialdom, have a sharp fear of war, fascism, and economic crisis, and unlike their high-paid leaders, want to fight against them. It is these masses that we have to reach directly, and we should nurse no illusions that the corrupt top bureaucratic officialdom will develop progressive policies and struggles. The strongest point of the National Committee's resolution is precisely that it stresses the elementary need to unite these masses, especially in the conservative-led unions and other democratic organizations, with active coalition policies based on the urgent need of these masses. However, as developments of this nature take place it is to be expected that some members of the top officialdom will be forced to go along with them, or, at least, appear to be going along with them.

The Party's basic ideological task is to combat the widespread mass illusions associated with the general

bourgeois conception of "progressive capitalism." This concept is based upon Keynesism, and has as its practical expression the so-called "managed economy" of the Roosevelt, Truman, and Eisenhower Administrations. Illusions about "progressive capitalism" which is the official policy of the great bulk of the labor movement, grow out of the ideological and material corruption of the skilled and sections of the semi-skilled workers by the imperialists—a corruption which in the working class of the United States has gone incomparably deeper and wider than in any other country.

Since the advent of this Keynesism, with the Roosevelt period, the propagation of Socialism in the unions has become virtually extinct, save on the part of occasional rank and file Communists. Even in the progressive independent unions there is practically no advocacy whatever of Socialism as the ultimate goal. The substance of Browder's revisionism was an attempt to commit the Communist Party to "progressive capitalism." A few years ago our Party, through a series of articles, began to fight the ideology of "progressive capitalism"; but this initial attack was not followed up. It is a great weakness of our Party that it has

for so long surrendered the trade-union field to the blatant advocates of this crass bourgeois reformism. It is high time, therefore, that the banner of Socialism again be unfurled far and wide in the labor movement and a relentless struggle be waged against the bourgeois conception of "progressive capitalism."

On this 34th birthday the Communist Party has both great opportunities and heavy responsibilities. Never have the masses needed its Marxist-Leninist leadership more acutely than now. The biggest internal obstacle the Party has to overcome in order to do its duty in the class struggle is sectarianism. There is a Right danger in the Party, of course, but the most predominant handicap is a Left-sectarianism which has grown as the Party, fighting against being destroyed or driven underground, has tended to shrink back upon itself and to neglect mass work on various fronts. Important developments may be looked for in the near future in the fight for the workers' living standards, in defense of the Bill of Rights, and in the building of a strong peace movement of organized labor, the Negro people and other strata. Our Party must gird itself to play its maximum part in this struggle.

By A

rec  
we

Our  
a full  
which  
scale  
establ  
which  
every  
the  
Party  
conve  
reality

Wh  
tion?

1. 't  
tives,  
ground  
Amer  
immig  
fire in  
presen  
have  
easing  
Soviet

2. T  
possib  
gle ag  
part  
periali  
strugg  
definit  
the d

# New Opportunities in the Fight for Peace

By Andrew Stevens

(The following is an extract from the main report delivered at the recent National Conference of the Communist Party. The full report, as well as other reports, are being made available in pamphlet form.)

OUR CENTRAL OBJECTIVE is to make a full assessment of the new situation which is rapidly emerging on a world scale and within our country, to establish clearly the new possibilities which are coming into existence in every field of activity, and to insure the adequate deployment of our Party's policies and forces so as to convert these new possibilities into reality.

What is new in the present situation?

1. The new Soviet peace initiatives, unfolded against the background of the most acute crisis of American foreign policy, have made imminent the conclusion of the cease-fire in Korea, have weakened the present anti-Soviet war alliance, and have created new possibilities for easing the danger of war against the Soviet Union.

2. This new situation enhances the possibility of broadening the struggle against McCarthyism, which is part and parcel of American imperialism's war drive, merging that struggle with the fight for peace, and definitely checking the destruction of the democratic freedoms of the

American people. To the degree that this can be realized, the possibility will be created for defeating all attempts to outlaw the Communist Party, for checking the onslaught against it, and for increasing the scope of its public activity.

3. As a consequence of this new situation, there is beginning to take place a process of the unfreezing of all political relationships which were established in the expectation of the "inevitability" of war against the Soviet Union. This is true, in the first instance of the trade unions, where the possibility exists to bring about a weakening of their "national unity" around the war program—to stimulate a new surge of militancy which will facilitate a better defense of the workers' living standards, a greater unity of action, a gradually diminishing atmosphere of internal warfare, a new step forward in the direction of independent political action in the 1954 elections, and important beginnings in the process of building a coalition of popular forces under the conscious initiative of organized labor.

4. This carries with it the per-

spective of forging a greater unity of the Negro people and the increasing participation of the Negro people's movement in the popular coalition. Conversely, it implies the possibility of creating greater consciousness in the ranks of labor and the white progressive masses of the decisive importance of the Negro people as an ally in the struggle. Likewise, especially in view of the rapid emergence of crisis factors in the countryside, the possibility is enhanced of strengthening the class alliance of the labor movement, the poor and middle farmers and agricultural workers.

5. Finally, as a result of the totality of these factors, large-scale possibilities emerge for the Party to break out of its present isolation, to establish a new relationship with the working class and the popular movement, and to increase its public activity.

In emphasizing to the Party these new possibilities, we do not minimize the great dangers of war and fascism which confront labor and the people. The magnitude and seriousness of these dangers as well as the potential for defeating them were correctly estimated in the National Committee Resolution on the results of the presidential elections. It is precisely because the masses now recognize these dangers to a greater extent than previously that their struggles have acquired a new breadth, vigor and momentum, that new possibilities have been created for blocking these dangers. For so

long as these dangers were not grasped by the masses there was no possibility of a reaction adequate to the needs of the moment. Even so, however, we cannot say that the masses fully comprehend the extremely dangerous course upon which our country has been set by the monopolists. Hence, it is incumbent on the Party to intensify its activity in signaling the dangers which confront the nation.

But these dangers are quite fully grasped by our Party. What is above all needed in the ranks of the Party is a consciousness of the new possibilities which are emerging for it to rally the masses and lead them in successful struggle for peace, democracy and the protection of their economic needs. And what must be emphasized is the fact that there are only the *beginnings* of a new situation. These beginnings will not automatically transform the political picture; what is required is the most stubborn, skillful and broad struggle to transform the potentials of a new situation into reality.

## I

### THE FIGHT FOR PEACE

The imminent possibility of a cease-fire in Korea has been hailed with joy by the people of our country and the world. Only in the camp of the imperialists is there gloom and despondency. For a cease-fire in Korea would be a tremendous victory for the American people and the world peace camp. It would bring an end to the fighting in the most

unpop  
our cou  
More  
new p  
for eas  
Soviet  
hower  
the ma  
and W  
ism car  
negotia  
midst  
commo  
against  
cannot  
before  
That  
Pentag  
nth h  
by the  
despera  
cease-fi  
in Kor  
mands  
abroad,  
a cease  
respons  
The  
possibil  
complet  
tional a  
danger  
domina  
picture  
key to  
clear re  
ties nov  
of chan  
the past  
and wit  
What  
generati

unpopular and criminal war that our country has ever engaged in.

More than that, it symbolizes the new possibilities that are emerging for easing the danger of an anti-Soviet war by forcing the Eisenhower Administration to negotiate the main differences between East and West. For if American imperialism can be forced against its will to negotiate the issues in Korea in the midst of a shooting war, then the common sense of the world rebels against the idea that other issues cannot be resolved by negotiations before any shooting starts.

That is why the White House-Pentagon cabal engineered the eleventh hour sabotage of a cease-fire by the Syngman Rhee clique. It is desperately anxious to prevent a cease-fire from being consummated in Korea. But faced with the demands for peace at home as well as abroad, it is attempting to sabotage a cease-fire without taking direct responsibility upon itself for so doing.

The actual materialization of the possibilities now emerging would completely transform the international and domestic situation. For the danger of an anti-Soviet war has dominated the world and national picture since the spring of 1947. The key to everything, therefore, is a clear recognition that these possibilities now exist and are the outcome of changes that have taken place in the past six years on a world scale and within our own country.

What factors are responsible for generating these new possibilities?

1. The all-round strengthening, consolidation, unification and intensified struggles for peace by the world peace camp at the head of which stands the great Soviet Union and which includes People's China, the People's Democracies of Eastern Europe and North Korea, the colonial liberation movements of Asia and Africa, the anti-imperialist movements of Latin-America, the national independence movements of the peoples of Western Europe and the rising peace movement of the American people.

That this strengthening of the world peace camp is taking place is amply attested to, among other things, by the following well known facts: the tremendous economic and social advance of the Soviet Union, which is now preparing the conditions for making the transition from Socialism to Communism; the political consolidation of the rule of the People's Government in China and its unparalleled successes in the reconstruction of its economy; the economic advances of the People's Democracies in Eastern Europe where the Wall Street fifth columnist, diversionary spy rings and provocateurs of civil war are being exposed and smashed; the military successes of the colonial liberation movements in Indo-China and Malaya and the turbulent spread of the colonial liberation movement to Africa; the results of the recent Italian and French elections which constitute a stunning defeat for American imperialism and their sat-

elite governments in these countries.

In our own country, there is unmistakable evidence of a broad expansion in the popular sentiment and struggle for peace. In the seven months since the elections the following can be noted: the deluge of mail to the White House insisting that Eisenhower fulfill his implied commitment to end the war in Korea; the universal and spontaneous outcry against the threat made by Eisenhower in his Inaugural Address to spread the war to the China mainland; the instantaneous rebuff given by the masses to the Administration trial balloon for a blockade of China; the enthusiastic response to Soviet Premier Malenkov's declaration that there are no differences between the Soviet Union and the United States that cannot be settled peacefully; the wide popular support for Prime Minister Churchill's proposal for a Big Power meeting; the mounting demands for a reduction in the war budget and the taxes arising from it; the new intensity of the public debate over the necessity for replacing the war economy with plans for jobs in a peace-time economy; the tendency for the struggle against McCarthyism to merge with the fight for peace.

Indicative of the new features of this growth in the peace sentiment of the masses is the fact that, for the first time, the peace desire of the mass of workers is beginning to break through the rigid controls of the labor bureaucracy and find public

channels of expression in important sectors of the labor movement even though the main sections of the labor movement have not yet been won for the fight for peace.

2. The serious weakening of the present anti-Soviet war alliance as a result of the extreme sharpening of all inter-imperialist contradictions.

This is particularly to be seen in the aggravated state of relations between American and British imperialism. There is hardly a single question of major international importance which has not brought to the forefront in the recent period the clash of imperialist interests between the monopolists of Wall Street and the bankers of London City—the formation of a European Army, Korean cease-fire, East-West trade, recognition of China and her admission into the U.N., control of the dependent countries of the Near and Middle East, Big Power negotiations, etc. Nor are these contradictions limited to those between American and British imperialism. The French imperialists are openly at loggerheads with American imperialism on various aspects of the German question, on the issue of Tunisia, etc. Reviving Japanese imperialism is in open collision with Wall Street's attempt to prohibit their trading with China, the traditional mass foreign market for Japanese industry.

All of which brilliantly confirms the analysis made by Stalin in his epochal work *Economic Problems of Socialism in the U.S.S.R.*:

Out  
be "go  
Wester  
talist  
(Weste  
Japan  
the U.  
comm  
to thin  
"go we  
countri  
and of  
ndless  
to tear  
and tal  
velopm

Wha  
current  
it cor  
effort  
tries to  
bondag  
penden  
out say  
lations  
powers  
nant a  
teriorat  
present  
3. T  
perialis  
whole c  
policy  
aration  
other t  
rejection  
Wester  
their p  
levels s  
failure  
inal ob  
spite I

Outwardly, everything would seem to be "going well"; the U.S.A. has put Western Europe, Japan and other capitalist countries on rations; Germany (Western), Britain, France, Italy and Japan have fallen into the clutches of the U.S.A. and are meekly obeying its commands. But it would be a mistake to think that things can continue to "go well" for "all eternity," that these countries will tolerate the domination and oppression of the United States endlessly, that they will not endeavor to tear loose from American bondage and take the path of independent development.

What we are witness to in the current sharpening of inter-imperialist contradictions is precisely this effort by various imperialist countries to "tear loose from American bondage and take the path of independent development." It goes without saying that this aspect of the relations between the imperialist powers will become increasingly dominant and lead to still further deterioration and disintegration of the present anti-Soviet war alliance.

3. The defeat for American imperialism in Korea brings to a head a whole chain of defeats for its foreign policy of aggression and war preparations. These include among other things the following: outright rejection by the governments of Western Europe, under pressure of their peoples, of the arms economy levels set by Wall Street; complete failure and abandonment of the original objectives set by N.A.T.O. despite Dulles' notorious "get tough

with our allies" European tour; failure to incorporate a West German Army into the European Army and as a result of this the enforced flight of American imperialism from the "target date" of 1954. The results of the French and Italian elections point up the failure of American imperialism's efforts to smash the aspirations of the peoples of Western Europe for peace and national independence through the imposition of governments resting upon American dollars and bayonets. A similar fate has befallen the efforts of American imperialism to place an embargo on trade between West and East Europe. And as a direct consequence of the cease-fire in Korea, Wall Street is now confronted with the prospect of being defeated in its fight to maintain the exclusion of People's China from the United Nations. This succession of major defeats for the foreign policy of American imperialism has thrown that policy into an acute crisis of the most profound dimensions.

4. It is in the light of these developments, as is made clear by Comrade Foster in his article, "Fighting War With Peace and Democracy", *Political Affairs*, June, 1953, that we must evaluate the new Soviet peace initiatives which have been continuously and rapidly unfolded in every sphere of international relations. It would be a serious error to see in this Soviet peace initiative only a continuation of what the Soviet Union has been doing ever since the cold war was

inaugurated by American imperialism. Of course, the Soviet Union has constantly taken the initiative for peace, for a peaceful settlement of all outstanding issues. In this general sense the present Soviet peace initiative is a continuation of its basic policy. But we must grasp what is qualitatively new in the current Soviet peace initiative. Formerly, because of the objective situation, the Soviet struggle for peace was mainly directed to, and could under the circumstances be, directed to blocking and retarding American imperialism's drive to war. And needless to say, it succeeded in this. In view of the new features of the international situation the Soviet Union's peace initiative has a qualitatively new content. It is aimed, as pointed out by Comrade Foster, at undermining the present anti-Soviet war alliance and thus easing the danger of an anti-Soviet war.

Further, the current Soviet peace initiative is not limited to its foreign policy proposals. A very important aspect of the present stage of the Soviet Union's fight against the war danger consists, as Comrade Foster has pointed out, in fighting war with peace and democracy. The Soviet Union, which is fundamentally the most democratic country in the world because it is a socialist democracy, was compelled during World War II and the ensuing period of the cold war, to institute many disciplines as a matter of sheer self-preservation. Today, because of its vastly strengthened position, both internally and

on a world scale, the Soviet government finds it possible to relax many of these disciplines. This it is doing consciously and deliberately as the events of the past number of months have shown. A most important result of this policy is its effect in undermining the Big Lie that the Soviet Union is a "totalitarian" state organized for war, a lie which the imperialists lean on heavily in attempting to prepare the public mind for their planned war against the Soviet Union. Hence, the continuous expansion of democracy in the Soviet Union is not only an internal question. It is very definitely part of the Soviet fight for peace.

The foregoing are the main elements in the world situation on which we base our judgment that important new possibilities are emerging to ease the danger of an anti-Soviet war and to compel American imperialism to negotiate the main differences between East and West.

#### ONLY MASS STRUGGLE WILL ENSURE NEGOTIATIONS

In making this judgment we emphasize two things. First, that this possibility implies a whole period of struggle for its realization. We have entered into a period which is characterized by this possibility, a period which may have many zigzags, many ups and downs, many unexpected negative turns of events. The most serious mistake we could make would be to oversimplify our esti-

mate  
be en  
mome  
plifica  
under  
can in  
der to  
Ameri  
ing m  
ondly,  
this pe  
od of  
previo  
to con  
the th  
world  
period  
bilities,  
become  
is in th  
has dis  
to und  
be tran  
only in  
struggle  
war or  
Admin  
Amer  
Big Bu  
stration  
main to  
y, to m  
war, to  
prepara  
in view  
and the  
Americ  
do so in  
not, tha  
be the  
error to  
the leop



mate as though the cold war could be ended by a single act at a single moment of time. Such an over-simplification would imply that we had underestimated the ability of American imperialism to manoeuvre in order to frustrate the wishes of the American people and the peace-loving masses of the world. And secondly, we emphasize the fact that this possibility implies a *whole period of struggle* for its realization. If previously the main danger we had to contend with was the influence of the theory of inevitability of a new world war, then as we enter into the period marked by these new possibilities, the danger will increasingly become a tendency to feel that "peace is in the bag," that the war danger has disappeared altogether—a failure to understand that possibilities can be transformed into living reality only in the process of the sharpest struggle against the war policies and war orientation of the Eisenhower Administration.

American imperialism through the Big Business Eisenhower Administration, is working with might and main to frustrate any such possibility, to maintain and heat up the cold war, to press forward with all its preparations for an anti-Soviet war. In view of the international situation, and the mood and temper of the American people, it is compelled to do so in new ways. But new ways or not, that is what it is doing. It would be the most criminal opportunist error to cultivate any illusion that the leopard has changed its spots,

that American imperialism has abandoned its central goal of world domination and the perspective of an anti-Soviet war, that it has reconciled itself to living at peace with the Socialist world, that it is prepared to negotiate peacefully its differences with the Soviet Union.

The extreme lengths to which American imperialism will go in its desperate effort to press forward its central objective of an anti-Soviet war were vividly demonstrated by the events which transpired in Korea and in the eastern part of Germany some weeks ago. In Korea, American imperialism connived with the Syngman Rhee government to carry through a last minute provocation in connection with the release of North Korean war prisoners on the very eve of the conclusion of the armistice. That this provocation did not succeed is due only to the firmness of the Chinese and North Korean peoples' forces which refused to permit any diversion from their central objective of concluding a cease-fire. Likewise with the events in the German Democratic Republic. Confronted with an overwhelming, world-wide response to the Soviet Union's peace initiative, with the development of unprecedented support to Churchill's proposal for a Big Power Conference, and the prospect that a cease-fire in Korea would bring about an enormous lessening of world tensions, American imperialism undertook to organize a putsch in Berlin in the hope that it would develop into civil war in the heart

of Europe. Taking advantage of certain dissatisfactions which had accumulated among sections of the workers in German Democratic Republic as a result of mistakes committed by the Socialist Unity Party of Germany over the past year, American imperialism put into operation its carefully prepared plans to foment civil war by unleashing its Project X agents to riot, sabotage, burn and pillage. The main immediate objective of this plot was to cancel out the world-wide effect of the Soviet Union's peace initiatives by restoring an atmosphere of tension in the heart of Europe.

We must soberly anticipate that American imperialism will undertake even further and still more desperate measures in its frantic effort to cancel out the impact of the Soviet Union's peace initiative and to block any progress toward peaceful negotiations. For the basic orientation of American imperialism remains the same—world domination achieved by war against the Soviet Union. Only the mass struggle of the people can force the Eisenhower Administration to negotiate with the Soviet Union; it will never do so voluntarily through a self-imposed change of course.

The exposure of Beria as an agent of world imperialism is directly connected with the present counteroffensive of American imperialism against the Soviet Union's peace initiatives. That Beria selected this moment to lift the mantle of his deception and come forward with such impudence that he could be

seen in his true colors as an enemy of the Soviet people can be understood only in relation to the desperation with which American imperialism is compelled to utilize all its reserves to reverse the trend of world sentiment for peaceful negotiation. By unmasking Beria, the Communist Party of the Soviet Union made a profound contribution to the cause of world peace. It has enormously strengthened itself by cutting out an alien and malignant growth which so long as it festered undetected menaced the whole camp of peace and democracy.

We should not underestimate the possible effect of the East Berlin and Beria developments as they are distorted by the imperialists, upon the movement for peaceful negotiations. For the imperialists are falsely portraying these events as "signs of weakness" in the peace camp, and hence, as arguments against the necessity for negotiating with the Soviet Union and for continuing and further developing the Dulles policy of "liberation"—a policy of provoking civil war in the Soviet Union and the People's Democracies. That is why we must ceaselessly explain the real meaning of these and similar events which may transpire in the future. It will be all the easier for us to do so because, in reality, these alleged "signs of weakness," the unmasking of traitors as in the case of Beria, and the correction of weaknesses and mistakes, as in the case of East Germany, are strengthening the Soviet Union and the People's Democracies by eliminating what

over co  
Americ  
carry  
the po  
these t  
on fals  
matial  
about  
East-W  
Mon  
y unit  
objectiv  
foreign  
ism con  
of the  
ship as  
he pub  
Eisenho  
his wo  
the uns  
ient Tr  
ient; th  
the Sta  
gression  
tratic P  
ncredib  
tratic  
Right"  
force ex  
no less,  
ning th  
It wo  
to assum  
in the c  
ness of  
sign pol  
ences an  
lists an  
fabric o  
top. Th  
these di  
clearly c  
the Nat

ever centers of internal disruption American imperialism counts on to carry out its nefarious designs. But the point is that we must explain these to the masses and not rely on false hopes that events will automatically, without struggle, bring about the peaceful negotiation of East-West differences.

Monopoly capital remains basically united behind its main over-all objectives. Bi-partisan support for the foreign policy of American imperialism continues to prevail in the ranks of the Democratic Party top leadership as well as in Congress. Witness the public support by Stevenson for Eisenhower's policies at every leg of his world-wide whistle-stop tour; the unsolicited advice of ex-President Truman to get behind the President; the unquestioning support of the State Department by the Congressional spokesman for the Democratic Party; and finally, the almost incredible spectacle of the Democratic Party opposing "from the Right" Eisenhower's reduction of air force expenditures on the grounds, no less, that Eisenhower was "weakening the country's military forces."

It would be a mistake, however, to assume that full harmony prevails in the camp of monopoly. The acuteness of the crisis in American foreign policy is accentuating the differences and rifts among the monopolists and beginning to strain the fabric of "national unity" from the top. The main issues around which these differences are developing were clearly outlined in the Resolution of the National Committee on the re-

sults of the presidential elections (*Political Affairs*, July, 1953).

During the recent period, the differences have been manifested with increasing frequency and growing force on a whole host of specific questions: to conclude a cease-fire, or "go-it-alone;" attitude to the U.N. as symbolized in the debate over the Bricker Constitutional amendment; maintenance or relaxation of the embargo on East-West trade; continuance or elimination of the "foreign aid" program; tax and budgetary policy in relation to the arms program, etc.

#### THE EISENHOWER ADMINISTRATION AND McCARTHY

The most dramatic and widely popularized differences in the field of foreign policy have been those between the Eisenhower Administration and McCarthy. Recall, for example, the fantastic affair of McCarthy's private negotiations with the Greek shipowners, the struggle by McCarthy against confirmation of Bohlen, the "go it alone," "sink the accursed British ships" speech of McCarthy in the Senate, the struggle by McCarthy against reliance on the U.N. as an instrument of American policy, etc.

It is important to establish full clarity on the significance of these differences. Social-Democracy is attempting to picture them as a basic struggle between the "McCarthy isolationists" and the "Eisenhower bi-partisan internationalists." On this Adolph Berle and Dubinsky con-

verted the platform of the recent I.L.G.W.U. convention into a forum for mobilization of support to Eisenhower as against McCarthy. But this is a most dangerous and conscious deception of the masses.

Both Eisenhower and McCarthy are united on the main direction and general objectives of imperialist foreign policy. Within the framework of this basic and underlying agreement, differences have developed and will continue to erupt on specific questions relating to the tactics involved in the execution of this general policy, the tempo with which this policy is unfolded, etc. These differences are an expression of the specific role which is being played at this moment by the Eisenhower Administration on the one hand, and the McCarthy forces on the other. The Eisenhower Administration expresses and carries out the policy of the dominant circles of monopoly capital in the United States. As such, it is compelled to reckon with and take into account the existing relation of forces within the imperialist camp and within the United States. McCarthy's role, as a spokesman for the most rabid warmongers is to attempt to change the existing relation of forces within the country by creating a mass fascist base of support for more extreme measures.

In this situation, we must at all times keep firmly in mind our central task, to rally the masses in struggle against the war policy of the Eisenhower Administration, which is the policy that is actually being car-

ried out by American imperialism. In the course of doing so, we must seize every occasion to single out for sharpest fire on one or another issue, the most rabid, open and exposed warmongers in and around the Eisenhower Administration: McCarthy, Dulles, MacArthur, etc.

