

political affairs

DECEMBER 1953 • 25 CENTS



NATIONAL COMMITTEE,
CPUSA

WILLIAM Z. FOSTER

MAURICE THOREZ

HENRY T. GOODWIN

HERBERT APTHEKER

MIKE MEADOWS

JAMES BURNHILL

- [1] Unity Can Rout McCarthyism
- [4] The *Putschist* Danger in American Foreign Policy
- [14] A New Policy for France
- [18] The Lessons of Pearl Harbor
- [29] Big Business Re-Writes American History, I
- [39] Some Problems in Coal Mining
- [50] The Mexican-American Question
- [64] Index for 1953

A New Monumental Work Coming—

By WILLIAM Z. FOSTER

THE NEGRO PEOPLE IN AMERICAN HISTORY

A PUBLICATION OF INTERNATIONAL PUBLISHERS

"Comrade Foster's new book is a synthesis and an analysis of all the Marxist writings of the past on the Negro question and on American history. It represents a monumental contribution towards an understanding of the struggles of the Negro people and of the development of the Negro nation. The book provides the necessary theoretical clarity for a comprehension of the significance of the national liberation efforts of the Negro people.

"The book will prove to be a great weapon in the hands of the American working class for it demonstrates the necessity for the Negro-labor alliance. . . . It shows, historically and conclusively, the tremendous importance of the struggle against white chauvinism, a struggle in the self-interest of the working class. . . .

"This most recent book will advance our whole understanding of the Negro question in the U.S. and of the colonial and semi-colonial status of the peoples of Latin America. I am confident that this book will be vigorously spread throughout the labor movement, the Negro movement, and throughout our Party."—PETTIS PERRY, in *Political Affairs*, October, 1953

This Book Will Be Out in Time for Negro History Week

WATCH FOR FURTHER ANNOUNCEMENTS

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

PRINTED IN U.S.A.

A Theoretical and Political Magazine of Scientific Socialism

Editor: V. J. Jerome

Unity Can Rout McCarthyism

By National Committee, C.P.U.S.A.

On November 21, 1953, the National Committee of the Communist Party of the United States issued a statement signed by William Z. Foster, Elizabeth Gurley Flynn, and Pettis Perry, dealing with the Brownell-Eisenhower assault upon the loyalty of ex-President Truman. The text of the statement follows:

The redbaiting attack by Attorney General Herbert Brownell, aided by F.B.I. director J. Edgar Hoover, upon ex-President Harry S. Truman in the Harry Dexter White case emphasizes afresh the growing fascist danger in the United States. For this is the deadly meaning of the long list of Smith, Taft-Hartley and McCarran acts, the wholesale jailings of Communist leaders, the thought-control loyalty tests in the industries, schools, and government services, the monstrous deportation of large numbers of foreign-born workers, the many attacks upon the Negro people, and the endless witchhunting and ideological terrorism that are increasingly evident in every feature and phase of our national life. The name of this growing fascist beast is McCarthyism.

Behind the fanatical anti-Communist, anti-Soviet crusade of Hitler and Mussolini was a drive towards war, and it led their peoples finally to overwhelming disaster. And that is the sinister significance of McCarthyism, the pro-fascist, anti-Communist crusade in this country. It, too, would lead people to catastrophe.

McCarthyism has an organic relationship with the frenzied preparations for aggressive war now going on in the United States—the ringing of the Soviet Union and People's China with air bases, the sabotage of peace in Korea, the attempt to extend the war in Indo-China, and the squandering of endless billions of the American people's money in an insane attempt to dominate the world through a vast international military organization. McCarthyism

points towards atomic war and national devastation.

• • •

Truman was correct when he stated that the Eisenhower Administration has "embraced McCarthyism." And the full truth is even more sinister. The Administration, with its whole complex of foreign and domestic policies, is spawning McCarthyism wholesale. Dulles and Brownell, not to mention scores of other Republican leaders, are the political blood brothers of Senator McCarthy. Such men should have no place in our government.

The immediate purpose of the unprecedented attack upon ex-President Truman is to divert the people's attention from the rising dangers with which the Eisenhower Administration is confronting the country. And the attempt, in the coming months, will be continued, as Sen. Jenner and others have let us know.

By confusing the masses with fantastic redbaiting and denouncing everything progressive as disloyalty, their aim is to dissolve the growing anger of the farmers at their increasingly difficult situation and to break up the resentment of the workers because of the studied hostility of Wall Street's agents now in power. It is an effort to blind the people to the developing economic crisis. It is a Republican attempt, in the face of staggering political defeats in Wisconsin and New Jersey, to carry the 1954 elections by a frenzied orgy of redbaiting. Their purpose

is to win under cover of ideological terrorism and confusionism. Anti-Communist hysteria is their panacea for all problems.

The attack upon Truman is in reality an attack upon the whole labor movement, which today is generally in the camp of the Democratic Party. McCarthyism is a violent anti-labor movement.

• • •

This time the redbaiters, drunk in their hitherto unchallenged arrogance, have gone too far. It is one thing to frame up Communist leaders with the help of government stool-pigeons and perjurers, but it is something else again to redbait an ex-President as a traitor to the nation. Truman, in his fiery denunciation of the charges, expressed the alarm and indignation that is rising far and wide among the American people at the shocking growth of the McCarthyite menace.

Now is the time to deal a smashing blow at this monster. The sharp stand of the recent CIO convention against McCarthyism sounds the right note. The whole labor movement, without delay, should take a similar position.

But the gravity of the situation demands far more than merely the passage of convention resolutions, however good. The issue must be taken to the great masses of the people. It should be raised in every trade union, in every Negro organization, in every farmer group, and in all other organized bodies of the masses.