It follows from this that we cannot be passive in the face of differences between Eisenhower and McCarthy simply because both are united in support of a common over-all imperialist war policy. But such passivity has been manifested on important occasions in the past. We must mobilize the masses to intervene actively and aggressively on all such questions on the basis of an independent peace policy, which, by directing the sharpest fire around a given issue against McCarthy, brings the masses objectively into collision with the basic policy of the Eisenhower Administration as a whole. Our failure to do this vigorously in the past is an expression of sectarian inability to develop the fight for peace by taking the present level of understanding of the masses as our starting point. At the same time, we must fight strenuously against any tendencies for such intervention in these differences to take on the aspect of "support for Eisenhower against McCarthy." Such tendencies have also revealed themselves on important questions in the past and reflect an opportunist pressure to abandon our principled position in the name of being with the masses in the struggle against McCarthyism.

THE ?  
PEA

In t  
possibi  
for ea  
Soviet  
played  
course,  
these  
foundl  
tivities  
other h  
new m  
ing cla  
stance  
are uni  
Ther  
ion in  
the fig  
past, o  
spoke  
the cau  
tween  
Soviet  
ment o  
the Rig  
itself a  
the offi  
unions.  
is not  
prior t  
Novem  
of the  
ers an  
Butche  
as the  
the Am  
of the  
port to  
cialist  
co-exist  
settleme

## THE TRADE UNIONS AND THE PEACE STRUGGLE

In the fight to realize the new possibilities which have been created for easing the danger of an anti-Soviet war, the role which must be played by the working class is, of course, decisive. On the one hand, these new possibilities have profoundly affected the mood and activities of the working class. On the other hand, the development of these new moods in the ranks of the working class gives added political substance to the new possibilities which are unfolding in the fight for peace.

There is a rapidly changing situation in the trade-union movement in the fight for peace. Whereas, in the past, only the progressive-led unions spoke up for peace and championed the cause of peaceful negotiations between the United States and the Soviet Union, now the peace sentiment of the mass of the workers in the Right-led unions is also asserting itself and finding its reflection in the official policies of certain of these unions. This development, of course, is not a completely new one. Even prior to the Republican victory in November of last year, the leadership of the Hotel and Restaurant Workers and the Meat Cutters and Butchers of the A. F. of L., as well as the Packinghouse Workers and the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of the C.I.O., announced their support to the proposition that the socialist and capitalist worlds could co-exist peacefully and called for the settlement of East-West differences

by peaceful negotiations. Since then the Railroad unions as well as the Miners Union, through their union publications, declared their forceful opposition to any spread of the war in the Far East. Even more significant was the action of the U.A.W. Convention which adopted a statement on foreign policy, which, while still liberally studded with the anti-Communist and anti-Soviet policies of the Reuther leadership, takes a positive attitude to the principle of negotiations and endorses the idea of an Eisenhower-Malenkov meeting. When we remember that some two years ago Reuther contributed an article to the infamous anti-Soviet war issue of *Collier's* magazine, the action of this U.A.W. convention in 1953 is startling by contrast and a fitting commentary on the water that has flowed under the bridge on the peace issue in the labor movement during the past two years.

The changing situation in the trade-union movement is reflecting itself in the following developments:

1. A growing differentiation between masses and leaders on the question of peace with the mass of workers beginning to press for the labor movement to enter actively into the fight for peace.

2. Resulting from this a process of differentiation is taking place among a whole layer of secondary and lower leaders of the trade unions with big sections of them moving toward support of a genuine peace policy. This creates new possibilities for united and parallel peace action from below.

3. Within the top leadership of the trade-union movement three distinct currents are developing:

On the one hand, there are such forces as are typified by Gorman, Helstein, Ernst and Potofsky, who in the past gave passive support to the foreign policy of Wall Street, but who for some time now have taken a stand for the peaceful settlement of the Korean war and the negotiation of all other differences. In this respect, while not breaking fully from their support of the Administration's foreign policy, this group has differentiated itself in very important respects from government policy as well as the official policy of the C.I.O. and A. F. of L.

Among the main Right-wing Social-Democrats, those who rabidly support the war policy of Wall Street, certain tactical differences are to be observed in the methods used by them to cope with and fight against the rising sentiment of the masses for the negotiation of differences between the U.S. and U.S.S.R. One tactic is followed by Reuther who tips his hat to the principle of negotiations as a result of mass pressure but, following the line of the State Department, places such conditions for negotiations as to cancel out in advance the possibility of these negotiations ever taking place or leading to positive results. This tactic is calculated by Reuther to associate himself with the masses who demand negotiations, at the same time that he misdirects and disorients the movements for negotiations. There should be no illusions that Reuther "has

changed his policy," that Reuther is moving into the peace camp. At the same time, it would be the height of political blindness not to understand that the position which Reuther has been forced into also creates additional possibilities for moving the masses of auto workers, against Reuther's desires, fully into the unreserved struggle for peaceful negotiations.

A different tactic is followed by the Right-wing Social-Democrats of the Meany-Dubinsky type. In face of the rising demand among the masses for peaceful negotiations, these rabid proponents of Wall Street's foreign policy follow a policy of head-on collision and frontal struggle against the wishes and sentiments of their memberships. They brand the call for negotiations as "appeasement" and beat the drums for support to the State Department's opposition to Churchill's proposal for a top level Big Power Conference. The vehemence with which this brand of Social-Democracy attacks the idea of peaceful negotiations must under no conditions be allowed to obscure the fact that the membership of their unions is as deeply desirous of a peaceful settlement as the auto workers, and, hence, that there are growing possibilities for involving these workers as well in various forms of the fight for peace.

It is very important to grasp the political significance of this new element in the fight for peace. It represents an important difference between the present moment and, let us say, the 1947-48 period. At

that time  
in the  
Left,  
bourgeois  
around  
class poli  
degree  
in the  
peace st  
to be c  
importa  
class in  
ing la  
even th  
active l  
for pea  
portant  
the dire  
be the  
the figh  
of this  
These  
ne pos  
of the  
against  
ng clas  
specific  
onal di  
ions. A  
work to  
eriously  
brming  
ect poli  
struggle  
policy. U  
ions ad  
remain c  
a stimul  
gation in  
The p  
particula  
in connec  
of resting

that time, the most articulate voices in the peace camp—outside of the Left, of course—were those of certain bourgeois-liberal forces grouped around Wallace, with the working class playing a secondary role to the degree that it was involved at all in the fight for peace. The present peace struggle, however, is beginning to be characterized by the fact that important sections of the working class in the Right-led unions are at long last speaking up for peace—even though they are not yet in the active leadership of the daily fight for peace. This means that an important first step has been taken in the direction of what must ultimately be the real relationship of forces in the fight for peace—the leadership of this fight by the working class.

These new developments open up the possibility of setting the bulk of the organized labor movement against the war policies of the ruling class and government on the specific issue of resolving international differences by peaceful negotiations. At the same time that we work toward this end, we must seriously tackle the problem of transforming the passive adoption of correct policy by the unions into active struggle for the realization of this policy. Unless this is done, the positions adopted by the unions will remain on paper instead of acting as a stimulus to labor's active participation in the fight for peace.

The progressive-led unions have a particularly important role to play in connection with this task. Instead of resting on their oars, grateful that

other sections of the labor movement are beginning to speak up for peace, these unions should redouble their peace activities. Such struggles now will help strengthen them among their own members as well as the workers generally, and confirm that the policies of these unions, for which they were subject to the sharpest attack, have been vindicated by life itself. Furthermore, this is necessary if the first beginnings in the Right-led unions are to be pushed forward instead of stymied by Right-wing attacks.

#### MAIN QUESTIONS IN FIGHT FOR PEACE

What are some of the cardinal questions which must be borne in mind if we are to take full advantage of the new possibilities which have opened up in the fight for peace?

The fight for peace must be put in the center of all our work and activity. It is clearly not there now.

It would seem that this admonition should be somewhat superfluous in view of the splendid new opportunities for leading the broad masses in the fight for peace. But the experience of our struggle for peace over the past years emphasizes one thing above all — the stubbornness with which the struggle must be waged at all times against an infinite variety of tendencies which, in different ways, divert the Party from placing centrally the fight for peace.

We can already anticipate, for example, certain demobilizing tendencies to regard peace as being "in the

bag," thus justifying passivity at the very moment when all our energies should be bent as never before to realize the potentialities of the present moment. In the past, our Party was demobilized by tendencies to regard war as inevitable, from which it followed that the struggle for peace was useless, hence, why exert ourselves? Now there is a danger that our Party may be demobilized by tendencies to consider that "peace is inevitable," from which it follows that the struggle for peace is superfluous, hence why exert ourselves? As we see, the viewpoints are diametrically opposed to each other but the end result is the same—passivity instead of activity.

We must warn against the complacency which assumes that war can be averted and the cold war ended by the sheer strength of the world peace camp regardless of what the American people do. Such sentiments are in the first place a shameful abdication of the responsibilities of the American working class. Furthermore, they are an invitation to disaster for the American people. Already, the most rabid warmongers are putting their own interpretation upon events, which are chiefly, although not exclusively, characterized by the intervention of the world peace camp. It is not the American people, they assert, who insisted on an end to the war in Korea, who demand that differences be negotiated; it is our allies, who are betraying us and taking the path of a new Munich, a new appeasement. And with this type of demagoguery, they

are endeavoring to stir up the wildest fascist type of national chauvinism to justify the continuation of the cold war and the preparations for a new war as well as to advance the drive to fascism at home through perpetuation of the Big Lie of an external and internal "Communist menace."

In addition, they are attempting to utilize the very victories of the peace camp to create new illusions in Eisenhower and the war policy of American imperialism. For example, they are now attempting to convince the masses that a cease-fire in Korea will be a victory "for the firm and aggressive policy of the Eisenhower Administration" instead of a defeat for that policy. To the degree that there is no active struggle for peace by the American people, such demagoguery will find fruitful soil. Only the most active peace struggle by the American people can bring about the internal change in the relation of political forces in our country which, alone, can guarantee world peace.

In the past, there was advanced the opportunist "tactical" consideration that the "fight for peace isolates us from the masses." The truth of the matter was that we were continually tailing behind the mood of the masses. This revealed itself time and again, as, during the elections with Eisenhower's pledge on Korea; as in connection with the popular outburst against Eisenhower's Inaugural Address; as, in connection with the fact that the Left forces at the U.A.W. convention were taken by surprise at the foreign policy resolution



wilderness adopted, etc. Nobody, of course, would dare repeat any such nonsense today. But, as the saying goes, "once a new war, twice shy." Let us therefore drive on guard in the period ahead against new "tactical" considerations which will again result in our Party falling behind the masses. We know from bitter experience how strong is the tendency in our ranks when we feel ourselves moving with the masses to merge ourselves and become the victims of spontaneity, forgetting altogether that our Party has a ceaseless vanguard role to play.

Most frequently the failure of our Party to place the fight for peace at the center of our activity derives from incorrect and one-sided conceptions of the relation between the fight for peace and other political activities.

For example, it is asserted that politically speaking peace is the *central issue*, the *broadest issue* in our fight against fascism. In proof of this, it is pointed out that many forces which support the foreign policy of the Administration oppose McCarthyism.

But such viewpoints fail totally to grasp what is new in the present situation. For whatever may have been the case in the past, it is an uncontested fact that today the fight against McCarthyism tends more and more to merge with the fight for peace. From the very beginning, McCarthy has selected the field of foreign policy as his special domain with the beginning with his attack on the State Department during Truman's administration and continuing even

more aggressively today with his struggle against negotiations between the United States and the Soviet Union. To think that the struggle against McCarthyism can be waged today without increasingly putting the fight for peace to the fore is to fall victim to a very narrow concept of the struggle against McCarthyism to the effect that it consists only of a struggle against witch-hunting expeditions, "character assassination," "abuse of congressional immunity" and other aspects of McCarthyism. Certain liberal and Social-Democratic forces attempt to confine the struggle as though McCarthyism were a "thing in itself" which developed without any relation to the war drive of American imperialism.

Furthermore, the very manner in which this question is placed betrays an inability to comprehend the relationship between the fight for peace and the fight against fascism. At the present juncture of events, the drive to fascism is primarily motivated by the drive to war. It is primarily intended to silence and intimidate the peace forces, to create a quiet rear for American imperialism so as to facilitate its ability to drive the masses into an unpopular war.

But the ability of reaction to wipe out popular liberties without serious resistance from the masses stems, for the most part, from the influence of the Big Lie—the "menace of Soviet aggression," the inevitability of a new world war—and hence the need to take "exceptional" measures in the interests of "national security."

To the degree that the masses discard the theory of "inevitable war," see the possibility of putting an end to the danger of a war between the socialist and capitalist worlds and mount the fight for peace, they will refuse to accept, sanction or countenance even the slightest destruction of democratic liberties in the name of "combatting the Communist menace." A successful fight for peace is the greatest guarantee that the struggle against fascism will take on new proportions. In fact the new high level of the struggle against McCarthyism is caused not only by the increased menace of McCarthyism, but also from the new momentum of the fight for peace in the country. That is why any effort to counterpose the fight for peace to the fight against fascism is false and harmful both to the fight for peace and the fight against fascism.

Of course, this does not imply that the danger of fascism will automatically be eliminated if the danger of an anti-Soviet war can be eased in the period ahead. For the fascist orientation of the ruling class is not a derivative of, or an appendage to, its drive to war. Both the drive to war and the drive to fascism are the twin and interrelated tendencies of monopoly capital. Both are engendered by the compulsory drive for maximum profits. At the present moment, the drive to fascism is motivated primarily by the drive to unleash an anti-Soviet war. But even if this danger should be somewhat eased in the period ahead, this will

not finally end the danger of an anti-Soviet war nor the danger of new kinds of wars arising from the contradictions between the imperialist powers. And, in the second place, the very victory of the popular front in the fight to ease the threat of an anti-Soviet war, coupled with the stormy struggles which the economic crisis is now maturing, will surely intensify the inability of the ruling class to cope with its problems on the basis of bourgeois democratic forms of rule, and strengthen it in its determination to impose a fascist dictatorship on the country. What must be recognized, however, is that on this front, too, new possibilities exist for the organization of a broader popular movement to preserve democracy and stem the advance toward fascism.

Among some of our trade unionists, it is asserted that while, of course, peace is the central issue, the struggle around economic questions is broader. Here again there is a failure to see the relationship between the fight for peace and the economic struggle. In the first place, the economic struggle is at the present moment a very direct and important aspect of the fight for peace since it is a struggle against the economic impact of the war economy on the living standards of the workers. We are opposed to an abstract fight for peace which is projected without a living relationship to the economic needs of the workers. On the other hand, as we have repeatedly emphasized, the struggle against the economic impact of the war economy

omy will not develop automatically into a fight for peace no matter how militantly it is developed unless such struggles are related, depending on the concrete situation, to the war policies of the government. As a matter of fact, the workers see very clearly the relation between their economic struggles and the war drive whether it be on the question of jobs, wages, prices or taxes. This, of course, does not mean that we should mechanically inject the fight for peace into any and every economic struggle, as for example in formulating a set of wage demands in a given shop, or in conducting a specific struggle in a department against the retiming of a certain job. But it does mean that we should put an end to the tendency to counterpose the economic struggle to the fight for peace as an excuse for not taking the fight for peace into the shops and unions.

Likewise there is a tendency to counterpose the Negro liberation struggle to the fight for peace, when obviously there is a close and organic relationship between the two. It is quite obvious that the liberation struggles of the Negro people are the greatest single unifying factor in the Negro community and in the mass organizations of the Negro people. As is the case with the struggle against fascism generally, so specifically in the struggle for Negro rights, unity of broad masses of Negro people can be achieved in the fight for F.E.P.C., for the right to vote, against all forms of Jim Crow and discrimination regardless of di-

visions on the matter of foreign policy. But, in the first place, this very united struggle for civil rights is a most important and decisive aspect of the fight for peace since the present assault on the Negro people bears the definite imprint of the Anglo-Saxon white chauvinist ideology heightened by the drive to war. In its turn, the struggle of the peoples of the colonial and dependent countries against Wall Street's drive to dominate the world evokes a profound wave of sympathy and admiration among the Negro people and inspires them to greater efforts in the United States.

A mechanical counterposing of the fight for peace to the Negro liberation struggle tends to hide the fact that the sentiments and desires of the Negro people for peace are as highly developed and as consciously articulated among the Negro people as among any other section of the population. Can we overlook the connection between the role of the Negro workers in the auto, packing, railroad, mining and hotel and restaurant industries and the position the unions in these industries have taken on the fight for peace? Of course not! In the Negro people's movement these peace sentiments are expressed in the most varied forms—church sermons, conferences, seminars, mass meetings on Africa, etc. It goes without saying that the struggle of the Negro people for peace is given a more advanced expression on special issues, for example, support of the colonial liberation movement, especially Afri-

ca, but also Indo-China, Malaya, etc.

We must guard against two tendencies here: first, any tendency to gloss over the fight for civil rights by abstract assertions about the primacy of the peace issue; second, any tendency to by-pass the fight for peace on the ground that the broadest issue among the Negro people is the fight for civil rights. Under the present conditions, neither movement can develop purely by itself, in isolation from the other. At the same time we must avoid mechanical "linking up." The task of the Party is, by correct political work, to make the masses of Negro people conscious of the interrelationship and on that basis to achieve a wider participation of the Negro people in the general movement for peace as well as to help further develop the more specific national expressions of the peace movement in Negro communities and mass organizations.

#### WINNING THE YOUTH FOR PEACE

We cannot talk seriously about putting the fight for peace in the center of our work so long as we continue our present inexcusable neglect of the task of winning the allegiance of America's youth to the peace camp. The pro-war, fascist forces of the country are highly conscious of the strategic importance of the youth and are waging a stubborn battle to turn the youth into a political reserve for their war drive and a base of support for their drive to

fascism. During the November elections, it was the Republican Party which made an audacious bid for support of the youth by throwing out the slogan: "Stop the slaughter of our boys in Korea." In the period since the elections, the Republicans have increasingly attempted to appear as the champions of the youth by giving support to the proposal for lowering the voting age to 18 under the slogan: "Old enough to fight, old enough to vote!"

But in the face of this determined bid by the pro-war camp to win the battle for the minds and the allegiance of youth, labor, the democratic forces generally, and particularly our Party, have been largely passive and dormant in this struggle. Our main task is to put an end to this one-sided character of the battle for the youth, to bring labor and the democratic forces into action on this front in order to avert the danger of the young generation being turned against the camp of peace and democracy.

Of course, we reject the characterization which is glibly made of a "silent generation," or a "beat generation." The attachment of the youth to the cause of peace and democracy, the moods of struggle among the youth, are as highly developed as among other sections of the population. Fundamentally this is so because the youth have paid most and benefited least from the Korean war and other imperialist adventures; and also, because the experiences of the anti-fascist war still exert a big influence on the youth.

At the same time, we must not overlook the conditioning effects of years of anti-Soviet preparations and propaganda especially among the millions who have gone through their periods of military service since the end of World War II; nor, the dangers of pro-fascist, anti-labor demagoguery under conditions of growing youth unemployment, enforced seniority rules in industry, the McCarthyite invasion of the schools and colleges.

This struggle between the camp of peace and the camp of war for the minds and the hearts of America's youth must not be seen as one in which the youth are simply a passive arena. There is growing activity and ferment among many important sections of the organized youth movement which are making a determined bid to place their own special imprint on this fateful struggle. The tendency for old political relationships to unfreeze in this new situation are particularly striking among the youth.

Our Party must undertake a most serious struggle to propel the organized labor movement into the struggle for the youth on the basis of a labor sponsored program to protect the young generation from the danger and burden of war and war preparations, from the horrors of fascism and from the effects of the crisis. It must give continuous and sustained political and material assistance and support to the Labor Youth League, helping to build it into a mass organization with a strong and expanding leadership in

all districts. This can be done only if every Party club and committee, beginning with the National Committee, becomes an active participant in the fight to win the young generation as an active sector of the peace camp in our country.

#### FOR BIG-POWER NEGOTIATIONS

Both the needs and the possibilities of the present moment call for the development of a veritable crusade for peaceful negotiations, for a top level meeting of the big powers to settle differences over the conference table. It is to this end that we must turn all our energies, our utmost skill, tenacity and resourcefulness, in overcoming all obstacles that hinder or delay the unfolding of the broadest united and parallel actions directed toward this end. Above all the labor movement, from one end of the country to the other, must be made to ring with the full-throated demand for peaceful negotiations.

This calls for planned and systematic efforts to organize and direct the struggle at all levels and in every field of activity. It is necessary, of course, to mobilize our forces politically; but that alone is not enough. This political mobilization must lead to plans and decisions which are checked on and verified, with appropriate lessons drawn from each success and each failure. Let us be done with that peculiar mentality that prevails among us which notes joyously the adoption of a resolution by the U.A.W. convention calling for big power negotiations, and then

does nothing to guarantee that this resolution is brought to the locals of this million-member union for discussion and action. This is the case today not only in the auto industry, but in the hotel and restaurant industry, the clothing industry and others in which union conventions or international leaderships have come out in support of peaceful negotiations.

Together with placing the main emphasis of our struggle for peaceful negotiations in the Right-led unions and organizations, we must guarantee that the various progressive peace centers and organizations develop their own initiative to the maximum. If ever there was a moment when the political initiative of the advanced peace forces was assured of a favorable response among the masses, this is that moment. We must categorically oppose any conception that the struggle against a sectarian interpretation of the role of the progressive peace centers implies the liquidation of Left initiative and activity.

In the course of developing this mass struggle for peaceful negotiations, our Party has the responsibility for developing a mass ideological struggle against the influence of the Big Lie. Only our Party can do this basically and thoroughly, even though, as we develop this struggle, broader circles will join us in their own way. For what is involved here is the establishment among the masses of the truth about the Communists in the United States and the

truth about the peace policy of the Soviet Union.

For more than seven years our Party has unceasingly played its vanguard role in the fight for peace. It has paid a heavy price for its steadfastness and devotion to this struggle. In the fight for a cease-fire in Korea, in the fight for a peaceful settlement of international differences through negotiations which we fought for under the slogan of a Big Five Peace Pact, in the fight for the principle of peaceful co-existence, in the fight against the thesis of an inevitable world war, in the fight against the hypocrisy of the Marshall Plan, in the fight for resumption of trade between East and West, in the fight for a reduction of armaments and against atom bomb diplomacy, our Party was the vanguard of the peace forces. Today its position is being taken up by increasingly broad masses of the people.

This vanguard role of the Party was made possible by the rejection of Browder revisionism. What Browder revisionism leads to was made fully clear when Browder dropped his hypocritical mask of friendship for the Soviet Union and openly joined the anti-Soviet camp. Revisionism led Browder, discredited to the open espousal of war incitement against the Soviet Union. The path of Marxism-Leninism has led and is leading our Party to the honorable fulfillment of its responsibilities to the American people, to the increasing support of the masses for its peace policies.

# The Defense of the Party is the Defense of the Bill of Rights

By Pettis Perry

SEPTEMBER 1953 is the 34th Anniversary of our Party. The Communist Party of the United States throughout these past thirty-four years has been confronted, in one way or another, with the fight for its legal existence and the fight to maintain and extend the democratic rights of our people. It is not necessary in a brief article to trace the history of the more than three decades of struggle our Party has led on this front. Comrade Foster has brilliantly unfolded this chapter in his monumental *History of the Communist Party of the United States*. Here we want to center attention on the recent years when monopoly capitalism opened its reactionary offensive to outlaw our Party and destroy the hard-won democratic rights of the people.

Almost from the time the guns were silenced in the Second World War, the ruling class of our country began to gird itself for new imperialist world adventures. Emerging from the war as the strongest capitalist power, the ruling class of this country struck out on the path of world domination. Obviously, such

a venture could not but bring with it a policy of internal repression of all democratic thought and activity. The ruling class knows full well that to throw the American people into a Third World War it must destroy the democratic processes at home. During the chauvinist, imperialist war just ended in Korea, this reactionary domestic course was amply demonstrated.

Our Party, already in 1945, saw this new danger of fascism and war. It was then that we rejected Browder revisionism and placed our Party back on the firm path of Marxism-Leninism. It was then, too, that we called for the broadest unity of labor, the Negro people, and all who cherished peace and democracy—to bring into being a broad people's democratic coalition to stem the tide toward fascism and war.

With the utmost speed the Wall Street warmakers moved to organize a "safe" rear as they embarked on the path of world empire. Resurrecting Hitler's discredited anti-Communist banner, they unleashed an unprecedented drive to tear the guts out of the Constitution and the Bill

of Rights through a many-sided attack upon our Party, upon the labor movement, the Negro people, and the democratic forces generally in our country. This assault has as its aim to intimidate and silence all opposition to U.S. imperialism's war course; to prevent the unity of labor and the people in the struggle to maintain peace and democracy; to behead the people's resistance to war and fascism by outlawing the Marxist vanguard, and through the fascistization of the entire state apparatus, foist an open dictatorship upon our country.

One by one the traditional democratic rights of freedom of speech, of assembly and association, of opinion and belief have been undermined—so that today "loyalty" oaths, witchhunts, FBI surveillance and hounding, militarization of science and institutions of learning, deportations of militant foreign-born workers—are the everyday facts of American life. Legal and extra-legal violence against the Negro people has taken a heavy toll in lives of men and women in both North and South in the attempt to stifle the rising tide of struggle for Negro freedom. Taft-Hartleyism and anti-labor legislation in state after state are but the beginnings of an effort to subvert and regiment the labor movement and destroy it.

By means of the thought-control section of the Smith Act, the ruling class opened its drive to behead and outlaw the Communist Party—as its

spearhead in the drive to smash all resistance to its plots for world conquest. And in 1950, the so-called Internal Security Act, generally known as the McCarran Act, which incorporates into the law of the land the monstrous lie that Communism is a world-wide conspiracy and a menace to the United States, was adopted in Congress over the opposition of labor and other sections of the people.

The arrest of the National Board of our Party in July 1948 on the trumped-up charge of conspiring to teach and advocate the overthrow of the U.S. Government by force and violence, signaled that the Wall Street rulers, like the monopolists in Germany, in their drive to destroy democracy for all, had to begin by destroying the Communist Party, the champion of the people's democratic and peace aspirations. The trial of the National Board, held in an atmosphere of anti-Communist hysteria, aroused to a fever-pitch by the bought-and-paid-for perjured testimony of depraved stool-pigeons, was a mockery of justice. The decision of the Supreme Court upholding the constitutionality of the Smith Act on June 4, 1951 tore to shreds the Constitution and the Bill of Rights and opened the road to mass arrests under the Smith Act of Communist and militant working-class leaders from New York to Hawaii. To date 93 men and women have been indicted. Fourteen, among them eight members of the

Natio  
prison  
day  
ay p  
Nazi  
Hitler  
ceived  
twent  
vania  
dorm  
trial  
ants  
Seattl  
follow  
Louis  
ACCE  
ON  
Wit  
hower  
on de  
have  
nine  
ists in  
fact t  
ment  
Act o  
ary d  
ivities  
Party  
lowed  
progre  
tions  
Brown  
organi  
versive  
velopm  
of M  
fascist  
son-Co



National Board, are already serving prison sentences; and seven are today political refugees from reactionary persecutions, as so many anti-Nazi fighters had to become under Hitlerism. Steve Nelson, who received a monstrous sentence of twenty years under the Pennsylvania Sedition Act (which had been dormant for decades), is again on trial together with four co-defendants under the Smith Act. The Seattle trial now in progress is to be followed in the early autumn by St. Louis and Detroit.

#### ACCELERATED ATTACKS ON DEMOCRACY

With the advent of the Eisenhower Administration, the attacks on democracy initiated by Truman, have been accelerated. The arrest of nine Communists and trade-unionists in Philadelphia is witness to the fact that the Eisenhower Government intends to employ the Smith Act on a wide scale. The reactionary decision of the Subversive Activities Board against the Communist Party last spring was quickly followed by indictments against 12 progressive working-class organizations and the announcement by Brownell of the addition of 64 organizations to the so-called subversive list. The most sinister development has been the rising threat of McCarthyism with its rabid fascist assaults on Communists and non-Communists alike, with its in-

quisitions and arrogant intimidations, demanding strict conformity to McCarthy's way of life or inevitable persecution and harassment, loss of job or right to practice one's profession, arrest and imprisonment. The symbol of this rising fascist menace is the barbarous murder of the Rosenbergs, the innocent Jewish couple, whose cause became a worldwide struggle that laid bare the heinous face of the U.S. warmakers.

How do we explain that in the midst of a rising concern of the masses of the people over the assaults on democracy and the threat of McCarthyism, we do not see a movement in defense of those arrested under the Smith Act? How is it to be explained that there is no mass movement around the question of amnesty for all those convicted under the thought-control Smith Act, first and foremost for the eleven leaders of our Party?

Is it because there is no possibility of mobilizing people to speak out and act on these issues? We know that among many honest elements there still prevails the false conception that the rights of the Communists are somehow not related to the task of maintaining democratic liberties. We know of course that the policies pursued by the reactionary labor officialdom and some A.D.A. leaders have aided the anti-Communist hysteria. But is this to be interpreted to mean that a movement of considerable proportions cannot be developed specifically

against the Smith Act and its application to Communists today? Of course not!

We can explain this situation, first of all, by the fact that there has been inadequate attention on the part of the entire Party leadership on all levels, and by the progressive forces generally, to the whole anti-fascist front, to the fight against the abrogation of one democratic right after another. Our Party and the forces it influences have not provided adequate leadership to the development of united action around the many issues to maintain democracy which have aroused deep concern in wide circles. Furthermore, we have not conducted a consistent ideological struggle to convince important sections of the people why the defense of the rights of the Communists is a front-line defense of democracy.

Secondly there is the one-sided interpretation of Comrade Foster's statement that the Party should not turn itself into a defense organization. Comrade Foster correctly warned that our Party should not repeat the mistakes made by the I.W.W.—which, with the attacks of the bourgeoisie, turned its main attention to defend itself with the result that it gave up any real attention to the protection of the day-to-day needs of the masses. Therefore, he urged that the struggle for peace, for Negro liberation, for maintaining and improving the people's living standards, should be steadfastly pushed by our Party. But he always stressed

that the fight to maintain the Bill of Rights and the fight for the legality of our Party must be fully unfolded, if the interests of the masses were to be advanced.

There is no ground for the conception, which has been encountered in many places, that we can adopt an attitude of indifference to the defense of the right of the Party to exist. Of course, it is correct that our Party should not turn itself into a defense organization. But it is absolutely impermissible for our Party to fail to mount a militant mass struggle in its defense.

Thirdly, when the ruling class began to direct its heavy blows against us, there developed considerable fatalism and defeatism in our ranks. Tendencies reflecting the belief that nothing could be done today—that it was inevitable that our Party was to be outlawed — permeated our ranks. It must be recognized that the national leadership did not sufficiently combat these moods of defeatism and fatalism.

Fourthly, there was a serious underestimation of the readiness of the masses to enter into this arena of struggle. Thus, we did not always search out ways and means of relating the defense of the Party with the struggle to defend democratic liberties. In fact, too often in our practice, we tended to separate the issue of the democratic rights of the Communists from the whole struggle to defend democracy. This made it more difficult for broader

force  
way  
Part  
it co  
peop  
attac  
tack

PEO  
AR

So  
run  
the c  
on t  
repea  
for t  
are '  
be w  
sheer  
not a  
that  
thous  
Left,  
tion.

ty co  
with  
this  
some  
one c  
who  
This  
Wor  
abeth  
and  
amne  
single  
this t  
of ac  
Ho  
is nar

forces to participate *in their own way* in defense of the rights of our Party, and, what is more, this made it considerably more difficult for the people to see behind the ruling-class attacks on the Communists the attack on democracy as a whole.

#### PEOPLE CAN BE AROUSED

Some of these defeatist arguments run thus: "You cannot bother with the question of the defense of those on trial under the Smith Act, the repeal of the Smith Act, or amnesty for the Communist leaders. These are 'narrow issues,' and we have to be with the broad masses." This is sheer phrase-mongering. Amnesty is not a "narrow" issue. It is an issue that can involve thousands upon thousands who are nowhere near the Left, if only this were given attention. For example, there is an amnesty committee set up in New York with a small group of people. Yet this committee has to date secured some 500 names of individuals from one end of the country to the other, who have spoken out on amnesty. This has been publicized in the *Daily Worker*, especially in Comrade Elizabeth Gurley Flynn's column, time and time again. Yet, where is the amnesty movement? Why hasn't a single state organization seized upon this to initiate even a minimum kind of activity?

How can one argue that the issue is narrow when there is this broad

and independent expression on the part of clergymen, professionals, businessmen, labor spokesmen, etc.? Must we not conclude that we, because of our failure to provide leadership, are responsible for the absence of activity on this important question?

Is the question of the defense of Communists on trial for "violation" of the Smith Act, really a narrow question? In California, from the time our comrades were arrested, a broad and impressive movement involving many sections of the population began to shape up. First, around the question of the right to bail. Secondly, mass delegations were organized from unions and other people's organizations, to attend the trial, and to report back to their organizations. Thirdly, the whole movement for the repeal of the Smith Act took a sharp spurt during that period. If this was possible in California, why not in other areas?

When the Supreme Court upheld the constitutionality of the Smith Act, this shocked many people throughout the country, both labor and professional, who reacted vigorously, demanding the repeal of the Act, and denouncing the Supreme Court decision.

Let us take a few expressions of labor from 1951 to 1952, confining our sampling only to Right-led unions.

On July 7, 1951, the organ of the Textile Workers Union (C.I.O.), *Textile Labor*, had this to say:

"The Communist leaders were not accused of plotting to overthrow the government by force. They were charged with teaching and advocating doctrines which, according to the prosecution, had this as a future objective. . . . Sending men to prison on this basis could be dangerous to us all. For example, there's no doubt that a whole segment of American society (including most southern mill-owners) consider unions in general and T.W.U.A. in particular 'subversive' and 'un-American.'"

The *Packinghouse Worker* on July 13, 1951, organ of Packinghouse Workers (C.I.O.):

"We have learned the hard way—we in the labor movement—that if we stand by while any minority group, however unpopular, is kicked around, we run the risk of being trampled on ourselves. . . . It is never just on one front that civil liberties are destroyed. When the torch of the Statue of Liberty is dimmed, we are all plunged into darkness together."

*Labor Sentinel* (July 1951), organ of Inland Steel Local 1010, United Steel Workers (C.I.O.):

"In plain words, a person doesn't have to be a member of the Communist Party to be prosecuted under this law. . . . Every local steel leader and the union membership which engages in any kind of a militant fight for their rights can be prosecuted. And of course that's one of the main reasons the bill was passed."

And at the National Convention of the C.I.O. in 1951:

"The Supreme Court's decision upholding the conviction of the Communist leaders (under the Smith Act) was a grave blow to America's precious heritage of freedom of speech. . . . We urge the Congress to review and revise existing security legislation, and especially the Smith Act. . . ."

Many Right-wing labor leaders, including, for example, Frank Rosenblum, Secretary-treasurer of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers, and Hugo Ernst, president of the Hotel and Restaurant Employees, have spoken out on various occasions following the Supreme Court decision. How then can it be argued that at least sections of the labor movement would not react to this issue? And yet, despite all this, we still hear the argument that the fight against the Smith Act is too narrow, that the labor movement understands only the issue of "pork chops."

One other point in this respect. On June 21, 1952, in New York, there was a conference of 169 representatives from A. F. of L., C.I.O. and independent unions under the auspices of the Trade Union Committee to Repeal the Smith Act. Of the delegation, 42 came from A. F. of L. locals, 33 from C.I.O. unions, and 80 from independent. This conference was organized primarily by two or three individuals with no assistance from Communists or progressives throughout the country. In

Cali  
unio  
held  
unio  
shov  
isted  
supp  
fight  
halt  
all t  
ask  
mov  
fully  
So  
shee  
thin  
attac  
worl  
mon  
main  
for  
are  
and  
draw  
to m  
relate  
How  
nism  
fense  
rades  
ate a  
our  
peop  
rulin  
broad  
No  
becor  
But  
the  
Walt  
freed

California a conference of trade unions to repeal the Smith Act was held with the support of 225 trade union locals. These conferences showed the possibilities which existed and continue to exist to enlist support from labor's ranks in the fight to repeal the Smith Act, to halt further prosecutions, and to free all those convicted. Yet we have to ask ourselves what happened to this movement? Why wasn't its potential fully realized?

Some comrades argue: "Why, it is sheer opportunism to think that anything can be done to defeat these attacks until we have peace in the world." Well, this is not only phrasemongering, this is a rejection of the main line of the Party on the fight for peace. Our Party says that we are engaged in the fight for peace and democracy. How can comrades draw the conclusion that the fight to maintain the Bill of Rights is unrelated to the struggle for peace? How can it be considered opportunism to raise the question of the defense of our Party? Do these comrades think that it is possible to create a powerful peace movement in our country that can impose the people's will for peace upon the ruling class without a simultaneous broad movement for democracy?

Now, it is a fact that peace must become the center of all our activity. But the fight against McCarthyism, the fight against the McCarran-Walter Act, the fight for academic freedom and, yes, the fight for the

rights of the Communists, is an inseparable part of the struggle to secure world peace.

The Supreme Court ruling on the case of the Eleven based itself on the "clear and present danger" theory, pointing to the Korean war and existing international tension. In the second Foley Square trial the judge, in his charge to the jury, similarly spoke of the Korean war and our opposition to it, the strength of the Soviet Union, the emergence of the Chinese People's Democratic Republic and the People's Democracies in Eastern Europe. To the judge this all added up to a "clear and present danger." Obviously the bourgeoisie sees no Chinese wall between its drive to fascism and its plans for World War III. It is impermissible for Communists to counterpose the fight for peace to the fight for democracy.

There are arguments to the effect that activity on this front would further isolate us from the broad masses. It is extremely important that Communists do not isolate themselves from the masses. Can it be said that the Textile Union, the Packinghouse workers' leaders, the Amalgamated and Hotel and Restaurant workers' leaders, have isolated themselves from the masses by vigorously speaking out on the Smith Act? Is it not a fact that these labor officials spoke out precisely because there are stirrings in the ranks of their membership? Can it be argued that the 500 nationally im-

portant individuals who have spoken out on amnesty thereby isolated themselves from the masses? The comrades who argue thus fail to see the forest for the trees. While they are shouting about staying with the masses, the masses in many instances are speaking up without them.

Now, it is of course true that the masses are confused on the issue of Communism and that it is not easy to arouse action in defense of the rights of Communists. But this does not excuse us from seeking ways and means of tackling this question. Very often Marxists must for a time take up issues that are not yet understood by the masses, and around which they are not yet ready to struggle. While not imposing our position on the masses, it is necessary, in a Leninist way, through constant teaching, patience, and persuasion, to win the masses, sections of them, to take a position on questions not popular at first.

A case in point was the Korean war. At the outbreak of that war, we Communists were almost alone. We were denounced even by large sections of the workers. In some cases, people were physically attacked by misled elements, or by goons and hooligans. We raised the question nevertheless. We were indicted, jailed and treated to every type of vituperation. Our position, despite everything, influenced the masses widely, and its truth will be recognized by the workers in the years to come.

What is more, the masses do not

understand our full position on the Negro question, and certainly not our advocacy of Socialism. Does that free us of the obligation to advance the understanding of the people on the nationally oppressed status of the Negro people, or on the ideas of Socialism?

The biggest problem of all that we must overcome is the passivity which persists on this front. *This must be overcome in the quickest possible time.* The defense of our Party is the defense of the Bill of Rights itself. This is no private fight. It is one of the most important aspects of the whole fight for democracy in our land.

We must find the ways and means of reaching out to new sections of labor and the people on the repeal of the Smith Act. We must call for a halt to further arrests. We have to expose the whole gang of stool-pigeons on whose lying testimony Communists and non-Communists are imprisoned, as hateful and despicable vermin who can continue their foul deeds only because the people are silent. We have to bring to all strata of the population the truth of FBI harassment, their snooping and Gestapo-like attempts to intimidate men, women and children. We have to find people to speak out against the life sentence imposed on Steve Nelson, whose twenty years in Blawnox can only mean death. And, above all, we have to fight to return our eleven national leaders to our Party and to their families—

so that they may give leadership to the working class and democratic forces of our country for peace, security and democracy.

### FIGHT FOR AMNESTY

There is another important question involved here. The leaders of our Party, both those in jail and those who are refugees, have hanging over their heads a second indictment, for membership in the Communist Party. This means that they can be subjected to another trial involving a possible penalty for another five years and a \$10,000 fine. For the possibility exists that these comrades may be re-arrested the moment they are released from prison. This emphasizes the seriousness of the situation, and it demands a speedy and complete change in the whole outlook and approach to the question of amnesty. The whole progressive movement should be aroused around the campaign for amnesty with special emphasis on the leaders of our Party, although the fight for amnesty must include all victims of political persecution.

One final word on this question. Some argue that amnesty is a good propaganda issue but impossible of realization. It so happens that amnesty is part of the history and tradition of our country. (See the series of articles in the *Daily Worker* by Herbert Aptheker). Furthermore, in fascist Greece and Spain the progressive movement is winning amnesty for

political prisoners. If this is possible in such countries, how can it be ruled out as a possibility in our country today?

The Civil Right Congress, which has a proud tradition of militant struggle in working-class defense, and which has fought valiantly to save the lives of Willie McGee, the Martinsville Seven, and other victims of "lynch-justice," can in this period emerge as a powerful force in organizing the movement against the thought-control provisions of the Smith Act. It merits the unreserved support of all Communists and progressives; its organizational and political strengthening stands out as an important task today. Attention should also be called to the National Committee in Defense of Negro Leadership, which, in the short span of its existence, has shown that it can play a vital role in developing and stimulating a broad movement around the defense of Negro leaders, both Communist and non-Communist.

### REPEAL THE McCARRAN ACT

Now, to pass to another question. In 1950, the reactionaries jammed through Congress, over Presidential veto, the hated police-state McCarran Act. This Act, with its provisions of registration of "Communist Action Organizations" and "Communist front organizations"; its heavy prison and fine penalties; its deportation, denaturalization and concen-

tration camp section aimed at foreign-born Americans, aroused a popular movement of protest, cutting across every section of the population. Even President Truman was compelled to say in his veto message that the application of this Act "can be the greatest danger to freedom of speech, press and assembly, since the Alien and Sedition laws of 1798."

Our Party was the first organization to be brought before the so-called Subversive Activities Control Board, and after a hearing consuming about 16 months, the panel of the Board held that the Party was "a foreign dominated revolutionary movement," a "Communist Action Organization." Recently the entire Board confirmed this finding and handed down the decision that the Party was to register, filing not only a financial report and a list of its officers, but its complete membership. This decision fully emphasizes what our Party stated in its answer to the Attorney-General's charges, that the McCarran Act "is a law with a built-in verdict," and that "the *Act itself* is predicated upon, and *contains explicitly*, exactly the slanderous characterization of the Communist Party as a 'conspiracy' and 'foreign agent.'"

Hardly had the ink dried on the Board's decision, when twelve other organizations were called upon to register as "Communist front organizations." These are the Civil Rights Congress, the Jefferson School of Social Science, the Labor Youth League, the International Workers Or-

der, the American Committee for Protection of the Foreign-born, the Veterans of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade, the Council on African Affairs, the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee, the United May Day Committee, the Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy, and the American Slav Congress. These organizations are now engaged in a fight to prevent their destruction. The Party too, is entering new litigations—this time before the courts, testing the constitutionality of the law. Should this fail the whole leadership is subject to indictments, for "violating" the McCarran Act. Hence, this Act and the attempt of the ruling class to implement it today are but another amphibious landing that the warmongers have staged on the Bill of Rights.

The McCarran Act is actually the legislative embodiment of present-day McCarthyism. It is aimed, not only against our Party but against every progressive and united front organization which fights for one or another issue in the interest of the people. The twelve organizations now called upon to register as "Communist front" organizations, are charged with advocating and conducting activity around issues which have brought support from vast sections of our people: the fight to save the lives of Willie McGee and the Martinsville Seven, freedom for Lieutenant Gilbert, opposition to

the K  
the S  
States  
foreign

Wit  
tions  
of 25  
prosec  
these  
questi  
to fill  
ing fu  
ruling  
Carran  
zation  
interes  
fashio  
its pro  
is also  
stroy  
the in  
Goldw  
Bills  
sion a  
Activi  
The  
Act, to  
of wo  
ization  
of the  
a "sub  
to the  
mover  
ed. Th  
growth  
this p  
feat M  
on oth  
an effe  
this fr

A c



the Korean war, friendship between the Soviet Union and the United States, defense of the right of the foreign born, etc., etc.

With the addition of 64 organizations to the "subversive" list—a total of 254 organizations are subject to prosecution under the law. Many of these have received an inquisition questionnaire which they are asked to fill out as the basis for determining further actions against them. The ruling class aims to apply the McCarran Act to any and every organization that truly defends the people's interests—and thus aims, Gestapo fashion, to destroy all opposition to its pro-war course. That its objective is also to weaken and eventually destroy the labor movement is seen in the introduction in Congress of the Goldwater-Rhodes and the Butler Bills to place labor under supervision and control of the Subversive Activities Control Board.

The fight to repeal the McCarran Act, to end the current prosecutions of working-class and people's organizations, to nullify the arbitrary act of the Attorney General to maintain a "subversive list," is of vital concern to the whole labor and progressive movement. This fight can be mounted. The widespread alarm over the growth of McCarthyism testifies to this possibility. For the fight to defeat McCarthyism and McCarranism on other fronts can be heightened by an effective all-embracing struggle on this front.

A crucial question in the struggle

to defend democracy is the need to defend the rights of the foreign-born. When the Smith Act was originally passed, it was known as the "Alien Registration Act." The "advocacy" section of the Act under which the Communist Party leaders were convicted was a rider attached to the law, just as the bill was going into the hopper. From 1941 to 1948, the Smith Act was primarily directed against the foreign-born. At first, our Party and the progressive movement waged a courageous fight to prevent passage of that bill. But once it was passed, the movement began to die down and to restrict itself to mere verbal opposition. But no mass movement for repeal of the law, or in defense of the foreign-born, was initiated in the years after its passage.

Many of our comrades, including John Williamson, Jack Stachel, Irving Potash, Betty Gannett, Alexander Bittelman and Claudia Jones, along with 3,000,000 other non-citizens, had to register under this law. Their original arrests for deportation took place under the Smith Act.

A movement in the early stages against the "alien and registration" provisions, for the defense of the foreign-born workers who became its first victims, would have considerably slowed down the deportation drive and laid a firmer groundwork for the defeat of the fascist-type of legislation passed by Congress in recent years.

As is known, the McCarran-Walter Act was passed in 1952. This

Act became law on December 24, 1952. Codifying all existing immigration and naturalization laws, it automatically repeals previous legislation. It embodies all the vicious anti-foreign born provisions of the McCarran Act and goes beyond it. As Abner Green, executive secretary of the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born, stated in his lucid pamphlet, *Police State Terror Against Foreign-Born Americans*:

"Under the McCarran-Walter Law, a non-citizen can be:

- arrested without a warrant under Section 287 (a) (2);
- held without bail, under Section 242 (a);
- deported for exercising freedom of speech or belief, under Section 241 (a) (7);
- deported on the basis of an ex-post-facto law, making an act which was perfectly legal when committed years ago illegal today, under Section 242 (a);
- deported on the basis of a bill of attainder, which punishes a group of individuals by name, as found in Section 241 (a) (6) (C);
- given a hearing *in absentia* and ordered deported even though not present at his deportation hearing, as provided by Section 242 (b);
- deported to any country that will accept him, under Section 243 (a) (7);
- sent to jail for 10 years for failing to attempt diligently to deport himself, under Section 242 (c).

"The McCarran-Walter Law is a

blue-print for the imposition of police-state conditions of living for the non-citizen in the United States. Nothing is left to chance. Every possible legal avenue to persecution and harassment of non-citizens is fully developed."

Added to this, the McCarran-Walter Law sets up an Anglo-Saxon standard for people who enter this country. The Italian, Caribbean, African, and Asian people have much smaller quotas than those, say, from Great Britain. In fact, Britain's quota is 65,000 to Italy's 5,000, even though the population of Italy is almost as large. The West Indies, Asia, and Africa are given 100. Everybody knows that Asia is many times larger than Britain. Yet its quota is many times larger than Asia's. The discriminatory racist features of the McCarran-Walter Law have incensed broad sections of the population and aroused a movement of protest here and abroad.

The broadest movement shaping up around the McCarran-Walter Law is on the question of revision. Many, however will fight for repeal, particularly if the progressive forces do not stand on the sidelines but actively support the united front movements which have arisen in different parts of the country.

But there is an additional obligation, that is, defense of those arrested and threatened with deportation. More than 300 men and women, most of whom have resided in this country thirty and forty years, face

depor  
possib  
them  
the A  
and  
These  
contri  
preser  
econo  
are le  
munis  
Work  
gressi  
In the  
handl  
for th  
Born  
job in  
ty yea  
It  
many  
natura  
ment  
ten t  
face  
proof  
the M  
We  
Carran  
Trum  
113 in  
the Se  
Senato  
can be  
Congr  
that e  
trou  
grams,  
action.  
It is  
fight.

deportation, some to countries where possible death awaits them. Among them are 80 trade unionists, 40 from the A. F. of L., 17 from the C.I.O. and 23 from independent unions. These are all men and women who contributed no small efforts to the present strength of labor and its economic gains. Among them also are leaders and members of the Communist Party, of the International Workers' Order, and of many progressive national-group organizations. In the main their defense has been handled by the American Committee for the Protection of the Foreign Born which has done a yeomen's job in this field for more than twenty years.

It is necessary to point to the many current proceedings for denaturalization. Brownell in a statement made in March announced that ten thousand naturalized citizens face loss of citizenship—a further proof of the dragnet unleashed by the McCarran-Walter Law.

We should remember that the McCarran-Walter Law was passed over Truman's veto by a vote of 278 to 113 in the House and 56 to 27 in the Senate. Many Congressmen and Senators, feeling popular pressure, can be won to introduce a repealer in Congress. It is therefore necessary that every Congressman and Senator be bombarded with letters, telegrams, and delegations urging such action.

It is now necessary to broaden this fight. The defense of the victims of

the McCarran-Walter Law must be brought to all labor and people's organizations. If properly related to the fight for the repeal of the McCarran-Walter Law, new sections, till now passive to the deportation drive, can be enlisted around particular individuals known in the community, in the unions, in the people's organizations.

What must be emphasized here is that the fight for the defense of the rights of the foreign-born, citizen and non-citizen alike, is an integral part of the struggle to safeguard democracy. Any tendency to minimize this phase of the struggle only endangers the whole fight.

It is incumbent upon the Communists, and all other Left and progressive forces to bring the issue of the foreign-born into every shop and local union, into every working-class community, into every people's organization. Opposition to the McCarran-Walter Law can be organized into a vocal movement not only for revision but for the repeal of the Act. True, the labor officialdom has satisfied itself with resolutions and speeches. But, with any consistently organized activity among the rank and file, it is possible to compel the participation of the official labor movement in broad united front actions to wipe this fascist law from the statute books. In addition, around the trade unionists who face deportation or denaturalization it is possible to activate hundreds of trade-union locals throughout the country.

The many-sided struggle for the defense of the Communists; for the repeal of the Smith, McCarran, and McCarran-Walter Acts; for amnesty of all political prisoners, in the first place for the Eleven Communist leaders; the fight to defeat the government's deportation and denaturalization drive are all part of the broader fight to rally our people to

defeat McCarthyism, to halt the advance of fascism. It is in this spirit that we call upon the entire Party leadership and membership to give systematic attention to developing the maximum initiative in organizing a fight-back movement that will defeat the drive of the ruling class to outlaw our Party, and force democracy underground.

### CORRECTION

Dear Editor:

The article "White Chauvinism and Negro Bourgeois Nationalism" in the December, 1952 and January, 1953 issues of *Political Affairs* contained an unhappy error, in fact, that should be corrected. An example of a county organizer being removed and a theory attributed to him of "immunity from white chauvinism" was unfortunate and untrue.

Before the article was printed, there was a re-examination by the N. Y. State leadership of the causes leading to his removal. As a result the removal was characterized as incorrect and unjust. This comrade was promoted to a post of commensurate responsibility. The theory of immunity from white chauvinism was not advanced by him. Needless to say, the political criticism of such a theory holds good.

These departures from fact deserve public repudiation and certainly point up the importance of complete accuracy on the part of writers for *Political Affairs*. I hope this letter will help to repair the damage to the record of the comrade who was mentioned and that the error will be seen as my own completely.

Fraternally,  
SAMUEL T. HENDERSON

By

THE  
tion  
peop  
imp  
ing  
ular  
ing  
coal  
the  
Ame  
the  
with  
unity  
of th  
by e  
eral

TH  
outli  
been  
ter i  
of th  
serio  
mun  
the  
plete  
mun  
the  
whic  
jects  
A  
urges  
First  
great

# The Mexican People in the Southwest

By James Burnhill

THE QUESTION of the Mexican national minority of some four million people in the Southwest is of major importance to the American working class and people. This is particularly true with respect to developing the anti-war and anti-fascist coalition led by the working class, the struggle against the efforts of American imperialism to enslave the countries of Latin America, and with respect to strengthening the unity and trade-union organization of the American workers, especially by extending trade unionism to several million agricultural workers.

The point of departure and basic outlines of an approach have already been established by Comrade Foster in his *Outline Political History of the Americas* as well as in much serious study and work by the Communists in the Southwest. However, the task still remains to be completed of rounding out the Communist program of struggle against the special forms of oppression to which American imperialism subjects the Mexican people in the U. S.

A number of factors heighten the urgency of this task at this time. First, the question has assumed a greater importance in relation to the

sharpening reactionary offensive within the U. S. and the efforts to bring about the complete subjugation of the peoples of Latin America under Wall Street rule. Second, the Marxists need to more clearly project their own program and policies, or, failing to do so, they will yield the field to others. It is necessary to combat more vigorously the ideology that American imperialism is so actively projecting in numerous ways, including the distorted and chauvinist portrayal of aspects of the Mexican question in a whole series of books and films. Likewise the Marxists need to define their position in relation to various theoretical propositions now being developed by Social-Democratic and liberal circles for the purpose of influencing the American people generally, and particularly the movements among the Mexican people. Third, further development and projection of the Communist position will provide an important weapon to expose the role and program of American imperialism and its policy of inculcating chauvinism among the American people.

All these considerations, of course, flow fundamentally from the fact

that among the Mexican people in the U. S. there is a rising movement of struggle for equality and of participation in the trade-union and peoples movement.

A tremendous amount of data is available on the Mexican question in the U. S., but this needs to be subjected to searching Marxist evaluation. Of particular importance is the scholarly and thorough presentation, from a liberal viewpoint, by Carey McWilliams, editorial director of the *Nation*, in his book, *North From Mexico*, published in 1949.

McWilliams helps to expose the oppressed status of the Mexican people, sympathetically recounts their struggles for full equality and citizenship, and portrays extensively the history and background of the question. The major contribution of McWilliams is his condemnation and rejection of the chauvinist, reactionary conclusions of bourgeois writers of past decades. As he points out, when all this material by American historians and sociologists is analyzed, it "apparently consists in the sum total of the voluminous statistics on Mexican delinquency, poor housing, low wages, illiteracy, rates of disease . . . The data 'proved' that Mexicans lacked leadership, discipline, and organization; that they segregated themselves; that they were lacking in thrift and enterprise, and so forth."

Such a "study" of the Mexican question is useful only to imperialism in re-enforcing its system of oppression, and in cultivating the chauvinist concept of the Mexican

people. The struggle against this vulgarized and pseudo-scientific "social-work" approach is a vital part of the fight to eradicate all forms of anti-Mexican chauvinism. The slander that the unequal status of the Mexican people is due to some inherent quality of the people themselves needs to be ripped apart with the truth—the exposure of American monopoly capitalism and its ruthless exploitation of peoples for the sake of maximum profits.

This, of course, a number of Mexican scholars and writers in the United States, such as Dr. George I. Sanchez and others, as well as McWilliams and other liberal non-Mexican writers, begin to accomplish. McWilliams, for instance, states that the "basic issues have always had to do with Anglo-Hispano relations in a particular historical setting as influenced by a specific set of cultural, economic, geographical and social forces." This is correct, but, not being a Marxist, McWilliams is unable to establish the *basic content* of this "historical setting" on the basis of class relations, as arising *specifically* from the development of American capitalism and imperialism and its ruthless efforts to exploit Mexico and the Mexican minority in the United States.

As we shall see, this lack of scientific analysis leads McWilliams into a number of erroneous bourgeois-reformist illusions concerning the possibility of U. S. imperialism following something other than an imperialist policy with respect to the Mexican people.

### THE HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

The present position of the Mexican people in the Southwest has its historic origin in the long history of relations between the United States and Mexico and in more than a century of effort to maintain the Mexican people in the Southwest in the status of an oppressed and exploited national minority.

In this article we shall try only to sketch some of the major outlines of this history, primarily at this point to emphasize the historic injustice done to the Mexican people.

The expansion and development of U.S. capitalism, specifically in the Southwest, required not only the annexationist drive culminating in two wars of conquest, the Texan War of 1839 and the war of 1846-48; it required also the maintenance of Mexico as a semi-colonial hinterland of U.S. capitalism serving as a source of raw materials for U.S. industry and as a convenient and almost inexhaustible source of low-paid, highly exploited labor needed to develop large-scale capitalist agriculture and the mining industry of the Southwest.

The first conflicts with Mexico were a direct outgrowth of the general expansionist drive of early nineteenth century U.S. capitalism, and more specifically grew out of the demand of the Southern slave-owners for extension of the slave system. The search for mineral wealth and land also played an important but subordinate role. For several decades

(both prior to and following the annexationist war of 1846-48) a sharp conflict raged over the issue of slavery with the slave-owners demanding new slave territory at the expense of Mexico and the Mexicans taking an anti-slavery position.

As early as 1839 large numbers of runaway slaves crossed the Rio Grande and settled in Matamoros. The unanimous sympathy of the Mexican people was with the runaway slaves whom they assisted in every way they could. In 1856 a Negro slave conspiracy in Colorado County, Texas, was uncovered in which "many of the Mexican inhabitants of the region were declared to be involved, and it was felt, as a local paper put it, 'that the lower class of the Mexican population are incendiaries in any country where slaves are held'."\* Even in the aftermath of military defeat the Mexican government sought to insert a provision in the treaty ceding the Mexican territory to the U.S. that would have banned slavery forever in the ceded territories. So sharp was the struggle over the slave question that, as McWilliams states, a Confederate Colonel Ford wrote, during the Civil War, that the "possession of slaves in Western Texas was rendered insecure owing to the contiguity of Mexico, and to the efforts of the Mexicans to induce them to run away."

The opening gun of the annexationist drive against Mexico was the so-called "Texas revolution,"

\* H. Aptheker, *American Negro Slave Revolts*, p. 346.

openly plotted and organized with the connivance of the U.S. government, and mistakenly supported by many of the small frontier farmers and settlers. But the slave-owner dominated government in Washington determined to push the aggressive expansionist drive further and deliberately provoked the war of 1846-48, one of the dirtiest wars in the long history of wars of aggrandizement fought by the U.S.

It is, of course, to the eternal credit of such outstanding Americans as Abraham Lincoln and Frederick Douglass, and other representatives of the developing alliance of northern industrial capitalists, western frontier farmers, the Negro people, and the infant trade-union movement, that they in no uncertain terms denounced and opposed the war against Mexico. Widespread opposition developed to this first "unpopular war" in U.S. history.

As a result the U.S. acquired by terms of the Treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo and later the Gadsden Purchase over one-half of all Mexican territory, an area larger in extent than either the original thirteen colonies or the Louisiana Purchase, constituting the present states of Texas, California, New Mexico, Arizona, Colorado and major sections of Wyoming and Utah. With this annexation, U.S. capitalism acquired for its subsequent rapid growth a broad new land frontier, stretching from the Oregon territory to the Rio Grande and from the Gulf of Mexico to the Pacific;

enormous natural resources in mineral wealth and timber; vast expanses of arable and grazing land; and an important reserve of potential (and in many respects skilled) low-paid labor.

All this was formalized in the treaty with Mexico which had but recently fought for and won its independence from Spain. Mexicans had explored and partially colonized these frontier areas in which settlements followed the river valleys, and mines were already extensively worked. The treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo, at the insistence of the Mexican government, also incorporated provisions for assuring the rights of language, culture and religion as well as the property and political rights of the Mexican people within the annexed areas and also promised early statehood to these areas. But in characteristic fashion the arrogant American conquerers flouted and ignored these obligations.

The close of the war of 1846-48 let loose a virtual reign of terror and violence along the Mexican-U.S. border as the invaders attempted to consolidate their conquest, drive the Mexicans from their lands and mines and subjugate the Indian tribes, particularly Apaches, who also inhabited the annexed areas.

Sharpest was the struggle in Texas where the non-Mexican white settlers outnumbered the Mexicans whose settlements were squarely in the path of their land-grabbing advance. It was here that for fifteen

years  
lead  
(1859  
throu  
Valle  
twen  
(wh  
of T  
Mexi  
In  
and  
inate  
Mexi  
popu  
advise  
rarily  
owne  
flared  
notab  
durin  
1846,  
priest  
a Me  
Als  
comp  
a we  
ownin  
South  
Mexi  
ance.  
strug  
the le  
etta, v  
force  
Thi  
border  
waged  
in def  
territo  
brothe  
these  
Mexic  
bandit



years the great Mexican guerrilla leader, Juan Nepomucena Cortina (1859-73), waged a patriotic war throughout the lower Rio Grande Valley. Until 1880 the territory between the Nueces and Rio Grande (where 80 per cent of the Mexicans of Texas lived) was held by the Mexicans.

In New Mexico, denied statehood and ruled by corrupt, Anglo-dominated territorial government, the Mexicans constituted 90% of the population and the Anglos found it advisable to ally themselves temporarily with the rich Mexican landowners. But here too resistance flared up time and again. Most notable was the revolt, occurring during the war-time occupation in 1846, led by the patriotic Catholic priest Father Martinez, together with a Mexican peon Pablo Montoya.

Also, in California, already long comparatively well settled and with a well established Mexican landowning aristocracy (largely in Southern California) in power, the Mexican people organized resistance. Outstanding was the guerrilla struggle waged by a Sonoran miner, the legendary hero Joaquin Murrieta, who is reported to have led a force numbering more than 2000.

This was the story throughout the borderlands as the Mexican people waged a battle for their rights and in defense of those in the annexed territories whom they called "our brothers who were sold." During these years U.S. troops violated the Mexican border dozens of times in bandit-like raids, and plots were

hatched to separate new territories from Mexico. It was only with rising U.S. imperialism, that the border areas were "quieted down" and it could be said the conquest had been completed.

This was the background of events behind which was carried out the forcible expropriation of the major part of the farming and grazing land owned by Mexicans (and Indians) and its acquisition by the large present-day land owners of the Southwest in alliance with Eastern capital. This process of expropriation took various forms: taking over the old semi-feudal "hacienda" system under new "owners," forced sales of lands for "taxes," swindles under fraudulent land claims, the forcible driving out of Mexican owners by terror and banditry conducted by bands of hired gunmen, sometime under cover of so-called "sheep wars," and finally, in the latest stages, by control of water rights. And all this, of course, was done under the protection of state and territorial "law" which was in the hands of the land-grabbers!

The semi-feudal land relations of the type that prevailed in old Mexico were thus shattered and the basis laid for establishing the largest concentration of monopolized capitalist agriculture known anywhere, transforming the former small land-owner and peon into the landless and primarily migratory wage worker of today.

Hand in hand with land-grabbing went the systematic and forcible exclusion of Mexicans from the

growing commercial and industrial life of the area and from any share in the monopoly capitalist control and ownership of the basic economy of the Southwest today. This was accomplished by mass vigilante violence and lynch terror against Mexican mining communities to drive Mexicans out of California's rich gold mines they had pioneered in opening, by "legal" measures such as the California "foreign miners tax," and through raids on Mexican pack trains (the "Cart War").

Thus was created the conditions for rapid expansion (especially following 1880) of U.S. capitalism in the Southwest and for the exploitation of Mexican (and Indian) labor that was the key to laying the foundations for the economic life and wealth of this area. Not only the labor, but also the skills and techniques of the Mexicans acquired over a period of 300 years' residence and experience made possible the rapid expansion of mining (gold, silver, copper and quick silver) and agriculture (sheep and cattle raising, irrigated farming methods). Mexican labor largely built the railroads of the Southwest and to this day does the bulk of maintenance work; and the hardest, most dangerous work in the Southwest mines is still reserved for Mexicans. The amount of wealth wrung out of the exploitation of this labor in literal superprofits is fabulous, and upon it were created such economic empires as the Bank of America, the big Southwest mining interests, the holdings of the cattle barons, cotton farms,

and the fruit, vegetable and sugar-beet industries.

#### U.S. IMPERIALISM AND INTERVENTION IN MEXICO

From the outset, as U.S. capitalism entered the stage of imperialist development, it regarded Mexico as its own domain. As Foster points out in his *Outline Political History of the Americas*:

The general result was that by 1910 United States investments had run up swiftly to \$1,058,000,000 while the total invested of Mexican capital amounted to only about three-fourths of that figure—\$793 million. The great bulk of the mines, smelters, oil fields, railroads and other decisive resources and industries were in the hands of United States and British imperialists. Profits from industry in Mexico were among the highest in the world.

The counterpart of this enrichment of U.S. monopoly at the expense of Mexican wealth was, of course, the retardation of Mexico's industrial development, the maintenance in power of reactionary anti-democratic landlord, clerical and military elements in Mexico and such grinding poverty for the masses that, as Comrade Foster writes, "ninety-five percent of all rural Mexican families were landless in 1910 and Mexico's agricultural workers became virtual slaves, working for from fifteen to twenty cents per day."

This was the situation with the outbreak of the Mexican revolution in 1910, which, while basically an agrarian revolution, as it developed

also  
tures.  
tionar  
threat  
can in  
and th  
tural  
that e  
U.S.  
Thi  
and t  
were c  
from  
Mexic  
border  
lated  
wise v  
ands  
in col  
period  
McWi  
ing of  
border  
most i  
have  
manki  
shooti  
over th  
you fe  
open  
along  
Culm  
the bal  
U.S. tr  
dent W  
1914 an  
the bor  
to Mex  
talk in  
Californ  
all of I  
Desp  
same h

also assumed anti-imperialist features. The upsurge of this revolutionary movement represented a threat to the interests of the American imperialist investors in Mexico and the powerful monopoly agricultural and other capitalist interests that exploited Mexican labor in the U.S.

This the American imperialists and their Washington government were quick indeed to recognize and from 1910 to 1925, the years of the Mexican revolution, the Mexican borders were again repeatedly violated by U.S. military forces. Likewise within the U.S. literally thousands of Mexicans were murdered in cold blood in this fifteen year period. George Marvin, quoted by McWilliams, reported that "the killing of Mexicans . . . through the border in these last four years is almost incredible. . . . Some rangers have degenerated into common mankillers. There is no penalty for shooting a Mexican . . . Reading over the Secret Service records makes you feel as though there were an open game season on Mexicans along the border."

Culminating this border terror was the baldly imperialist intervention by U.S. troops on the orders of President Wilson to take Vera Cruz in 1914 and the pursuit of Villa across the border in 1916 in direct assistance to Mexican reaction. There was again talk in Washington of seizing Lower California and even of "taking over" all of Mexico, as Foster points out.

Despite variations in tactics this same hard-boiled imperialist policy

has characterized every subsequent Washington Administration, including the pressure of the Roosevelt Administration against Mexico's expropriation of some U.S. oil and mining interests, and the more recent Truman and Eisenhower efforts to force Mexico into an open war alliance with the U.S. and into direct participation in the Korean war. Most characteristic of the recent period has been the despoiling of Mexico's labor force and hampering of its economic development by the pressure exerted for the importation of hundreds of thousands of Mexican workers to work under intolerable conditions and at miserable wages in U.S. agriculture. With this has gone the flouting of the sovereignty of Mexico in ignoring the rights of Mexican citizens in the U.S., systematically encouraging Mexicans to "illegally" enter the U.S. when needed for farm labor and then deporting them en masse when no longer needed. Of a piece with this was the high-handed kidnapping of Gus Hall from Mexican territory where he had sought political asylum.

The realities of this state of affairs are, unfortunately, ignored by bourgeois-liberals who are otherwise cognizant of the facts. McWilliams, for instance, who points out that "a prime condition to an improvement in Anglo-Hispano relations has always consisted in a clarification of relations between the two nations" then projects the illusion that "this clarification has finally been achieved . . . on the basis of mutual depend-

ency and respect," in the "policy of the Good Neighbor" of Roosevelt.

This, written in 1949, flies in the face of the fact that already under the Truman Administration all the limited positive aspects of the Roosevelt "Good Neighbor" policy were scuttled. Neither the Truman Administration nor the present Eisenhower Administration operate on the basis of "mutual dependency and respect" in relation to Mexico. On the contrary, their policy is blatantly imperialist and is reflected in the status of the Mexican people in the United States.

The imperialist essence of U.S. policy toward Mexico today is especially revealed in two factors. One is the fantastic rate at which U.S. zinc, lead and copper trusts are expanding the extraction of non-ferrous metal from Mexico—naturally to the profit of U.S. investors and owners of the mines. All this, moreover, is at the expense of the Mexican nation whose natural resources are being shipped abroad without even the benefit of developing Mexico's basic industries or improving conditions of the mine workers.

The other touchstone revealing this imperialist reality is the brutal exploitation of Mexican-Americans and hundreds of thousands of Mexican nationals in the U.S. as farm labor, contrary to all concepts of decent work standards and violating even the meagre concessions toward safeguarding working conditions, granted in labor contracts with the Mexican government. Coupled with this is the fact that there could hardly be

a more flagrant attack upon and violation of the rights of the citizens of a sovereign nation than the wholesale deportation drive against Mexican nationals, and even U.S. citizens and residents of long-standing, that is now taking place under the McCarran-Walter Act. The struggle for new relationships on the basis of full equality to Mexico and also to the Mexican-Americans within the U.S. is closely related to the fight against the imperialist foreign policy of the U. S. government.

#### MONOPOLY AGRICULTURE IN THE SOUTHWEST

The recent decades of U.S. imperialist expansion and intervention in Mexico coincided with the large-scale expansion of capitalist farming in the Southwest. The main feature of Southwest agriculture, developing with particular rapidity from 1900 to 1930, are: it is to a large extent based upon irrigated farming requiring an enormous capital outlay (government and private); the system of growing the main crops requires a tremendous army of migratory farm labor, of wage workers on the land, to plant, harvest and process the crops (vegetables, fruits, sugar beets, cotton); land ownership is highly concentrated in huge farms requiring large capital investments; its whole structure is closely intertwined with monopoly capital in investment, direct ownership and control. In short, this is capitalist agriculture in its most advanced kind of development.

The rapid development of this

system  
trated  
1880's  
17  
per c  
in 19  
1910,  
over  
aroun  
ernm  
projec  
lion o  
millio  
in 19  
tially  
Wi  
highly  
farm  
so rap  
develo  
dreds  
minin  
fabulo  
treme  
land i  
A n  
has be  
of con  
gration  
Mexic  
migrat  
the ye  
agricu  
there  
years  
and us  
culture  
during  
tinued  
U.S. c  
ico yie  
for ex  
In th

system of capitalist farming is illustrated by the expansion after the 1880's of land under irrigation in 17 Western states, increasing 100 per cent, from some 7 million acres in 1900 to over 14 million acres in 1910, by nearly 35 per cent again to over 19 million acres in 1929 and around 28 million acres today. Government investment in irrigation projects represented only 321 million dollars in 1910, jumped to 892 million in 1930, to over one billion in 1940, and has risen very substantially since.

Without a tremendous supply of highly exploited labor this capitalist farm set-up could not have expanded so rapidly nor reached such levels of development. Only the labor of hundreds of thousands of workers at a minimum wage could produce the fabulous profits expected from the tremendous investment of capital in land irrigation and machinery.

A major portion of this labor force has been provided by the importation of contract laborers and mass immigration, legal and "illegal," from Mexico. The peak of Mexican immigration from 1900 to 1930 was in the years of greatest expansion of agriculture in the Southwest. While there was a lull during the crisis years of the 1930's in immigration and use of Mexican nationals in agriculture this was again stepped up during World War II and has continued to the present year when the U.S. continues to demand that Mexico yield up its own labor supply for exploitation in the U.S.

In this manner the exploitation of

Mexican labor in the Southwest is a direct payoff to monopoly of its imperialist policy of keeping Mexico in a subject status. This compels many of its poverty-stricken people to seek a livelihood in the U.S., where they fall to the tender mercies of the U.S. exploiters.

The wages and conditions of work are, of course, scandalous even as revealed in the official report of the President's Commission on Migratory Labor in 1951. This report gives the average farm labor wages for 1950 as 54c per hour in Texas, 54c in New Mexico, 67c in Arizona and 88c in California, but adds that wages are actually lower in the Rio Grande Valley, being as low as 15 to 25 cents per hour. The same report reveals the scandalous conditions of housing, sanitation, health and schooling that are the lot of the agricultural worker and particularly of the Mexican worker. Exploitation of the "illegals" who are openly hired by hundreds of thousands is, of course, even sharper as they have no protection whatsoever, and in turn their status is used to exploit all Mexican workers more drastically and to turn loose a virtual reign of terror by sheriffs, immigration officials and police.

It is hardly any wonder, then, that the Mexican workers in the Southwest have been the pioneers of trade-union organization and struggle on the land. In 1883 the first union of Southwest agricultural workers, a union of cowboys in the Panhandle, was led by Juan Gomez. There are few more heroic chapters

in American labor history than these struggles of Mexican farm workers, miners and laborers that are unfortunately not yet considered an integral part of the history of American labor. The list is too long to recount. It includes early struggles such as a strike of Mexican and Japanese sugar-beet workers in Ventura, California in 1903 and a wave of strikes in Southern California in 1910 initiated by a strike of Mexican workers on the local street railway. It includes the strike of 1928 of Mexican Imperial Valley workers broken by wholesale arrests and deportations and a strike of 5,000 Imperial Valley workers again two years later. In 1933 some 7,000 walked out in Los Angeles County and later in 1933 the Left-led United Cannery and Agricultural Workers Union led a series of strikes in the San Joaquin Valley, three-fourths of whose participants were Mexican workers. In 1933 a third strike in Imperial Valley was broken with tear gas, clubs and arrests. Again in 1936 numerous strikes broke out in California. And in the years since then wherever Mexican labor was employed the same picture was duplicated, as for instance, the heroic strikes of Texas pecan shellers.

These strikes were all generally met with the vicious and brutal system of strikebreaking by vigilante violence followed by deportation terror. Yet these organized trade-union movements and hard-fought strikes did establish a tradition of militant struggle and trade unionism, and did answer the question in the af-

firmative of whether or not it is possible to organize effectively among agricultural workers. Moreover, gains were won, even though limited.

These defeats of trade unionism were not inevitable. A tremendous share of the blame for lack of trade-union organization and conditions of work among the agricultural workers, and the consequent pressure for lowering the status of all workers in the Southwest, lies at the door of the trade union bureaucracy of the CIO and particularly of the AFL. McWilliams writes: "In most of these strikes the Mexican workers stood alone, that is, they were not supported by organized labor and for the most part, were affiliated neither with the CIO nor the AFL." Only the Communist-led independent unions of the early 1930's were a notable exception, and yet even these unions were not always sufficiently conscious of the fact that the great bulk of the militant agricultural workers were Mexican workers. This condition of virtual failure of the major trade-union organizations to undertake the organization of agricultural workers, specifically of the Mexican migratory workers, continues to this day as a blot on the record of American labor.

#### THE ROOTS OF ANTI-MEXICAN CHAUVINISM

Discussing white chauvinism as "an indispensable part of the ideology of human exploitation," in the epoch of imperialism, William Z. Foster points out that, "The capitalist imperialists have found it highly

profit  
system  
a f  
their  
and  
the d  
locate  
essen  
the v  
segre  
which  
U.S.  
ploite  
ple is  
chauv  
nation  
vinism  
the M  
strong  
dian p  
contri  
Mexic  
The  
dice, s  
Mexic  
status,  
1846-4  
violenc  
periali  
ers of  
hands  
the So  
fathers  
plicati  
a full  
tory n  
that li  
Henr  
disgrac  
tory w  
from t  
"tice" o  
cious s

profitable to apply this reactionary system of cultivated chauvinism as a fundamental policy in building their great modern colonial empires, and also in the super-exploitation of the darker peoples who happen to be located in industrial countries." This, essentially, is the root and basis of the vicious system of discrimination, segregation and brutal violence with which the Mexican people in the U.S. have been victimized and exploited. Applied to the Mexican people is a vicious blend of national chauvinism (the ideology of "great nation" superiority) and white chauvinism. The imperialist attitude to the Mexican people has always been strongly influenced against the Indian peoples who have made a great contribution to the emergence of the Mexican nation of today.

The origin of the system of prejudice, so essential to maintaining the Mexican people in a subordinate status, is in the period of the War of 1846-48 and in decades of murderous violence, in an annexationist and imperialist policy. Truly the slave-holders of the South, who hoped to lay hands on the rich lands of Texas and the Southwest, are the original god-fathers of this doctrine. Its full implications are not apparent without a fuller knowledge of the whole history of violence and lynch terror that lies behind this system.

Hence, the efforts to cover up this disgraceful aspect of American history with a thousand lies ranging from the supposed "glory" and "justice" of the Texas War to the malicious slander of Mexican patriots as

"bandits". This is the reason, also, for Hollywood glamorization of the Texas Rangers, California vigilantes, and all the other efforts to cover up this degradation of American life.

The objective of this system of anti-Mexican chauvinism is, of course, to maintain the Mexican people in an inferior status subject to double-exploitation. But it is also intended to depress the general wage and working conditions in Southwest agriculture and industry, to divide Mexican and non-Mexican workers and thereby prevent effective trade-union organization. Moreover it is a double-edged proposition that degrades, blinds and brutalizes the American people generally to the point where this becomes a major weapon of the war-makers and fascists.

Liberals such as McWilliams are basically wrong when they treat this question as one aspect of a "conflict of cultures." This tends to take the full responsibility for the oppression off the shoulders of the imperialists. It covers up the roots of this situation which lie in the policy of monopoly capitalism, and it emphasizes primarily the negative effect upon the Mexican people thus obscuring the way in which this is fundamentally contrary to the interest of the people generally and the working class, in particular, of the United States.

\* \* \*

*(A future article will deal with some theoretical and programmatic aspects of the Mexican-American question in the United States—The Editor.)*

## Book Review

### LESSONS FOR AMERICANS

By V. J. Jerome

*Letters to Americans*, by Karl Marx and Frederick Engels. International Publishers, 312 pp., \$3.50.

History has long since assured the letters of Marx and Engels to their American adherents a permanent place in the great democratic and working-class heritage of our country. For these imperishable documents have as their pervading theme the advancement of the American labor movement and the common progress of all democratic forces in this nation.

In the course of their lifetimes, the co-founders of scientific socialism paid particular attention to the development of the working-class movement in the young American bourgeois democracy where the workers were just emerging as a distinct social force. They sensed the wide gap of language, tradition, and experience between the early Marxists in the United States, mainly immigrants, and the native-American working class molded by a different background and a different tempo of capitalist development.

A main purpose of these letters was to close that gap. Marx and Engels saw that a correct attitude toward the working class of this country was a major

requirement for their followers. Basic confidence in the capacity of the workers to struggle as a class was imperative if Marxists were to help evolve an effective policy for the nascent American labor movement, and if they were to help it, with its allies, achieve independent political action through a mass labor party.

These letters reveal their authors' deep insight into the historical laws governing the motion of bourgeois society and the dialectics of their operation on the American scene. They throw the bright light of scientific social investigation on the political life of our people during the latter half of the past century.

Always the authors deal concretely and critically with living issues and problems. Always they direct their discussion to the main task of the working class as the leading social force in the rising movement of all the oppressed. They apply their phenomenal knowledge, genius for leadership, and masterly dialectical reasoning to the development of a broad political policy stemming from the conditions of the times. They formulate clearly the correct role and the tactical line for the Marxist vanguard. This collection of

letters  
cepts a  
ance f  
the A  
face i  
One  
includ  
nation  
(the I  
collect  
His  
the y  
was s  
Unite  
ests,  
indust  
of dev  
the p  
was J  
ican M  
union  
Union  
munis  
For t  
1870,  
and d  
of the  
was F  
Ameri  
the F  
States.  
The  
the f  
publis  
transl  
is fait  
editor:  
• Br  
Phil. A  
Karl M  
(Letters  
Becker,  
Marx a



Letters furnishes vital theoretical precepts and sharp lines of practical guidance for the mounting struggles that the American workers and their allies face in our time.

One hundred and sixty-eight letters, including three addresses of the International Workingmen's Association (the First International), make up the collection.

Historically they cover a period from the year 1848, when manufacturing was still vying for dominance in the United States with the agrarian interests, to 1895, when trustification of industry had reached here a high point of development. For the earlier years, the principal American correspondent was Joseph Weydemeyer, pioneer American Marxist, newspaper editor, trade-union builder, brigadier general in the Union Army, and outstanding Communist leader until his death in 1866. For the quarter century beginning 1870, until 1883, when Marx died, and during the twelve remaining years of the Letters, the chief correspondent was Friedrich Adolph Sorge, German-American Communist and leader of the First International in the United States.

The Letters have as their main source the famous Sorge Correspondence, published in Germany in 1906.\* The translation by Mr. Leonard E. Mins is faithful and fluent, while the overall editorship by Alexander Trachtenberg

\* *Briefe und Auszüge aus Briefen von Joh. Phil. Becker, Jos. Dietzgen, Friedrich Engels, Karl Marx u. A. an F. A. Sorge und Anders.* (Letters and Excerpts from Letters by John Philipp Becker, Joseph Dietzgen, Frededick Engels, Karl Marx and Others), Stuttgart, 1906.

is expert. His extended preface is elucidating and most helpful to the reader.

• • •

In the time-range covered by *Letters to Americans*, what was the main task confronting the working class of the United States, and what role were the Marxists called upon to play with respect to it?

The answer is two-fold—in relation, first, to the period from 1848 to the end of the Civil War, involving less than a quarter of the correspondence, and, secondly, to the post-Civil War period leading up to 1895, the year of Engels' death.

Fundamentally, in terms of its historical movement toward the establishment of Socialism, the working-class task was identical for both periods. Concretely, however, in the former, that task was interconnected with a developing democratic-revolutionary conflict that culminated in the Civil War and defeat of the slavocracy. In the immediate sense, therefore, the working class had before it a bourgeois-democratic historical task.

The profoundly revolutionary character of the anti-slavery struggle was stressed by Karl Marx from the first. He, more penetratingly than anyone else, saw in the "irrepressible conflict," not a "war between the states," but a war between opposing social systems—on the one side, a bourgeois-democratic revolution and, on the other, the counter-revolution of slave-holders. There could be no real objective for the Northern side, he pointed out,

short of destruction of the economic base and political power of the slaveholding class. Only such a decisive outcome would establish a homogeneous, nationally consolidated capitalist economy, and thus give full swing to the developing productive forces. To this end, Marx voiced criticism of the limited objective of the Northern leadership, as manifested in its irresolute conduct of the war, and urged an effective transition to the revolutionary solution of the conflict.

Marx clearly foresaw that this historically progressive victory would open up the high road for the growth and forward movement of the working class and the general advance of the democratic forces. The great scientist of society who stated, in *Capital*, that "Labor cannot emancipate itself in the white skin where in the black it is branded," understood that a permanent American working class, independent of the bourgeoisie and its political parties, could not emerge, "so long as slavery disfigured a part of the Republic." Marx gave classic expression to this guiding idea in the famed Address of the International Workingmen's Association to Abraham Lincoln, which declared that "as the American War of Independence initiated a new era of ascendancy for the middle class, so the American anti-slavery war will do for the working classes." (p. 66)

The early Marxists in the United States, although numbering very few and exerting direct influence almost exclusively among the immigrant German workers, nonetheless contributed

greatly to the anti-slavery struggle, both before and during the Civil War. They combined humanist revulsion against the barbarism of chattel slavery with scientific understanding of its doom. The letters during that period, dealing mainly with the political and military-strategic aspects of the war, do not explicitly discuss the tasks of the Marxists. There is, however, at hand extensive documentary evidence of their militant and highly influential participation in the struggle. The Marxists, making the fight for the destruction of slavery their central task, won support for Lincoln among the crucial foreign-born voters in the elections of 1860. Their war record from the outset lives on to inspire the freedom-struggles that must still be waged and won. A concentrated and profoundly analytical discussion of the early Marxists' role prior to and during the Civil War is contained in the third chapter of William Z. Foster's *History of the Communist Party of the United States*.\*

• • •

The second period through which the Letters extend sees the working class enter a new phase in its history. The victory of industrial capitalism over the slave-owning aristocracy presented the working class with problems of a new character. Its immediate political task was now to develop an independent movement with a working-class policy and tactic. The role of the early Marxist groups in relation to this central

\* Further material of value on this subject may be found in Alexander Bittelmann's article in *The Communist*, September, 1939, pp. 771-78.

political task is pervasively discussed in the Letters.

Production expanded at a tempestuous rate in the decades following slavery's destruction. Large-scale modern production, marked by ever-increasing centralization of capital, rapidly superseded small-scale manufacture. For, as Marx wrote in *Capital*, "only the destruction of rural domestic industry can give the internal market of a country that extension and consistency which the capitalist mode of production requires."\* With the crushing of the Southern slave power, the country's agrarian economy gave way to dominantly industrial economic structure. In 1850 farms constituted fifty-five percent of the "national wealth;" in 1890, twenty-four percent. The total industrial investment of little more than a billion dollars in 1860 grew to six times that amount during the next thirty years. Within twenty-five years after the Civil War, the United States had leaped to the position of second industrial country in the world.

The surging development of capitalism hastened also the stratification of the workers as a permanent class that "stands face to face with the bourgeoisie." It brought the class struggle into the open with increasing intensity and stimulated a strong trade-union movement. At the end of the Civil War, the insupportably high cost of living and the wage reductions gave a great impetus to trade-union organization. By the end of the decade, thirty nation-

ally-organized unions had sprung into being, numbering between two hundred and three hundred thousand members. The important trade-union center, the National Labor Union, was founded the year after the Civil War ended. Quickly to the fore came the issue of the eight-hour day and the movement to form an independent labor party.

• • •

The letters dealing with this period define the special tasks of the Marxists against this general background.

Of basic significance is the Address, composed by Marx, of the International Workingmen's Association to the National Labor Union. In that notable document of 1869 we read:

"... the successful close of the war against slavery has indeed inaugurated a new era in the annals of the working class. In the United States itself an independent labor movement has since arisen which the old parties and the professional politicians view with distrust." (p. 76)

The counsel of Marx and Engels to their followers in the United States may be summed up in these terms: Firm confidence in the future of this independent labor movement; patient participation in its unfoldment; zealous work for its broad extension; and Marxist guidance to aid its advance, always on the basis of its own experiences in struggle, at its own pace and in its own manner, upon the road of true, *political*, independence.

Theoretically stated, this General Line involved a three-fold cardinal task, which William Z. Foster formulates in his *History* as "the task of develop-

\* Karl Marx, *Capital*, Vol. I, International Publishers edition, p. 772.

ing the ideological, tactical, and organizational bases for Marxism in America."\*

Marx and Engels were fully aware of the Herculean labors this course involved.

Early in the book, in his famous letter of March 5, 1852, to Weydemeyer, Marx noted that "bourgeois society in the United States has not yet developed far enough to make the class struggle obvious and comprehensible." (p. 44)

Although in the years after the Civil War the class struggle became more obvious, it was still far from comprehensible. This theme runs like a refrain through the Letters. In 1883 Engels writes to Sorge: "If American energy and vitality were backed by European theoretical clarity, the thing would be finished over there in ten years. But that is impossible historically." (p. 41)

In the last letter of the collection, Engels still speaks of the "ups and downs of the movement, depending upon whether the mind of the industrial worker or that of the pioneering farmer gains predominance in the average man's head." (p. 270)

Earlier Engels dwells on the subject of reactionary tradition as a factor retarding the development of proletarian ideology in the United States:

"... for good historical reasons the Americans are worlds behind in all theoretical questions, and while they did not bring over any mediaeval institutions from Europe, they did bring over masses of mediaeval traditions, religion, English common (feudal

law, superstition, spiritualism, in short, every kind of imbecility which was not directly harmful to business and which is now very serviceable for stupefying the masses." (p. 164) In this way, "America is the *youngest*, but also the *oldest* country in the world." (p. 269)

Writing to Schlüter in 1892 and to Sorge the following year, Engels speaks of the divisions, fostered and exploited by the bourgeoisie, in the workers' ranks—between native-born and foreign-born workers, among the varied immigrant national groups, and between Negro and white workers. He points to the "aristocratic position" of the native-born workers in employment and in trade-union organization, as against the condition of the immigrant workers, to whom are left the badly paid occupations and who are almost completely kept out of the unions. These divisions, he points out, are a major check on the development in the United States of a homogeneous, continuous working-class movement permeated with a proletarian ideology. "In such a country," he writes, "continually renewed waves of advance, followed by equally certain setbacks, are inevitable." He adds, however, "Only the advances always become more powerful, the setbacks less paralyzing, and on the whole the cause does move forward." (pp. 242-43)

*The cause does move forward.* This vital breath permeates the whole discussion of what stood before the Marxists in that stage of history. It expresses the deep faith which the originators of Marxism reposed in the working class of our land and which these letters

\* Foster, *cited work*, p. 32.

transm  
time.  
In  
the ea  
need t  
a back  
Marx  
fall ev  
would  
often  
Ameri  
Their  
slavery  
cussed.  
the org  
path-bl  
the for  
trade  
Labor  
And t  
organiz  
of the  
they w  
Letters  
Marxis  
Intern  
whose  
in retro  
early c  
nation  
ment i  
Marx  
that t  
activity  
States  
the dev  
ing cla  
self in  
the A  
\* San  
Labor, I

transmit to us across the reaches of time.

In entering upon the criticisms of the early Marxists in the letters, we need to see their inadequacies against a background of high contribution. Had Marx and Engels set out to give a full evaluation of their activities, they would have recorded their vital, and often influential, participation in the American labor and Socialist movement. Their devotion and valor in the anti-slavery struggle has already been discussed. Their fight against barriers to the organization of Negro workers was path-blazing. Their leadership spurred the formation of nation-wide federated trade unions, of which the National Labor Union was a high expression. And their pioneering role in Socialist organization extended to the founding of the Socialist Labor Party, of which they were the mainstay. Certainly, the Letters point to the fact that the early Marxists were the core of the First International in the United States, of whose influence Samuel Gompers wrote in retrospect: "Unquestionably, in those early days of the 'seventies the International dominated the labor movement in the United States."\*

Marx and Engels sensed from afar that the major shortcoming in the activity of the Marxists in the United States was sectarian self-isolation from the developing movement of the working class. This tendency expressed itself in defeatist moods in the face of the American workers' notorious dis-

regard for theory. These moods spelt acquiescence to the bourgeois-inspired notions of "American exceptionalism" in reference to class consciousness and any independent or Socialist program for the working class.

Those sectarian tendencies, reflecting lack of faith in the revolutionary capacity of the American working class, prevented the early Marxists from correctly relating vanguard to class. "Impatient" at the pace of the working-class movement, they sought to superimpose Marxian theory dogma-wise upon it. They failed to apply Marxism as a guide to action on the basis of the primacy of practice. They did not see that the working class of a given country, while benefiting from the generalized experience of the world proletariat, must itself accumulate experience and revolutionize its consciousness, through trial and error, in the nationally unique conditions of its own life and struggles.

In a letter outstanding for its theoretical contributions—that of November 23, 1871, to Friedrich Bolte—Marx sets forth the anti-historical, reactionary essence of sects and sectarianism in the modern working-class movement. In discussing the struggle which the First International waged against the secret conspiratorial activities of the anarchists, Marx states:

"The International was founded in order to replace the socialist or semi-socialist sects by a real organization of the working class for struggle. . . . The development of socialist sectarianism and that of the real labor movement

\* Samuel Gompers, *Seventy Years of Life and Labor*, New York, 1925, Vol. I, p. 60.

always stand in inverse ratio to each other. So long as sects are justified (historically), the working class is not yet ripe for an independent historical movement. As soon as it has attained this maturity all sects are essentially reactionary." (p. 90)

This commanding Marxist principle is a universal and abiding truth. It is a devastating answer to all trumped-up charges of "conspiracy" and "violence" by which the Wall Street-directed government seeks, vainly, to destroy today the American working-class Party which bases its theory and practice on the profoundly democratic and unconquerable teachings of Marxism.

The vigorous, unabating effort to bring about a decided turn from Leftist and doctrinaire attitudes and methods of work stands out with the salience of grandeur in Engels' communications to Marxists in "that sectarian land America." (p. 141)

To break with sectarianism, Engels counseled, it was necessary, in the first place, to shift the tactical orientation to the native-American workers. He castigated the smugly sectarian German Marxists in the United States who "learn no English on principle." (p. 163)

Underlying Engels' exhortation to concentrate the activity among the native-American workers in the trade unions was the urgent necessity to overcome the antagonism between them and the foreign-born workers. The condition of a caste-superiority status and ideology of the native-born within the working class hindered development of a genuine national labor party. Only

by working to end this division, created and sedulously sustained by the bourgeoisie, would the Marxists shake off their sectarian fetters.

Therefore Engels exulted in the letter to Sorge written in the year of magnificent struggles for the eight-hour day and of the numerical peak of the Knights of Labor:\* "A real mass movement exists among the English-speaking workers for the first time." (p. 154)

Keen to the imperative need of a mass worker-Negro-farmer alliance, and to the favorable conditions for its formation, Engels, like Marx before him, sought to guide the Marxists in the United States to center all their efforts upon this objective. He directed cogent polemics against the dogmatic purists who fought shy of the Knights of Labor because of its confused ideology and its "Noble Order" ritual. How to apply the generalizations of theory to the unique American conditions in order to accelerate the movement of the workers as a class—that was the task of tasks to which the Marxists must set themselves.

Engels was battling to bring the Marxists in the United States to perceive within the still rudimentary working-class organizations the unfolding future of the movement.

He writes in that same letter:

"The first great step of importance for every country newly entering into the movement is always the constitution of the workers as an independent political party, no matter how, so long

\* From 111,000 in 1885 the membership shot up to a number estimated as high as 800,000 in 1886.

as it is  
That  
still co  
that it  
George  
but al  
masses  
to dev  
opport  
movem  
in wh  
own r  
and le  
(p. 16  
In a  
for ou  
democ  
charact  
"Wh  
Spring  
Party  
gaining  
we w  
of that  
When  
he drew  
way th  
that p  
ists, P  
more a  
trade u  
to 197  
only w  
our pl  
today?  
shown  
with th  
ing clas  
out giv  
inct p  
(pp. 16

\* Hen  
the labo  
size in  
1886.

as it is a distinct workers' party. . . . That the first program of this party is still confused and extremely deficient, that it has raised the banner of Henry George,\* these are unavoidable evils but also merely transitory ones. The masses must have time and opportunity to develop, and they can have the opportunity only when they have a movement of their own—no matter in what form so long as it is *their own* movement—in which they are and learn through their mistakes." (p. 163)

In a passage of utmost significance for our time, Engels sets forth the democratic essence and united front character of such a mass movement:

"When we returned to Germany, in Spring 1848, we joined the Democratic Party as the only possible means of gaining the ear of the working class; we were the most advanced wing of that party, but still a wing of it. When Marx founded the International, he drew up the General Rules in such a way that *all* workingclass socialists of that period could join it—Proudhonists, Pierre Lerouxists, and even the more advanced section of the English trade unions. . . . Had we from 1864 to 1873 insisted on working together only with those who openly adopted our platform, where should we be today? I think *all our practice has shown that it is possible to work along with the general movement of the working class at every one of its stages without giving up or hiding our own distinct position or even organization....*" (pp. 168-69; italics mine—V.J.J.)

\* Henry George, "Single Tax" advocate, was the labor and Socialist-backed majority candidate in the New York municipal elections of 1886.

The concluding sentence delineates clearly the relationship of vanguard to class in the developing movement. It answers effectively the sectarians in the Socialist Labor Party who charged Engels with relinquishing theoretical leadership and negating the role of the vanguard. It establishes the all-important tactical principle that for Marxists, the ties with the mass movement, *under all conditions, are constant*, never to be sundered; and that through these ties, and *only through them*, can the vanguard Party manifest its leadership, its very existence.

Engels' words "without giving up or hiding our own position" hold the deep meaning that participation of Communists in mass activity signifies participation *with the quality of Communists*, with the essence of Marxism—in our epoch, Marxism-Leninism. It signifies that their actions and policies must be guided by the revolutionary theory of Marxism. Only as they make proper regard for theory their way of life are they enabled to give leadership to the masses with whom they build their connections. Only on that basis of the unity of theory and practice are they able to carry through their vanguard task in working together on a common platform of struggle with people and organizations of varying political views.

Hence, in another letter of that same year (1887) Engels rejoices that "there still is a core among the Germans over there which retains theoretical insight into the nature and the course of the whole movement, keeps the process of

fermentation going, and finally rises to the top again." (p 154) For only as this Marxist core performs its task maturely will it realize the teaching in the *Communist Manifesto*: to represent the future of the movement in its present. In this sense he writes to Sorge later that year:

"If there are people at hand there whose minds are theoretically clear, who can tell them the consequences of their mistakes beforehand and make clear to them that every movement which does not keep the destruction of the wage system constantly in view as the final goal is bound to go astray and fail—then much nonsense can be avoided and the process considerably shortened." (p. 164)

Utterly baseless, therefore, were the objections of dogmatists and separatists that criticism directed at them meant surrender of the vanguard role of the Marxists.

Abandonment of sectarian aloofness from organizations like the Knights of Labor as "movements that proceeded upon lines of ignorance," in Daniel DeLeon's phrasing some months after Engels' death,\* did not mean abandonment of the vanguard. Merging with labor's organizations did not mean submerging the Marxist party. It meant what Engels wrote in 1886 to Sorge: "to work inside them [the Knights of Labor], to form within this still quite plastic mass a core of people who understand the movement and its aims"—who would be able to extend to it the leadership of proletarian vanguard. (p. 163). It meant what Lenin wrote in another epoch when, in his *Left-Wing*

*Communism, an Infantile Disorder*, he exposed as "empty phrase-mongering" the contentions of the Leftist-sectarians of his day against working in "reactionary" trade unions and declared that Communists "must imperatively work wherever the masses are to be found." It meant what our Party stresses today in putting paramount importance on work within the Right-led unions and people's organizations.

That core with "theoretical insight into the nature and course of the whole movement," of whom Engels spoke, waged a two-front struggle on the ideological plane. Besides the "Left" danger, it had to meet the danger from the Right, expressed in various agrarian panaceas and most formidably in the opportunism of the Lassalleans. However, within the conditions of this period, for general policy and tactic, Leftist sectarianism was the pressing and overshadowing danger.

Thus, in the successive phases of the movement, with respect to the question of political activity by the working class, Weydemeyer and Sorge led struggles against "Left"-sectarian and Right currents of opposition to such activity. They combatted the adventurist, petty-bourgeois-minded advocacy of conspiratorial action and, later, the fuller-blown anarchist dogma of abstention from politics. They fought those sectarians who rationalized want of faith in the working class with "exceptionalist" phrases about the "unsuitability" of

\* Daniel De Leon, *Reform or Revolution*, p. 25.

sociali  
sought  
to eco  
they  
action  
pure-a  
had u  
when  
weake  
The  
strugg  
labor  
letter  
above  
the u  
strugg  
ated v  
ty, in  
scripts  
Opt  
made  
phasis  
Leftis  
the U  
made  
of th  
bor P  
tators  
gress,  
tion a  
guard  
Party  
amon  
In  
the I  
Corre  
those  
to tw  
the I  
tion  
1)  
1887,



socialism to the United States, and who sought to restrict the workers' activity to economic issues. At the same time, they fought this rejection of political action also in its Right manifestation of pure-and-simple trade unionism, which had upswings during economic crises, when the trade unions were greatly weakened.

The theoretical basis for that early struggle against "economism" in the labor movement is furnished in Marx's letter of November 23, 1871, to Bolte, above cited, wherein the principle of the unity of the economic and political struggles of the working class is enunciated with classic conciseness and clarity, in one of the most remarkable post-scripts in history.

Opportunist attempts have been made to misinterpret the strong emphasis in the Letters upon combatting Leftist sectarianism and dogmatism in the United States. Such an attempt was made at the time of the Fifth Congress of the Russian Social-Democratic Labor Party, in 1907, by Menshevik agitators for a non-Party "Labor Congress," which could only mean liquidation of the Party as revolutionary vanguard of the proletariat. (This anti-Party agitation quickly found support among the anarcho-syndicalists).

In his preface, written that year, to the Russian translation of the *Sorge Correspondence*,\* Lenin takes to task those "utilizers" of Engels. He refers to two passages in the Letters which the Menshevik strategists of liquidation have pounced upon:

1) The cited letter of January 27, 1887, which states: "Had we from 1864

to 1873 insisted on working together only with those who openly adopted our platform, where should we be today?"—and

2) The letter of December 28, 1886, which declares in reference to the need for consolidating a national mass movement to embrace the large working-class support for Henry George, the Knights of Labor, and others: "A million or two workingmen's votes next November for a *bona fide* workingmen's party is worth infinitely more at present than a hundred thousand votes for a doctrinally perfect platform." (p. 167)

Lenin brilliantly refuted the distorters, laying bare the fallacy on which they attempted to build their mechanical American-Russian parallel. His mighty polemic transcends the specific historical conditions that aroused it; its deep values break through in a torrent of truth for us in our time:

"In countries where there are *no* Social-Democratic workers' parties, *no* Social-Democratic members of parliament, *no* systematic and consistent Social-Democratic policy either at elections or in the press, etc., Marx and Engels taught the Socialists *at all costs* to rid themselves of narrow sectarianism and *join* the labor movement so as to rouse the proletariat *politically*; for in the last third of the nineteenth century the proletariat displayed *almost no* political independence either in England or America. In these countries—where bourgeois-democratic historical tasks were almost entirely absent—the political arena was wholly filled by the triumphant and self-complacent

\* Lenin's Preface is included as an appendix to this volume.

bourgeoisie, which has no equal anywhere in the world in the art of deceiving, corrupting, and bribing the workers.

"To think that these recommendations of Marx and Engels to the British and American labor movement can be simply and directly applied to Russian conditions is to use Marxism not in order to elucidate its *method*, not in order to *study* the concrete historical peculiarities of the labor movement in certain countries, but in order to settle petty, factional intellectual accounts." (p. 281)



What are the concrete ways in which these valuable writings of Marx and Engels can best be utilized in our time? What lessons do they hold for the Communist Party, inheritor of the high proletarian and democratic traditions of the early Marxists in our country? How can they help the Party give leadership to the working class in relation to the central task of today—the fight for peace and, inseparable from it, the struggle for democracy?

Many indeed are the lessons to be drawn from this volume that so richly rewards the reading. On this occasion especially, when the Communist Party enters upon its thirty-fifth year of life and struggle, the lesson that stands out foremost is two-fold:

- 1) unbounded faith in the working class:
- 2) the indispensability of the Party to the working class and the people as a whole in every main area of their struggles.

Faith in the working class is not a mystical or romantic sentiment; it is

bed-rock confidence deriving from the scientific understanding of its position in the structure and movement of capitalist society. This position determines historically its basic revolutionary role and its ascendant course. The Marxist-Leninist understanding of history's "line of march" reveals for our day that the working class is called upon to lead in the defense of the nation against the national-ruin program of war and fascism with which the imperialist bourgeoisie is pressing forward.

It is of course true that the American working class, while strengthened in economic organization, is backward politically and has still to attain the consciousness of its historical role. But Marxism-Leninism teaches that the development of this consciousness is a process which is inevitable and unexceptional.

We Communists must spread these teachings among the working people and equip the advanced workers especially with this sustaining knowledge to combat moods of apathy and discouragement. We must reinforce faith in the basic health and capacity of the American working class, by holding up to view its great heritage of militant struggles—the heart and core of these Letters.

We Communists must stress more than ever before that there can be no forward movement to build the coalition for peace, economic security, Negro rights, and democracy, unless this coalition is based upon the labor movement and is led by it. We cannot ever permit the delusion that it is possible to have an independent political move-

ment  
labor  
paid  
tion  
work  
dear  
the  
As  
the  
the  
Part  
mun  
to de  
litical  
impr  
the p  
mem  
plac  
and  
Th  
exist  
foun  
tain  
necti  
vang  
entir  
capit  
fight  
of th  
ment  
peace  
econ  
of th  
of th  
gains  
of in  
action  
in fu  
guid  
of th  
decis  
of th  
their

ment of the people without a strong labor core, a truth brought home to us painfully by the 1948 Wallace election campaign. Stubborn belief in the working class must be expressed in clear-sighted and devoted work to hasten the fulfillment of its role.

As to the second aspect of the lesson, the ruling class is all too conscious of the indispensability of the Communist Party. Its drive to destroy the Communist Party has precisely this aim—to deprive the working class of its political leader. Hence, the frame-ups and imprisonments of the Party leaders, the persecution and harrassment of its members and sympathizers. Hence, the placing on trial of the Party's theory and ideology in print and in speech.

The Party's heroic fight for its legal existence has thus to be seen as a profoundly historical struggle to maintain and build strongly the basic connection of the working class and its vanguard. This struggle is vital to the entire labor movement and all whom capitalism oppresses. It is vital to the fight for economic security in the face of the threatening crisis; to the movement for creating a powerful labor-led peace front; to the struggle for the economic, political, and social rights of the Negro people; and to the defense of the Bill of Rights and all democratic gains. It is vital to the development of independent working-class political action. For only as the Party succeeds in functioning as political vanguard to guide the working masses in the course of their struggles, will they overcome decisively the ideology and the policies of the class that robs them and blights their life. That role of the vanguard

is a life-or-death necessity for ending the sway of the labor aides of imperialism over the trade unions, for liberating the unions and the people's organizations from the shackling ideologies and policies of reformism, Social-Democracy, and chauvinist nationalism.

The Party faces the task of overcoming its relative isolation from the decisive sections of the working class and the Negro people. This isolation is not due solely to objective factors: the vicious attacks of the government, aided by the Red-baiting orgy of the labor bureaucracy, the widespread ideological confusion among the workers induced by unceasing pro-imperialist propaganda, as well as the deception and softening-up of large sections of workers by the wartime pseudo-prosperity and the ensuing war-economy "boom."

The isolation is due also to a subjective factor—weaknesses of an internal character which harm the Party's fight to build strong connections with the masses in the course of extending leadership to them in their struggles.

The subjective factor is manifested in the twin variants of Right opportunism and "Left" sectarianism.

Both evils derive from an unrealistic estimation of the relationship of forces, and each by its own path can only lead to the blind-alley of isolation from the masses. The Right opportunist brand is expressed in the tendency to lag behind the masses, in repeated failure to come forward with leadership around issues that stir the masses. It reflects an attitude of being overawed by the power of reaction, of deficient confidence in the working class, of

accepting fatalistically the status of "outcast" with which the ruling class wants to stamp the Party.

The Leftist-sectarian danger, alarmingly manifested in the recent years, has proceeded, in the first place from overstating the present mass readiness for a distinctly independent political course, with resulting tendencies to concentrate activity in the most advanced areas. On the other hand, such proneness to abandon the mass base of activity leads more and more to a go-it-alone policy for the Party, by which the vanguard and those who can be mustered on the Left replace the working class. These and similar "Left" tendencies, which are a bee-line to the utter isolation of the Party and the liquidation of its vanguard role, constitute the greatest obstacle today to the Party's fulfillment of its vanguard task. They are in fact the greatest hindrance to the struggle against Right opportunism.

The great value of Marxism-Leninism, the value that is ours to draw from the letters of Marx and Engels to the early Marxists in the United States, is precisely the scientific method

it places in the hands of the Party to steer its course between the two rocks of perdition, the Scylla of Right opportunism and the Charydbis of Leftist sectarianism. Mastery of this method can be achieved only as the Party, battling to break out of its isolation, goes forward to carry through its main vanguard task of the day. That task was set forth in the National Committee Resolution "On the Situation Growing out of the Presidential Elections":

"... no basic political realignment, no great and powerful people's coalition against war and fascism can be built today which can succeed in reversing American foreign policy that does not have the working class as the basic driving force and backbone of the coalition."

Therefore:

"Our Party must be the foremost, the most effective, the most consistent fighter for unity of the working class. It must strive to achieve the united action of the working class, Negro people, farmers and democratically-minded people."\*

\* *Political Affairs*, July, 1953, pp. 9, 7.

**READER'S GUIDE**  
**to**  
**William Z. Foster's**  
**HISTORY OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY**  
**OF THE UNITED STATES**  
(prepared by Henry T. Goodwin)

FOREWORD

INTRODUCTION

TOPIC ONE:

*The American Birthright of Socialism.*

TOPIC TWO:

*The Development of U.S. Imperialism.*

TOPIC THREE:

*The Struggle against Right and "Left" Opportunism.*

TOPIC FOUR:

*The Communist Party and the Trade Unions.*

TOPIC FIVE:

*The Communist Party and the Negro People.*

TOPIC SIX:

*The Communist Party and the Struggle for Peace.*

TOPIC SEVEN:

*The Communist Party and the Struggle for Democracy—The Working Class as the Leader of the Nation.*

TOPIC EIGHT:

*The American Road to Socialism.*

TOPIC NINE:

*The Development of the Party Organization.*

**Special Supplement—Political Affairs**  
**September, 1953**

## FOREWORD

The thirty-fourth anniversary of our Party is likewise the first anniversary of the publication of Comrade Foster's *History of the Communist Party of the United States*. In this period, when our Party is under such sharp attack, when wholesale slander as well as repression are used in an effort to build a wall between our Party and the people, Comrade Foster's book stands out as a revelation of the true nature of the Communist Party and its significance for the American people.

This book has been ignored by the capitalist press, that fills its columns with hysterical lies about "Communism" in the United States. But no book is more important or more deserving of study by American workers. For this book shows how the Communist Party grew out of the experience of the American people, and especially the American working class, illuminated by the scientific truths of Marxism-Leninism. And it shows how, armed with this experience and this theory, the people can win the struggles of today and of the days to come.

Comrade Foster's history of our Party is a weapon against dogmatism. It tears to shreds the grotesque claim of the government in the trials of the Communist leaders, that our Party seeks to apply to America "a blueprint of revolution." The references in the *Guide* to Stalin's great work, *History of the CPSU*, show how the same general historical principles can be traced in the different forms in which they appeared in the experience of the American working class and Party.

*Political Affairs* is happy to present to its readers this *Guide* to Comrade Foster's *History of the Communist Party of the United States*, to facilitate the study of this work. The *Guide* has been arranged by topics so that the reader can link the material of the book more easily with his own experience.

This *Guide* is oriented towards a six to eight-month course of study of the book. Naturally, the amount of time required for the different topics would vary according to the material involved, etc.

The *Guide* has also drawn freely from material in Comrade Foster's previously published *Outline Political History of the Americas*. Numbers in the *Guide* without any further designation refer to pages in the *History of the Communist Party of the United States*; numbers preceded by the

letter A refer to pages in the *Outline Political History of the Americas*; those preceded by CPSU refer to pages in the *History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union*.

References of immediate importance, besides those in the book itself and the two other works mentioned above, are marked with an asterisk. Other references are supplementary material that will aid the reader in securing a fuller grasp of the subjects.

## INTRODUCTION

"The history of the Communist Party of the United States is the history of the vanguard party of the American working class. It is the story and analysis of the origin, growth, and development of a working class political party of a new type, called into existence by the epoch of imperialism, the last stage of capitalism, and by the emergence of a new social system—Socialism. It is the record of a Party which through its entire existence of more than three decades has loyally fought for the best interests of the American working class and its allies—the Negro people, the toiling farmers, the city middle classes—who are the great majority of the American people. It is the life of a Party destined to lead the American working class and its allies to victory over the monopoly warmongers and fascists, to a people's democracy and Socialism.

"The life story of the Communist Party is also the history of Marxism for a century in the United States. The C.P.U.S.A. is the continuer of the many American Marxist parties and organizations which preceded it during this long period. It incorporates in itself the lessons of generations of political struggle by the working class; of the world experience of the First, Second, and Third Internationals; of the writings of the great Socialist theoreticians, Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin; and of the great revolutions in Russia, China, and Central and Eastern Europe. It is also the continuation and culmination of American scientific, democratic, and artistic culture, embracing and carrying forward all that is sound and constructive in the works of Franklin, Jefferson, Douglass, Lincoln, Morgan, Edison, Twain, Dreiser, and a host of American thinkers, writers, and creators.

"The Party history is the record of the American class struggle, of which it is a vital part. It is the story, in general, of the growth of the working class; the abolition of slavery and emancipation of the Negro

people; the building of the trade-union and farmer movements; the numberless strikes and political struggles of the toiling masses; and the growing political alliance of workers, Negroes, farmers, and intellectuals. The Party is the crystallization of the best in all these rich democratic and revolutionary traditions of the people; it is the embodiment of the toilers' aspirations for freedom and a better life.

"The story of the Communist Party is also necessarily the history, in outline, of American capitalism. It is the account and analysis of the revolutionary liberation from British domination and establishment of the Republic, the expansion of the national frontiers, the development of industry and agriculture, the armed overthrow of the southern slavocracy, the recurring economic crises, the brutal exploitation of the workers, the poles of wealth and poverty, the growth of monopoly and development of imperialism, the savage robbery of the colonial peoples, the great world wars, the barbarities of fascism, the bid of American imperialism for world domination, the fight of the people for world peace, the general crisis of capitalism, and the development of the world class struggle, under expanding Marxist-Leninist leadership, toward Socialism."

WILLIAM Z. FOSTER, *History of the Communist Party of the United States*, pp. 15-16.



## Topic One: The American Birthright of Socialism

### I. Origins of Socialism in the U.S.:

A. "Socialism and Communism did not originate in Germany, but in England, France and *North America*" (Marx, *Selected Essays*, N. Y., 1926, p. 140).

B. "Social Democracy is a combination of the labor movement with Socialism" (Lenin, "The Urgent Tasks of Our Movement" (1900), *Selected Works*, II, p. 11).

The science of Socialism, and the labor movement both had their origin and development in the U.S. simultaneously with other countries.

1. Beginnings of U.S. working-class entry into organized class struggle—beginnings of labor movement. (18)

a. On political as well as economic front. (20-21)

b. Ideology not working-class but Jeffersonian.

2. Utopian Socialism. (22-25)

3. The *Science* of Socialism in the U.S. (26-27)

a. German Marxist immigrants (1848). (27)

(Weydemeyer, Sorge, etc.) (28-32)

b. The theoretical foundations of Marxism in U.S. (32-35)

i. Marx and Engels as the personal theoretical leaders of the early Communists in the U.S. (75, 82, 85, 105)

### II. The Marxist movement in the great national crisis of the struggle against slavery:

A. The role of the working class in the early phase of the struggle. (38)

1. Incorrect ideas about slavery. (38)

B. The role of organized labor in the Civil War. (46)

C. Theoretical position of Marxism.

1. "Labor cannot emancipate itself in the white skin when in the black it is branded." (Marx, *Capital*, I, p. 287)

2. Weydemeyer's struggle against sectarian tendencies of refusal to enter struggle against slavery. (39-40)

D. Active role of Marxists in struggle against slavery.

1. In period prior to Civil War. (38-43)

2. Role and strategy of Marxists in the Civil War Period. (47)

a. Marx' and Engels' advice on political and military strategy. (48)

b. Marx mobilizes British workers against British government's plans of military intervention. (49)

1. Lincoln's thanks to the British workers and to the First International. (49)
- III. The Marxist movement and the development of a National Labor movement:
- A. Weydemeyer's contribution to founding of the National Labor Union (1866). (53)
  - B. Marxist influence on Sylvis and the N.L.U. (53-4)
  - C. The N.L.U. and the First International. (56)
  - D. Marxist influence in the founding of the A. F. of L. (70)
- IV. Formation and continuity of the Marxist Political Party, Chapter V:
- A. Predecessors: the Proletarian League (1852) (29-30)  
the Communist Club (1858) (31-2)  
International Workingmen's Association (1st International) groups and sections (1864-76) (50, 60-1)
  - B. Founding of the Socialist Labor Party (1876). (62-4)
  - C. Formation of Socialist Party (1901). (94-5)
  - D. Foundation of Communist Party (1919). (171-2)
- V. The continuing line of American Marxist leadership:  
Weydemeyer (29); Sorge (29, 50); Debs (78); Haywood (78, 101); Foster (124); Ruthenberg (124); Bloor (125); Flynn (125); Dennis (508).
- VI. The struggle against the McCarran Act "foreign agent" slander (519-20):

*General Reading:*

- \*Marx and Engels: *The Civil War in the U.S.* (International Publishers, 1938)
- \*Marx and Engels: *Letters to Americans* (International Publishers, 1953)
- \*Communist Party of the U.S.A.: *The McCarran conspiracy against the Bill of Rights* (The C.P.'s answer to the charges under the McCarran Act) (Pamphlet) 1951.
- Karl Obermann: *Joseph Weydemeyer* (International Publishers, 1947)
- \*V. J. Jerome: "Forerunners," in *The Communist*, September, 1939.

**Topic Two: The Development of U.S. Imperialism**

- I. What is Imperialism? (150, 152; A229-30, 357-8); CPSU 168;  
\*Lenin: *Imperialism*, 88-9.
- II. Incorrect Theories of Imperialism and Lenin's Refutations.
  - A. DeLeon: "Expansionism"; trusts viewed as "progressive". (96)
  - B. Kautsky: Imperialism a "policy," not a *stage* of capitalism.

\*Lenin: *Imperialism*, 90-3.

Kautsky: "Ultra-imperialism" (the development of one world-monopolistic state) (418); \*Lenin: *Imperialism*, 94, 117-8.

C. Lenin's Law of Uneven Development (150); \*Lenin: *Imperialism*, 118-20; \*Stalin: *Economic Problems of Socialism in the U.S.S.R.*, 26-30; CPSU, 168-9.

### III. The Development of U.S. Imperialism.

A. Pre-imperialist capitalism in the U.S.; the origin of the monopolies ("trusts"). (A221-9, 232-4)

B. The Birth of U.S. Imperialism. (A229-30)

1. The Spanish-American War (1898); beginnings of building an empire. (77, 358; A231-2)

2. Mass opposition to imperialist aggression—the Anti-Imperialist League. (A232); \*Lenin: *Imperialism*, p. 111.

C. U.S. Imperialism in, and following, World War I. (132, 196; A368-71)

IV. U.S. Imperialism and Latin America; the "Good Neighbor" Policy, Chapter XXV. Perry: "Puerto Rico and the Fight for Its Independence," *Political Affairs*, June-July, 1952.

V. Imperialism creates an aristocracy of labor and develops Social-Democracy as its main support among the working class.

A. The bribery of the upper layer of the working class with part of the super-profits from exploitation of the colonial peoples. (543-4, 547-8); CPSU, 165; \*Lenin: *Imperialism*, 105-8.

B. The great Social-Democratic betrayal in World War I. (128-30, 131-2); CPSU, 163-5.

C. The Social-Democrats betray the revolution in Europe. (145-7, 147-8); CPSU, 231.

D. The policy of the Social-Democrats in the 1929 Economic Crisis. (280-1)

E. The Social-Democrats aid the accession of Hitler. (295; A412)

F. The characteristic American form of Social-Democracy. (147, 485, 548-9, 552; A397-400)

### VI. The General Crisis of World Capitalism.

A. The nature of the general crisis. (530-2, 143, 265)

B. The general crisis and the U.S. (533-5, 549, 541)

C. The general crisis and the cyclical economic crisis of 1929. (276-8)  
\*Stalin: "Report to XVI Congress of CPSU," in *Leninism*, II, pp. 248-55.

D. The bourgeois economics of the period of the general crisis: In the '20's: Ford vs. Marx (236-39); Later: Keynesism vs. Marx (481-84)

## VII. Imperialism and War.

- A. World War I an inevitable consequence of imperialism. (127-8)  
CPSU, 160-2.
- B. U.S. Imperialism supports policy of directing Hitler's war preparations to the East—against the U.S.S.R. (375-7, 383-6, 389-90)  
CPSU, 331-5.
- C. U.S. Imperialism leads drive towards World War III. (459-63, 526-30)

## VIII. U.S. Imperialism Drives for World Mastery. (Chapter XXXII)

- A. U.S. hegemony a result of the law of uneven development. (452)
- B. Inter-imperialist contradictions sharpen instead of lessening; possible break-down of the war alliances. (453); \*Stalin: *Economic Problems*, 26-30.
- C. Forces behind Wall Street's War Drive. (454-7)
  - i. Stalin's Law of Maximum Profits. \*Stalin: *Economic Problems*, 31-3.
- D. Deepening crisis of U.S. foreign policy. (453)  
\*Rockman: *Broaden the Fight for Peace and Democracy*, (1952)

*General Reading:*

Lenin: "The United States of Europe Slogan," *Selected Works*, Vol. V, pp. 138-41.

\*Foster: "Stalin and American Imperialism," *Political Affairs*, Feb. 1953.

\*Foster: "The Explosive Situation in Latin America," *Political Affairs*, Aug., 1954.

Dennis: *The Fascist Danger*, pp. 10-16.

Perlo: *American Imperialism*. (International Publishers, 1951)

## Topic Three: The Struggle Against Right and "Left" Opportunism

*What is opportunism?*

"Opportunism is the sacrifice of the fundamental interests of the masses to the temporary interests of an insignificant minority of the workers, or in other words, the alliance of a section of the workers with the bourgeoisie against the mass of the proletariat."—Lenin: "The Collapse of the 2nd International," in *Selected Works*, V, p. 203.

## I. In the period before the formation of the S.L.P.

- A. The struggle to lay the theoretical foundations of Marxism in the U.S. (33-5)
- B. Opportunism on the slavery question. (33, 38-40)

- C. The struggle against Lasalleanism and the question of the role of the trade unions. (58-9)

Marx: *Value, Price & Profit*

—: *Critique of the Gotha Program*

- D. Struggle against "Left" sectarianism (self-isolation). (59)

II. In the period of the S.L.P.

- A. Further degeneration of (Right-wing) Lasalleans. (65)

- B. The struggle against anarcho-syndicalism. (66-7)

"Anarchism was often a sort of punishment for the opportunist sins of the working-class movement. Both monstrosities mutually supplemented each other." (\*Lenin: *"Left-Wing" Communism*, 17-18)

- C. Right opportunism and "Left" sectarianism in the S.L.P. (75-6)

- D. DeLeonism—sectarianism triumphant. (79-90)

III. In the period of the Socialist Party.

- A. Right opportunism in the S.P. (101-6, 119-23, 169-70)

- B. Anarcho-syndicalism in the I.W.W. (110-111)

- C. The 1912 split and the Left-wing program: a fighting program but with Leftist errors, (122-6)

IV. Origin of the Communist Party out of the struggle against Right opportunism in the period of the Imperialist World War I.

- A. The great Social-Democratic betrayal. (128-136); CPSU, 163-5.

- B. Impact of the Russian Revolution upon the U.S. labor movement. (147-8)

1. Marxism-Leninism and Lenin's contribution to the struggle against opportunism in the U.S. Marxist movement. (148-56)

- C. Split of S.P. and formation of C.P. Chapters XI and XII

1. The Left-wing Manifesto. (166-8)

2. The C.P. and C.L.P. Programs. (172-4)

3. The Workers Party Program. (191-3)

V. The struggle against "Left" sectarianism in the early years of the C.P.

- A. What is "Left" sectarianism? The tendency to use Marxism as a dogma instead of a guide (571); \*Lenin: *"Left-Wing" Communism*, Chapter X.

- B. Lenin's contribution to the struggle against "Left" sectarianism in the U.S. (151-6, 180, 211-12)

- C. "Left" sectarianism in early programs of C.P. (167, 172-74)

VI. The Struggle against Trotskyism. (269-70)

- A. What is Trotskyism?

1. Prior to the Russian Revolution: "Trotskyism is opportunism covered with Left phrases" (Lenin).

2. In the early years of the Soviet Government: an "ultra-revolu-

tionary" program opposed to the idea that Socialism could be built in one country, and therefore, opposed to the worker-peasant alliance and in favor of forcing revolution abroad (269); CPSU, (265-7, 272-8, 289-95)

3. In later years: "Trotskyism has changed from a political trend in the working class that it was seven or eight years ago into a frantic and unprincipled gang of wreckers, diversionists, spies, and murderers, acting on the instructions of the intelligence services of 'foreign states'". (Stalin, 1937).

Stalin: *Mastering Bolshevism* 12; CPSU 324-9, 346-7.

B. Expulsion of the Trotskyites from the C.P. (1928). (270)

C. Titoism. (441)

Tito's policies of complete sell-out and restoration of capitalism on the orders of U.S. imperialism represent the realization of the policies of Trotskyism. Titoites and Trotskyites work hand in hand on an international scale and in the U.S.

## VII. The struggle against revisionism.

A. What is revisionism? (106, 149); CPSU, 37.

"The policy of revisionism consists in determining its conduct from case to case, in adapting itself to the events of the day and to the chops and changes of petty politics; it consists in forgetting the basic interests of the proletariat, the main features of the capitalist system as a whole, and of capitalist evolution as a whole, and in sacrificing these basic interests for the real or assumed advantages of the moment."—Lenin, in *Marxism and Revisionism*, p. 4.

1. Its special American form: *American Exceptionalism*. (570-1)

- a. Its basis: exaggeration of *specific* features of U.S. capitalist development. As a result, the *general* features are played down and U.S. capitalism is made to appear "progressive" in contrast to capitalism in other countries. (106, 247)

Thompson: Report to XV National Convention, *Political Affairs*, Feb., 1951, pp. 94-95.

Wilkerson, "Henry Luce's Revolutionaries," *Masses & Mainstream*, Sept. 1951.

Goodwin, "Life's Dream Picture," *Political Affairs*, Feb. 1953.

- b. The exceptionalism of Lovestone in the period prior to the 1929 crisis. (270-5)

1. Connection with Bukharinities, CPSU, 291-95.
2. Foster and Bittelman fight against Lovestone's revisionism. (273)
3. Stalin's analysis. (273)

- c. Exceptionalism of Browder in World War II. (425-7)
- B. Browder's Revisionist System. (Chapters XXIX, XXX)
1. Attempt to surrender fight for labor's standards. (411)
  2. False "Integration" of Negro people. (424)
  3. Opportunist conception of national unity. (415-6)
  4. "Organized capitalism." (417-8)
  5. Teheran thesis of class peace. (422-4)
  6. Liquidation of the Party. (430-1)
  7. Foster's fight against Browderism. (428-30)

Foster, "The Struggle Against Revisionism," *Political Affairs*, June-July, 1945.

- VIII. The struggle against Right opportunism and "Left" sectarianism today. (570-2)
- A. "The fight to overcome internal Party differences is the law of development of all Communist parties of any considerable size." (Stalin, in *Marxism and Revisionism*, p. 47)
  - B. The Party is strengthened by cleansing its ranks of opportunists, etc. (571-2)
  - C. The necessity of struggle on two fronts. Stalin: *Leninism*, 185-6.

*General Reading:*

- \*CPUSA: Resolution on Results of Presidential Election, *Political Affairs*, July, 1953.
- \*Swift: "Work in Right-Led Unions," *Political Affairs*, April-May, 1952; "The Struggle for a Mass Policy," *Political Affairs*, Feb., 1953.
- \*Kendrick: "Party & Trade Unions in Post-War Period," *Political Affairs*, Dec., 1952.
- \*Lenin: *State & Revolution*.
- \*Lenin: Preface to "Letters to Sorge." (In Marx & Engels: *Letters to Americans*, 273-85)
- \*Lenin and Stalin: *Marxism and Revisionism*. (Little Lenin Library No. 29)

**Topic Four: The Communist Party and the Trade Unions**

- I. The Beginnings of the Trade-Union Movement (up to 1837). (17-19)
  - A. Prosecutions as "conspiracies." (19)
  - B. Achievements of the early unions. (19-20)
  - C. Ideology Jeffersonian, but beginnings of anti-capitalist expression. (21-2)
- II. The IWA and the National Labor Union (1866-76). (Chap. IV)
  - A. Role of Weydemeyer and Sylvis. (53-4)

- B. Achievements of NLU. (57)
- C. Reasons for decline of NLU. (57)
1. Not definitely a trade-union body.
  2. Influence of Lasalleanism against trade-union action and towards petty-bourgeois "currency reform" and other reformist theories.
    - a. Lasalle's opportunist system. (58-9)
 

His "Iron Law of Wages" and Marx' refutation in *Value, Price & Profit*.

Modern capitalist theories of tying wages to productivity are a present-day version of Lasalle's false "law."

\*Marx: *Value, Price & Profit; Gotha Program*.
- III. Anarcho-Syndicalism and the Question of the Role of the Trade Unions.
- A. Anarcho-Syndicalism. (A388-9, 391-2)
1. Reasons for its rise. (66)
  2. Its characteristics. (67)
    - a. Rejection of political action.
    - b. View of the trade-union movement as the embryo of the future society.
- B. What is the role of the trade unions?
1. "The elementary, lowest, most simple . . . most easily accessible form of organization." (\*Lenin: *Left-Wing Communism*, 37)

"Good or bad, the worker regards the trade unions as his citadels, his strongholds which help him to maintain his wages, his working day, etc." (\*Stalin: "Interview with American Trade Union delegation") *Leninism*, I, 158-60.

  2. Lenin's struggle against "Economism" ("no politics in the Union"—"pure and simple" trade unionism, spontaneity, etc.)—the theory that the labor movement does not need the guidance of socialist theory and consciousness—in reality leaving it a prey to the ideology and misleadership of the bourgeoisie. CPSU, 23, 34-7; \*Lenin: *What Is To Be Done?* (Chapter III)
- IV. The Socialist Labor Party and the Knights of Labor.
- A. The SLP and the first great national strike (Railroad 1877). (63-4)
- B. The SLP and the K. of L. (68-9)
- V. The foundation of the A. F. of L.
- A. Its original ideology: Marxist influence manifest but not dominant. (70)
- B. Contrast with K. of L.: more effective organizationally but more backward politically. (70-73)



- C. The national 8-hour day fight and General Strike (1886)  
 Origin of May Day. (71-2)  
 The Haymarket frame-up. (67)
- VI. Imperialism and the Creation of an Aristocracy of Labor.
- A. Factors retarding the development of class consciousness among the workers. (542-4)
  - B. A.F.L. geared primarily to winning concessions under capitalism for skilled workers. (73)
  - C. Corruption and class-collaboration of A.F.L. leadership. (92-3)
- VII. The SLP, DeLeonism and the Trade Unions.
- A. The fight against Right opportunism and class collaboration. (82)
  - B. "Leftist" dual unionism. (82-5)  
 Major successes of Socialists in A.F.L. destroyed by DeLeon's dual unionist policy of withdrawal from A.F.L. (84-5)
- VIII. The Socialist Party and the Trade Unions.
- A. Militant policy of Socialist trade unionists. (98)
  - B. Hillquit develops policy of "neutrality" towards unions. (99)
  - C. The I.W.W. dual unionism. (100-1, 103, 109-12)
    1. Its militant struggles and originally Socialist character. (Bill Haywood). (100, 109-12)
    2. Its turn toward syndicalism. (110-11)
- IX. Foster begins the fight against Dual Unionism and for the Organization of the Mass Production Industries.
- A. The syndicalist error of the International Trade Union Educational League. (137-8)
  - B. Foster wins support in Chicago Federation of Labor for unionizing drive. (138)
  - C. Foster and Johnstone organize packing industry. (139)
  - D. Foster leads steel organizing campaign and great steel strike of 1919. (139-40)  
 "If there was ever an example in the American revolutionary movement of the development and application of the Stalinist concept of struggle on two fronts, it was Foster's two-sided struggle against "Left"-sectarian concepts of dual unionism on the one hand, and against the Right-opportunism of the A.F.L. bureaucracy which blocked the organization of the unorganized on the other." (Thompson: "Report to XV National Convention," *Political Affairs*, Feb. '51, p. 100.)  
 Foster: *The Great Steel Strike*, 1920.
- X. The Post-War Attack on Labor.
- A. The Palmer Raids and attack on the C.P. and C.L.P. (174-6)
  - B. The "American Plan" (open shop) campaign; company unions

- embryo of fascist "unions" of Mussolini and Hitler. (196, 201)
- C. Bankruptcy and corruption of AFL leadership. (201-2)
  - 1. "Higher strategy of labor"; the B.&O. plan; labor banking, etc. (R. W. Dunn: *The Americanization of Labor*)
- D. Role of Communists and T.U.E.L. (headed by Foster) in the AFL unions. (203-8)
  - 1. The 3-point campaign: Amalgamation into industrial unions; For a Labor Party; Recognition of Soviet Russia. (205-7)
- XI. The C.P. and the Unions in the Coolidge "Prosperity" period. (Chap. XVII & XVIII)
  - A. Class-collaboration and degeneration of Labor Bureaucracy. ("Ford versus Marx") and fight led by Communists. (236-46)
  - B. Expulsion of militants from unions with approval of S.P. leaders. (248-9)
  - C. Communists lead textile, needle and mining strikes, leading to formation of independent unions of Trade Union Unity League. (250-9)
    - 1. New line opposed by Lovestone. (258)
    - 2. Not dual unionism, but to organize the unorganized in a situation where A.F.L. rejected this task, and a base therefore existed for independent unionism. (258)
    - 3. Achievements of T.U.U.L. (259, 304)
- XII. The C.P. and the Unions in the New Deal Period.
  - A. The NRA and the mass strike movement of 1933-34. (296-8)
    - 1. Mass strikes develop along lines of strategy and tactics taught by C.P. and T.U.U.L. (299)
    - 2. Role of National Unemployed Councils led by C.P. (299)
    - 3. The San Francisco General Strike. (300-3)
  - B. The T.U.U.L. merges with the A.F.L. (303-4)
  - C. The Formation of the C.I.O. (304-7)
    - 1. C.P. supports C.I.O. but opposes Lewis' refusal to fight against expulsion of C.I.O. unions from A.F.L. (305, 307)
      - a. Not dual unionism, but a broad mass movement to organize the unorganized. (345)
    - 2. Communists play key role in organizing the mass production industries and building C.I.O. unions. (Chapter XXIV)
      - a. Leading role of Foster's pamphlets on industrial unionism, organizing methods, strike strategy, union building and union democracy. (347)
      - b. Participation and militancy of numerous Communists as organizers (Gus Hall). (347, 349, 352)
      - c. Role of Communist and former T.U.U.L. workers in shops

XIII.

XIV.

Gene

as centers of unionism. (349, 351)

d. Development of Left-center bloc. (347, 348-9)

Bonosky: *Brother Bill McKie* (International Publishers, 1953)

3. Errors of the C.P. in relation to the C.I.O.

a. Browder's opportunist reliance on negotiations with top leaders and uncritical adulation of Lewis and Murray. (348)

b. As a result, Communists did not pay adequate attention to building progressive union leadership, especially in steel. (351)

c. Browder's playing down of Party recruiting, and influence against letting Communists active in building the unions be publicly known as Communists. (348)

XIII. The C.P. and the Unions in World War II.

A. Following Pearl Harbor, C.P. and unions support National Unity, Battle for Production and no-strike pledge during the war. (410-11)

B. Browder's opportunist incentive-wage scheme endangers Party's fight to protect labor's standards. (411)

C. Browder's post-war outlook of continued no-strike pledge and class peace damages influence of Communists in the unions. (432)

XIV. The C.P. and the Unions in the post-World War II period.

(Chapter XXXIV)

A. The modern form of corruption of the trade-union bureaucracy. (485-6)

B. The 1946 strike wave. (487)

C. The Taft-Hartley Law to hamstringing the unions. (487-9)

D. C.I.O. leadership joins Wall Street's "anti-Communist" War Drive by supporting the Marshall Plan, breaking up the Left-center bloc, denying autonomy to international unions, and splitting the C.I.O. (489-94)

E. The crisis of the American Labor Movement. (500-3)

F. The election of Eisenhower; new attacks on the labor movement and the question of labor unity.

\*CPUSA: "Resolution on Results of Elections," *Political Affairs*, July, 1953.

*General Reading:*

\*Lenin: *What Is To Be Done?*

\*Stalin: *Interview With American Trade-Union Delegation.*

Foster: *Pages From a Worker's Life.*

Foster: *The Great Steel Strike.*

Foster: *Misleaders of Labor*.

Foster: *American Trade Unionism*.

Williamson: "The Party's Trade Union Work" (Report to the XV National Convention), *Political Affairs*, February, 1951.

\*Swift: "Work in the Right-Led Unions," *Political Affairs*, April-May, 1952.

Swift: "Reuther's Seizure of the Ford Local," *Political Affairs*, July, 1952.

Swift: "The Ford Local Elections," *Political Affairs*, November, 1952.

\*Swift: "The Left-Led Unions and Labor Unity," *Political Affairs*, July-August, 1953.

\*Kendrick: "Party and Unions in the Post-War Period," *Political Affairs*, December, 1952.

### Topic Five: The Communist Party and the Negro People

#### I. Enslaved Labor in North America. (A Chapter V)

A. Enslaving the Indians. (A71-2, 74)

B. The role of Negro slavery in the development of capitalism in Europe and America. (A76-8)

C. The slave trade. (A78-82)

D. The brutality of slavery. (A82-4)

E. White indentured servitude in the colonies. (A87-92)

#### II. The Marxists and the Struggle Against Slavery. (Chapter III)

A. The most powerful force fighting for abolition was the Negro people themselves. (37-8, A84-7)

Aptheker: *American Negro Slave Revolts*.

—: *The Negro in the Abolitionist Movement*

B. Role of the Abolitionists, representing "the historic interests of the as yet hesitant bourgeoisie." (37-8)

1. Building of the Underground Railroad and defiance of the Fugitive Slave Law and the Dred Scott Decision.

2. Role of Frederick Douglass. (37, 44)

Foner: *Frederick Douglass—Selected Writings*.

C. Strategy and Activities of the Marxists in the Struggle Against Slavery.

1. Incorrect ideas about slavery. (38, 39-40)

2. Marx' basic principle: "Labor cannot emancipate itself in a white skin when in the black it is branded." (38)

3. Marxists view defeat of slavocracy and abolition of slavery as the basis of all progress for the working class and the nation. (38-40)

4. Activities of the Marxists in the struggle. (39-43)

5. Strategy of Marx and Engels and the American Marxists in the Civil War. (47-9)

- a. Struggle for the U.S. to take the offensive, free the slaves and enlist Negroes as soldiers. (43-5)

D. The working class and the Negro people in the war. (45-7, A268-9, 271-85, 326)

Marx and Engels: *The Civil War in the U.S.*

Aptheker: *The Negro in the Civil War.*

—: *To Be Free*, 75-135.

III. The Marxist movement and the Negro People in the Post-Civil War Period.

A. Reconstruction. (50-2)

1. Negroes win minimum democratic rights, but not the land.
2. Negro U.S. Senators, Congressmen, Lieutenant-Governors and local officials.
3. Marx warns the American people of the danger of counter-revolution.
4. Northern bourgeoisie betrays the revolution, allies with the Southern reactionary landlords, agrees to development of K.K.K. terrorism and counter-revolutionary force and violence, reducing the Negro people to peonage. (A284-5)

\*Lenin: *Letter to American Workers.*

Allen: *Reconstruction.*

Aptheker: *To Be Free*, 136-87.

Fast: *Freedom Road.*

B. The Marxists, the National Labor Union and the Negro Question. (54-6)

1. International Workingmen's Association fights discrimination in unions, and Negro union groups cooperate with Marxists.

(55)

2. Inadequate position of Marxists on Negro question. (86-7)

IV. The S.L.P. and the Negro question. (86-8)

A. DeLeon crystallizes incorrect position in Socialist movement.

1. underestimation of Negro struggle.
2. reducing Negro question solely to a class question.
3. acceptance of white chauvinism.

V. The Socialist Party's chauvinist policy. (103-5)

A. Founding convention (1901) re-states DeLeon's denial of any special status and reduces question solely to a class question.

B. Left-wing also fails to develop any special demands.

C. White chauvinist attitudes.

VI. Renaissance of the Negro Liberation movement. (114-6)

- A. Development of imperialism brings increased attacks against Negro people in South: Jim Crow laws, re-birth of K.K.K., lynching, etc.

Aptheker: "American Imperialism and White Chauvinism," in *Jewish Life*, July, 1950.

- B. Du Bois organizes Niagara Movement (1905); N.A.A.C.P. founded (1909); primarily middle-class movements at origin.

- C. Attitude of Labor.

A.F.L. encourages Jim-Crow unions; Railroad brotherhoods totally Jim Crow; I.W.W. anti-Jim Crow.

- D. White chauvinism grows in S.P.

VII. Towards Negro-White Labor Solidarity (1917-24). (Chapter XVI)

- A. The Negro "migration to the North" of 1919, and the so-called "race riots" in Chicago, Detroit, East St. Louis and Washington, D.C.—growth of the K.K.K. (225-6)

- B. The Garvey movement: bourgeois nationalist and utopian, but helped develop unity and consciousness of Negro people. (226-8) —attitude of Workers Party "friendly though critical."

- C. Forces making for division between Negro and white workers. (228-30)

1. Employers' policy: No industrial jobs for Negroes except as scabs.
2. A.F.L. bureaucrats' cynical policy of exclusion of Negroes.
3. Anti-trade union policy of Negro middle-class leaders.

- D. The fight for Negro-white Labor Unity.

1. Foster and Johnstone bring 20,000 Negro workers into unions in packinghouse campaign and strike movement of 1917-18. (139, 230-1)

- a. Johnstone and white stockyard workers defend Negro workers during Chicago "race riot." (231)

2. Militancy and organizing role of Negro *Messenger* group, comprising several pioneer Negro Communists. (231-2, 183)

3. The steel campaign and strike of 1919 and the Negro workers. Gus Hall: "Thirty Years of Struggle in Steel," in *Political Affairs*, September, 1939.

4. Increased attention by Workers Party; Foster, as candidate for President in 1924 election campaign, carries Party's program on Negro question to many cities of the Deep South. (232-4)

5. The policy and activity of the Workers Party in this period in contrast to the Socialist Party. (233-4)

- a. The fight to get Negroes into industry and unions.
- b. For *social* equality, as well as political and economic.

VIII

IX

X

- c. Against white chauvinism.
  - d. Importance to white workers of the fight for Negro rights.
  - e. Action instead of lip-service.
  - f. *But* the Party still failed to understand the Negro question as a national question.
6. Effects of these developments upon the Negro Liberation Movement. (234-5)
- a. Beginning of break-down of isolation of the Negro movement.
  - b. Strengthening of the role of the Negro proletariat.
  - c. Growth of Communist influence among the Negro people.
- VIII. The C.P.'s Resolution on the Negro question as a national question (1930). (266-7)
- A. Lenin's teaching on the national and colonial question.
  - B. Stalin's teaching on the national question and definition of a nation.
  - C. The right of self-determination.
- Lenin: *Selected Works*, Vol. X, 235.  
 Stalin: *Marxism and the National Question*.  
 Haywood: *Negro Liberation*, 140-1.  
 Mann: *Stalin's Thought Illuminates Problems of Negro Freedom Struggle*.
- D. The penetration of the South. (285-8)
    - 1. The Scottsboro case. (286-7)
    - 2. Share-croppers' struggles and organization. (287)
    - 3. The Herndon case (Ben Davis). (288)
  - E. The white chauvinism trial (1931). (288)
  - F. The League of Struggle for Negro Rights. (268)
- IX. The Party and the Negro people in the period of the economic crisis and the New Deal.
- A. Negro-white solidarity in unemployed struggles. (282-3)  
 Lloyd Brown: *Iron City*.
  - B. The C.P. runs a Negro candidate for Vice-President; Ford runs with Foster in the 1932 election campaign. (291)
  - C. Negro Communists help organize Negro workers in C.I.O. (349-50)
  - D. The Communists and the National Negro Congress: a broad mass movement of the Negro people "expressing the leading role of the Negro working masses among the Negro people." (308-9, 377-8)
  - E. Southern Negro Youth Congress. (378)
  - F. The Southern Conference for Human Welfare. (378)
  - G. Negroes in the Lincoln Brigade. (372)  
 Steve Nelson: *The Volunteers*.
- X. The Party and the Negro People in World War II.

- A. The Federal F.E.P.C. set up by executive order. (413)
- B. First Negro Communist elected to public office: Ben Davis to New York City Council (1943). (421)
- C. Browder's false theory of Negro "integration." (424, 432, 434)
  - 1. Liquidation of the Party in the South.
- XI. The Party and the Negro People in the Post-World War II Period.
  - A. The advance of the Negro people. (444-6)
    - 1. One million Negro trade unionists. (445)
    - 2. The struggle against Jim Crow in education, sports, culture, residence, jobs, etc. (445, 477)
    - 3. The role of the Negro reformists. (446)
  - B. Intensified attack on Negro people.
    - 1. Legal and police lynchings. (477)
    - 2. The attacks on leadership of the Negro people (Robeson, Du Bois, Davis, Winston, Jackson, Perry, Claudia Jones, etc.). (475, 477)
  - C. C.P. re-affirm line on Negro question as a National question and the right of the Negro nation to self-determination (1946). (477-8)
    - \*C.P.U.S.A.: *The Communist Position on the Negro question.* (1947)  
Haywood: *Negro Liberation.*
    - C.P. elects Winston National Organizational Secretary.
  - D. C.P. intensifies struggle against white chauvinism. (\**Political Affairs*, June, 1949)
    - 1. Struggle against Leftist and bourgeois-nationalist distortions.  
Haywood: "Race, Nation and the Concept Negro," *Political Affairs*, October, 1952.  
Henderson: "White Chauvinism and Bourgeois Nationalism," *Political Affairs*, Dec., 1952-Jan., 1953.  
\*Foster: "Leftism" on Negro Question, *Political Affairs*, July, 1953.
  - E. The struggle for the leadership of the Negro proletariat among the Negro people; Role of the Negro Labor Councils. (478)
  - F. The struggle for Negro representation in government. (445-6)
    - \*Hall: *Marxism and Negro Liberation* (1951).
    - \*Perry: "Negro Representation," *Political Affairs*, Dec., 1951.
- XII. The Contribution of the C.P. to the Struggle of the Negro People. (562-3)

*General Reading:*

- \*Stalin: *Marxism and the National Question.*
- \*Haywood: *Negro Liberation.*



- \*Davis: *In Defense of Negro Rights* (Summary at Foley Square Trial).
- \*Mann, *Stalin's Thought Illuminates Problems of Negro Freedom Struggle*.
- \*Aptheker: *A Documentary History of the Negro People in the U.S.*
- Du Bois: *Black Reconstruction*.
- Allen: *Reconstruction*.
- Foner: *Douglass' Selected Writings*.
- Alpatov: "On the Transition from the Ancient World to the Middle Ages," *Political Affairs*, July, 1952.

### Topic Six: The Communist Party and the Struggle for Peace

#### I. The Revolutionary War of 1776.

- A. Its progressive significance (Franklin, Jefferson, Paine). (16-17, A122-34)

Lenin's characterization of the war and approval of its revolutionary strategy.

\*Lenin: *A Letter to American Workers*.

- B. Struggle for colonial liberation part of struggle for lasting peace.

#### II. The Mexican War (1846-8)—U.S.' first reactionary war. (36, A197-9)

- A. A grab to extend slavery. (A208-10)
- B. Opposition to the war by the bourgeoisie; Lincoln denounces it as unjustified aggression by the U.S. (36, A209-10)

- C. Opposition by labor. (A209)

- D. Incorporation of a national minority of Mexican people into the U.S. (A198)

"Resolution on Condition of Mexican-American People," *Political Affairs*, May, 1949.

James Burnhill, "The Mexican People in the Southwest," *Political Affairs*, Sept., 1953.

#### III. The Civil War and the Role of the Marxists. (43-50)

See *Topics* 1, 5, and 7.

#### IV. The Spanish-American War. (77-8, 357-8, A231-2)

- A. The transformation of the Monroe Doctrine from a generally progressive to a reactionary policy. (77, 358, A256-64)

- B. U.S. Imperialism seeks its "Manifest Destiny." (A264-5)

- 1. The anti-imperialist movement in the U.S. (Mark Twain, etc.). (95-6, A232)

Sillen: "Dooley, Twain and Imperialism," in *Masses & Mainstream*, Dec., 1948.

- C. U.S. aggression in Latin-America and in the Pacific. (358, A265-6)

#### V. The Imperialist World War I. (Chapter IX)

- A. The Imperialist character of the war. (127-8, C.P.S.U. 160-3)
  - B. The Social-Democratic Betrayal; Social-chauvinist "defensism." (128-9, C.P.S.U. 163-5)
    - 1. Lenin and the Bolsheviks fight for peace. (129-30, C.P.S.U. 164-66)
  - C. The Socialist Party of the U.S. takes a pacifist position and exonerates European Social-Democracy. (131)
    - 1. Left-Wing repudiates war and condemns Social-Democracy. (131)
  - D. Mass Opposition to U.S. entering the war. (132)
    - 1. Wilson's re-election (1916) on slogan, "He Kept Us Out of War."
    - 2. Gompers and A.F.L. leadership support war. (132)
    - 3. I.W.W. opposes war. (136)
    - 4. Socialist Party's emergency convention (St. Louis, April 1917) adopts anti-war resolution drafted largely by Ruthenberg. (134-5)
      - a. S.P. centrist leadership (Hillquit) sabotages the St. Louis Resolution. (135)
    - 5. Government terror against the Left. (140-2)
  - VI. The Russian Revolution declares peace. (143, C.P.S.U. 215-17, 218-19, 225, 230)
    - A. U.S. Intervention in Soviet Russia. (144-5, C.P.S.U. 225-246)
  - VII. The Struggle to Prevent World War II. (Chapter XXVI)
    - A. The menace of Axis aggression. (368, C.P.S.U. 331-3)
      - 1. The complicity of the British and French Governments ("appeasement"). (368, C.P.S.U. 333-4)
    - B. The Soviet Union leads the world peace forces in a struggle for collective security. (369-375, C.P.S.U. 334-5)
      - 1. U.S. fails to take steps against fascist aggression. (369)
      - 2. C.P. opposes U.S. supplying Japan for war against China; anti-Japanese boycott. (419)
      - 3. The Spanish Civil War and Axis Intervention. (371-3)
        - a. U.S. adopts Neutrality Act to strangle Spanish Republic. (371)
        - b. C.P. and Y.C.L. organize the Lincoln Brigade (Thompson, Gates, Nelson). (371-3)
- Steve Nelson: *The Volunteers*, 1953
- C. The American People's Resistance to fascism and war. (377-9)
  - VIII. The Party and World War II. (Chapter XXVII, XXVIII)
    - A. The character of World War II. (383-6, 404-7)
    - B. The position of the C.P. and the American people during the im-

perialist phase of the war. (386-91)

1. The persecution of the C.P. (391-3)

2. The America First Committee. (393-4)

C. The people's anti-fascist war. (Chapter XXVIII)

1. The C.P.'s position on the turning-point of the war. (394-6, 408)

2. The C.P.'s position on Pearl Harbor. (398, 409)

3. The U.S.S.R.'s destruction of the Nazi army and the role of Stalin. (398-400)

4. Anglo-American imperialist strategy and the struggle for the Second Front. (400-2)

D. The Communists in the War. (Chapter XXIX)

IX. Wall Street's Drive Towards World War III. (Chapter XXXII)

A. Forces behind the war drive. (452-7, 459-63)

B. The C.P. and the Cold War. (Chapter XXXII)

1. The C.P. warns against the war danger. (469-70)

2. The C.P. supports peace program of Progressive Party in 1948 elections. (471-3)

3. The C.P. and the Korean War. (461, 473-6)

X. The C.P.'s Peace Policy.

A. C.P. places peace as the central issue. (474)

B. Essence of C.P. peace policy. (529)

1. Against "inevitability" of war with U.S.S.R. (524-5)

\*Foster and Dennis statement, *Political Affairs*, July, 1949.

2. For peaceful co-existence. (524-5)

3. For cease-fire in Korea and Big Five Peace Pact.

Foster: "On Peaceful Coexistence," *Political Affairs*, May, 1953.

C. Stalin asserts war still inevitable among imperialist powers.

D. Stalin defines the nature and tasks of the peace movement.

\*Stalin: *Economic Problems*, 27-30.

E. The great new peace initiative of the U.S.S.R. and world peace camp.

\*Foster: "Fighting War with Peace and Democracy," *Political Affairs*, June, 1953.

#### General Reading:

\*C.P.U.S.A.: "Resolution on Results of Elections," *Political Affairs*, July, 1953.

\*Hall: *Peace Can Be Won* (Report XV National Convention C.P.-U.S.A.).

Winston: "Stalin—Champion of Lasting Peace," *Political Affairs*, April, 1953.

Davis: "The Struggle for Peace and the Negro Liberation Movement,"

*Political Affairs*, June, 1952.

\*Kendrick: "The Eisenhower-Dulles Liberation Nightmare," *Political Affairs*, April, 1953.

Rockman: *Broaden the Fight for Peace and Democracy* (1952).

Brewster and Colton: "Sectarianism in Peace Activity," *Political Affairs*, September, 1952.

Dennis: "The MacArthur Ouster," *Political Affairs*, May, 1951.

—: "Broaden the Fight for Peace," *Political Affairs*, May, 1951.

Du Bois: *In Battle for Peace*.

### Topic Seven: The Communist Party in the Struggle for Democracy —The Working Class as the Leader of the Nation

I. The role of the bourgeoisie and the working class in the bourgeois-democratic revolution. (*CPSU* 64, 66-70)

A. The two-sided role of the bourgeoisie in 1776 and 1861.

1. Its progressive role.

a. Leading role in the American Revolution; Jeffersonian democracy. (16-18)

b. Leading role in the struggle against slavery; the Abolitionists. (36-7, 40)

c. In the Civil War; Thaddeus Stevens, Lincoln. (43-5)

\*Lenin: *Letter to American Workers*.

2. Its reactionary role.

a. In the American Revolution: unsolved democratic tasks; slavery retained (17, A169-70); "Loyalists" and reactionary pressures. (A131)

b. In the Civil War: Hesitancy in prosecuting war. (43-5)  
Delay in emancipation and enlistment of Negroes.  
Copperheads.

Betrayal of Reconstruction. (50-2)

c. Repression of working class. (19, 63-4, 67, 78, etc.)

B. The working class and the struggle for democracy.

1. Workers and small farmers most active force in revolution (the Sons of Liberty). (17, A132-3, 162)

Win fight for Bill of Rights, eliminate Alien and Sedition Acts, and bring Jefferson to presidency.

2. Early struggles of the trade unions win manhood suffrage, public school system, 10-hour day, and wipe out imprisonment for debt. (19, A347-8)

3. Organized Labor in the struggle against slavery and in the Civil War. (38-46)

- a. Role of Marxists in support of Republican Party and in election of Lincoln. (41-3)
- II. What is Bourgeois democracy and Bourgeois "freedom"?
- A. The limitations of bourgeois democracy. (149, 336-9, A344-53)
- \*Lenin: *Dictatorship and Democracy*.  
 Lenin: *Kautsky the Renegade*.  
 \*Lenin: *State & Revolution*. (71-75)
1. Negro people, under *national* oppression, suffer additional restrictions, even of bourgeois-democratic rights.
- B. Imperialism brings "reaction all along the line." \*Lenin: *Imperialism*, 120.
- C. Working class seeks to defend and maintain democracy and advance to higher democracy of Socialism. (321, 551-6; \*Dimitroff: *The United Front*, 109-13.
- III. The struggle of the working class for political independence.
- A. Early Labor Parties and farmer-labor political alliances. (20-1, 65, 73-4, 85-6)
- B. The working-class, the Farmer-Labor and LaFollette movements (1924) (211-21)
1. The necessity of working-class political independence. (211)
- a. Reasons why the American working class gravitates towards a labor party based primarily on the trade unions in contrast to the mass individual membership, Social-Democratic parties of workers in the countries of continental Europe. (212, 542)
3. The betrayal by the Labor Bureaucrats. (216-219)
4. Tactical errors of the Workers Party. (219-21)
- C. Labor's un-utilized opportunities in the 1936 elections. (3332-3, 335-6)
- IV. The Communist Party and the working class in the struggle against Fascism.
- A. The C.P. in the great 1929 Economic Crisis, through leading the struggle of the unemployed and the fight against wage-cuts, helps save millions from starvation, prevents annihilation of the workers' standards and keeps the unemployed from becoming a mass base for fascism. (276-290)
- B. Why the U.S. did not become a fascist regime in the course of the economic crisis. (295-6)
- C. The great mass strike movement of 1934-6 and the rise of the CIO. (297-307)
- D. The 7th C.I. Congress and the Policy of the People's Front.
1. What is fascism? (321); \*Dimitroff, same, 7-17.  
 Bourgeoisie can no longer "afford" democratic liberties for the

- people. CPSU, 302.
2. Attempts to establish mass base for fascism in U.S.—“panacea” movements (316); America First Committee. (393-4)
  3. The policy of the People’s Front. (321-3)
- E. The working class as the leader of the nation in the struggle against fascism. (323-4)
1. Elements of the people’s front—the broad democratic struggle against fascism. (Chapters XXII, XXIII, 370, 377-82)
    - a. The National Negro Congress (308-9)
    - b. American Youth Congress (Gil Green). (310-12)
    - c. Southern Negro Youth Congress (Henry Winston). (311)
    - d. The Women’s movement. (312-14)
    - e. The cultural upsurge. (317-20)
  2. The C.P. and the working class in the people’s anti-fascist war (World War II). (408-11)
    - a. Browder’s opportunist conception of National Unity, subordinating role of the working class. (415-17)
- V. The C.P., working class and the Nation in the post-World War II period.
- A. U.S. Imperialism endangers the nation by driving towards World War II and fascism. (Chapter XXXII)
  - B. The people’s resistance. (457-8)
    1. The Progressive Party and the Wallace candidacy. (471-3)
 

National Committee, CPUSA; “Resolution on the Situation Growing Out of the Presidential Elections, in *Political Affairs*, July, 1953.
    2. The C.P. opposes the Korean War. (473-6)
  - C. The crisis in the American Labor Movement. (500-5)
  - D. The attack on the C.P. (Chapter XXXV)
- VI. The C.P., the working class and the Nation today in the struggle for Peace and Democratic Rights. (Chapter XXXVIII)
- A. Wall Street’s drive towards fascization under Truman. (Chapter XXXV)
 

\*Dennis: *The Fascist Danger* (pamphlet).
  - B. The significance of the Eisenhower election.
    - \*CPUSA: “Resolution on Results of Election,” *Political Affairs*, July, 1953.
    - \*Kendrick: “Eisenhower and the Fascist Danger,” *Political Affairs*, May, 1953.
  - C. The growth of McCarthyism.
    - \*Logan & Douglas: “Anatomy of McCarthyism,” *Political Affairs*, June, 1953.

D. Perspectives of sharpening labor and people's struggles.

\*CPUSA: "Resolution on Results of Election."

*General Reading:*

\*Lenin: *Two Tactics of Social-Democracy in the Democratic Revolution*, Chapters VI, XII.

\*Dennis: *Ideas They Cannot Jail*.

\*Stalin: Speech at XIX Congress, CPSU in *Political Affairs*, October, 1952.

\*Dimitroff: *United Front Against Fascism*.

\*Rockman: *Broaden the Struggle For Peace and Democracy*.

### Topic Eight: The American Road to Socialism

I. The Declaration of Independence Asserts the Right of Revolution. (16-17, A128)

A. Affirmed in many state constitutions and in Lincoln's First Inaugural Address.

II. The science of Marxism Charts the Road to Socialism.

A. Scientific Socialism replaces utopian Socialism;

Weydemeyer and the early American Communists receive the Communist Manifesto. (22-31)

III. The Struggle Against Dogmatism. (59, 156)

A. Marxism not a dogma. (151-2, 167, 553)

Lenin: *Left-Wing Communism*, 72-3.

B. Marx, Lenin and Stalin point out the possibilities and obstacles to peaceful transition to Socialism in countries such as England and the U.S. (80, 551-2)

IV. What Is Socialism?

A. The Decay of Capitalism.

1. Its goal: war and destruction. (524-30)

2. Its economic decay. (533-5)

3. Its cultural decay. (535-7)

4. The basic law of modern capitalism.

\*Stalin: *Economic Problems*, 31-3.

B. The advance of Socialism.

1. The growth of the socialist world. (439-44)

2. The nature of Socialism. (537-40, A602-8)

3. The basic law of Socialism.

\*Stalin: Same, 33-4.

V. Marx, Lenin and Stalin on the dictatorship of the proletariat. (79, 149, 152-3)

A. People's Democracy as a form of the dictatorship of the Proletariat. (441, 553-4)

- VI. The Development of the American Working Class Towards Socialism. (Chapter XXXVII)  
 Factors affecting the ideological development of the American workers. (212, 541-4)
- B. Marx' law of impoverishment of the workers, and the temporary illusions of the working class. (545-9)
- VII. The American Road to Socialism.
- A. Socialism the "ultimate expression and climax of the everyday struggles of the workers enlightened and organized by Marxist theory and guidance." (550-1)
- B. C.P. works for democratic conduct of the struggle and opposes violence, which emanates from the capitalist class. (551)
- C. The C.P.'s objective of peaceful transition to Socialism—the possibilities and obstacles. (551-3, 80)
- D. The C.P. perspective of a people's front coalition government and the transition to a People's Democracy. (553-9)
- E. Socialism is in the national interest of the American people. (566-7)
- \*Dimitroff: *The United Front*, 79-80.

*General Reading:*

\*Mark and Engels: *The Communist Manifesto*.

\*—: *Letters to Americans*.

Lenin: *Preface to Letters to Sorge* (appendix to *Letters to Americans*).

\*Foster: *In Defense of the Indicted Leaders*.

\*Dennis: *Ideas They Cannot Jail*.

\*—: "Lenin, Stalin and the Mid-Century," *Political Affairs*, April, 1953.

\*Swift: "On Stalin's Method," *Political Affairs*, April, 1953.

\*Figueres: "A Form of Socialist Democracy: People's Democratic Power," *Political Affairs*, November, 1952.

Sobolev: "People's Democracy as a Form of Political Organization of Society," *Political Affairs*, May, 1952.

**Topic Nine: The Development of the Party Organization**

- I. Beginnings of Marxist Organization in the U.S. (Chapter II)
- A. The Proletarian League (1852), (Weydemeyer & Sorge). (29-31)
- B. The Communist Club (1858). (32-5)
- C. The International Workingmen's Association (1867). (50, 58-61)
- II. The First Marxist Party.
- A. Socialist Labor Party organized (1876). (62-3)
- B. Its deviations and sectarian (German) composition. (34-5, 74-6)
- C. Destructive effect of DeLeonism on the Party. (81-2, 88-9)
- D. The split in the S.L.P. (1899). (89-90)
- III. The Socialist Party (1900). (Chapter VII)



- A. Formation of Socialist Party (Debs). (93-5)  
 1. The question of "immediate (partial) demands." (96-7)
- B. The Left wing crystallizes around the I.W.W. and the fight for a militant trade union policy as against class collaboration (1905). (100-101)

Haywood: *Bill Haywood's Book*.

- C. Status of S.P. at the time. (101-3)  
 1. Growth in membership, press and voting strength.  
 2. Growth in petty-bourgeois composition.  
 3. Amorphous organization.  
 a. Total autonomy of state organizations and press.  
 b. Absence of discipline.  
 c. Complete eclecticism in ideology.  
 4. Opportunist influence of Second International. (105-6)
- D. Continued growth of S.P. in pre-World War I period as a result of participation in struggles. (112-114)  
 1. Intensified struggle between Lefts and Rights; the 1909 and 1912 splits. (119-23)
- E. Status of the Left Wing (Haywood, Bloor, Debs, Ruthenberg, Foster). (123-6)

IV. The Split in the S.P. (Chapter XI)

- A. The Left Wing wins the majority of the Party. (157-62)  
 B. The Right sabotages the anti-war ("St. Louis") resolution, opposes support of the Bolshevik Revolution in Russia and expels the Left Wing. (161-3)  
 C. The national Left-wing conference. (164-9)

V. Formation of the Communist Party. (Chapter XII)

- A. C.P. formed as two parties: Communist Party and Communist Labor Party. (171-2)  
 B. The Palmer raids. (174-6)  
 1. Communist Parties forced to protect their security while fighting to exercise their legal rights. (174-7)  
 C. The struggle for unity. (177-85)  
 D. The Party achieves its constitutional rights, uniting all Communist forces in the *Workers Party*. (Chapter XIII, 186-95)

VI. The Communists, the working class and Proletarian Internationalism.

- A. The First International (International Workingmen's Association) mobilizes support in England and France for the cause of the U.S. in the Civil War; Lincoln's recognition of their aid. (49)  
 B. The I.W.A. in the U.S. (50, 53-4, 56-60-1)  
 Sylvis' letter to Marx: "Capital is the same tyrant in all parts of the world. Therefore I say our cause is a common one."  
 C. The S.P. and the second International. (105-6)

- D. The response to the Russian Revolution in the U.S. (143, 147, 159)
- E. The role of the Communist International. (178-80, 273-4, 321-3)
- F. The C.P. and Latin-America. (365-7)

\*Dimitroff: *The United Front*, 76-80.

#### VII Lenin's Teachings on Organization. (Chapter X)

- A. Lenin's concept of the "party of a new type." (151, 260-3)
  1. Against "economism," "spontaneity," "tailism," "pure and simple" trade unionism. (C.P.S.U. 23, 35-7)
  2. The Party as the *organized vanguard* of the working class; the importance of theory and consciousness. (C.P.S.U. 38, 46-9)
  3. The Party as the essential *leading* organization of the working class. (C.P.S.U. 50-1)
  4. The Party is composed of an active disciplined membership. (C.P.S.U. 41-2, 47-8)
  5. A monolithic party based on Democratic Centralism. (C.P.S.U. 42-3, 49)

#### VIII. The Organizational Maturing of the C.P.

- A. The factional struggle and its liquidation (1923-9). (221-3, 263, 269-75)
  1. Unification of the Party through expulsion of Trotskyites, rejection of Lovestone's opportunist theory of "exceptionalism," and expulsion of Lovestone and his factional clique.
- B. Re-organization on shop and industry basis (1925). (261-3)
- C. C.P. recognizes the Negro question as a national question (1930) and develops struggle against white chauvinism. (232-4, 266-9, 286-8)
- D. Subjective weaknesses holding back the growth of the Party. (291-2)
- E. The Extraordinary Conference (1933) and connection on basic industries. (298, 261-3)

\*Weinstone: "An Important Chapter in Party's History of Industrial Concentration," *Political Affairs*, September, 1949.

- F. The growth of the Party in numbers and composition in the mass struggles up to 1936. (307)

#### IX. Browder's Revisionism and the Party Organization.

- A. Organizational Roots of Browder's Revisionism.
  1. Inadequate social composition of Party. (427)
  2. Weakening of organizational principles. (428)
    - a. bureaucracy.
    - b. lack of democratic centralism, of criticism and self-criticism.
- B. The organizational fruit of revisionism: Liquidation of the C.P. (429-31)

1. Effect of revisionist line upon mass work.
- C. Foster carries on political fight against Browder's revisionism while remaining within bounds of Party discipline. (429-30)
- D. The Emergency Convention repudiates Browderism (1945). (433-8)
- X. The Party in the Post-War Period.
  - A. The Party meets the test of Wall Street's Attack. (484)
    1. The elimination of Browderism and the fight against Right and "Left" opportunism.  
Elimination of disgruntled sectarians (Darcy, Dunne, Harrison George, Vern Smith, etc.)
    2. The struggle for peace.
    3. The defense of the Party and democratic rights. (Chapter XXXV)
      - a. The indictment, trial and imprisonment of the National Board. (509-18)
      - b. The McCarran Act Registration Order. (519-20)
      - c. Additional arrests and persecutions. (518-9)
    4. Criticism and Self-criticism.
  - B. The situation of the Party today (521-3);  
combination of measures to protect security while fighting to exercise and defend its legal rights.

\*Larsen: "Vigilance Against Infiltration," *Political Affairs*, October, 1952.

\*Hastings: "Basing the Party in the Shops," *Political Affairs*, May, 1953.

#### XI. The Historical Progress of the Party. (570-2)

##### *General Reading:*

\*Lenin: *What Is To Be Done?*

\*Stalin: *Mastering Bolshevism*.

\*Khrushchev: *On Changes in the Rules of the C.P.S.U.* (1953).

\*Gates: "Sharpen Fight vs. Browderism, Titoism, and Trotskyism," (Report to XV National Convention) *Political Affairs*, February, 1951.

\*Green: "For Communist Vigilance," *Political Affairs*, May, 1950.

\*Winston: "The Meaning of Industrial Concentration," *Political Affairs*, Aug., 1952.

\*—: "Gearing the Party to Its Tasks," *Political Affairs*, February, 1951.

\*Hall: "On Collective Leadership," *Political Affairs*, July, 1951.

\*—: "Importance of Communist Cadres," *Political Affairs*, January, 1952.

\*C.P.U.S.A.: *McCarran Conspiracy Against the Bill of Rights*.

\*Bittelman: "Stalin and the Party," *Political Affairs*, April, 1953.

\**Constitution, C.P.U.S.A.*

*On the 34th Anniversary of the Communist Party*

**A Reader's Guide**

History of the Communist Party of the United States	\$6.00
by WILLIAM Z. FOSTER	
Letters to Americans: 1848-1895	3.50
by KARL MARX and FREDERICK ENGELS	
The Communist Party	.25
by PETTIS PERRY	
Communists and the People	.25
by ELIZABETH GURLEY FLYNN	
Thirteen Communists Speak to the Court	.35
The Party of Negro and White	.05
by PETTIS PERRY	
Ideas They Cannot Jail	.50
by EUGENE DENNIS	
In Defense of the Communist Party and the Indicted Leaders	.15
by WILLIAM Z. FOSTER	
In Defense of Your Freedom	.15
by EUGENE DENNIS	
Party Vigilance Against Enemy Infiltration	.10
by ELMER LARSEN	
Why Defend the Rights of Communists?	.02
by HERBERT APTHEKER	
Broaden the Fight for Peace and Democracy	.15
by JOSEPH ROCKMAN	
What It Means to Be a Communist	.05
by HENRY WINSTON	
Marxism and Negro Liberation	.10
by GUS HALL	
Grasp the Weapon of Culture!	.10
by V. J. JEROME	

**NEW CENTURY PUBLISHERS**

832 BROADWAY • NEW YORK 3

...