Every
the pe
to pre
movem
candid
does r
Carthy

An
McCar
the Co
and tr
and S
Denni
others
The f
the C
of the
Bill o

In
pro-fa
and i
Carth
of W
Eisen
They
is im
effect
suppe
istic
Adm

It
Trun
with
redba
to, a
McC
Adm
fort t
aries.
OB

Every step should be taken to rouse the people to the grave danger and to prepare them for a vast political movement that will defeat every candidate in the 1954 elections who does not specifically repudiate McCarthyism and all its filthy works.

• • •

An organic part of the fight against McCarthyism is the fight to defend the Communists now being indicted and tried under the Smith, McCarran and Sedition laws, and to free Gene Dennis, Ben Davis, and the many others imprisoned under these laws. The fight to defend the legality of the Communist Party is the first line of the whole struggle to defend the Bill of Rights.

In warring against this McCarthy pro-fascist menace, organized labor and its allies must realize that McCarthyism is bred of the war policies of Wall Street, as expressed through Eisenhower, Dulles and McCarthy. They must also understand that it is impossible to fight McCarthyism effectively while at the same time supporting the aggressive imperialistic war policies of the Eisenhower Administration.

It is an indisputable fact that the Trumans, Meanys and Reuthers, with their violent anti-Sovietism and redbaiting, have contributed greatly to, and are continuing to feed the McCarthyite danger. The Truman Administration gave aid and comfort to the worst redbaiting reactionaries.

Obviously, labor and its allies must

fight the Eisenhower Administration not only in its domestic policies but also in its decisive foreign policies. It is politically absurd to take the position, as many of the top leadership of the A.F.L. and C.I.O. now do, of opposing Eisenhower at home as an enemy, and of supporting him abroad as the spokesman of the American masses. The deadly contradiction in policy must be removed. And it can be done only by organized labor and its allies freeing themselves from the Big Lie that the U.S.S.R. is a military menace and that war is inevitable. They must accept the realistic policy of international negotiations on the basis of the peaceful co-existence of the United States and the Soviet Union.

The American people, in the face of a developing economic crisis, the growing menace of McCarthyism, and the continuing sinister danger of war, face many grave and urgent problems. The elections of 1954 will provide an opportunity to lay the basis for solving many of them. That is, if the people will crack down on the reactionaries.

The situation is ripe for organized labor and its allies, by a united smash, to rout the McCarthyite pro-fascists and warmongers, and to score a great political victory. This opportunity must not be missed. The working masses must not allow themselves to be politically deceived and blinded by the poison gas of the redbaiters, warmongers, and witchhunters.

The "Putschist" Danger in American Foreign Policy

By William Z. Foster

Since the end of World War I, the United States, by far the strongest of all capitalist powers, has maneuvered consistently to put itself in a position of complete international dominance. This is in the nature of big capitalist powers to struggle relentlessly for greater markets, for larger supplies of raw materials, for firmer control of the most strategic areas, and for more and more peoples to exploit. The United States, dominated by monopoly capital, with its great wealth and half the capitalist world's industrial production, has inevitably participated full blast in this imperialist struggle for world mastery.

This drive of American imperialism for world mastery is bred of the very fibre of monopoly capitalism, especially emphasized by the present world of decaying capitalism and rising Socialism. The capitalist rulers of the United States are thrust into their world conquest program in the firm conviction that this is the only possible way they can keep their industries running and can extend their enormous profits. They believe it to be the sole means by which they can destroy world Socialism and save

the world capitalist system. They know very well, of course, that there is no remotely possible chance for them to establish American world domination, short of a great war, and upon this basis they are cold-bloodedly orientating all their policies. They can be halted in this murderous objective only by superior mass peace pressure in this country and abroad.

The sum total of the results of American policy since the end of World War II, aiming at world mastery through another world war, amounts to a basic failure. It is already abundantly clear that Wall Street, war or no war, cannot possibly achieve its hard-set purpose of world domination. Its policy of conquest is bankrupt. This does not mean, however, that the grave danger of war has been liquidated. On the contrary, that danger is now taking on new and sinister aspects. The peace forces of the world must be on guard against the danger that Wall Street, grown desperate over failure, may suddenly plunge the world into war by an "incident" or a putsch.

WAL
IMP

In
II, du
of the
Japan,
perial
sort o
body
gressiv
States
defini
monop
the R
genera
of the
by th
crucia
failur
Unio
peace
the c
and c
war d
prevai
of the
abroa
able
talist
peasen
sult i
Germ
divisio
trary,
rialist
perial
Dur
War
winni
imper
States

WALL STREET'S PLANS OF
IMPERIALIST CONQUEST

In the decade prior to World War II, during the imperialist offensive of the fascist Axis powers, Germany, Japan, and Italy, United States imperialist policy contemplated some sort of eventual bargain, over the body of the U.S.S.R., with these aggressive powers, with the United States in the driver's seat. This was definitely true of the big Wall-Street monopolists, and they strove to press the Roosevelt Administration in this general direction. This was the basis of the appeasement policies followed by the Government during those crucial years, and especially of the failure to join in with the Soviet Union's proposal to preserve world peace by a collective security pact of the democratic countries, socialist and capitalist, to restrain the mad war dogs of fascism. In view of the prevalent powerful anti-fascist spirit of the masses, in this country and abroad, however, and the irreconcilable antagonisms among the capitalist powers themselves, these appeasement tendencies could not result in a definite agreement with German, Japan, and Italy for a re-division of the world. On the contrary, the war broke out as an imperialist struggle among the great imperialist powers for world control.

During the early phases of World War II, with the Axis powers winning spectacularly on every front, imperialist prospects for the United States looked pretty dim. That is,

they did up until the historic battle of Stalingrad in January 1943. In this world decisive battle the Red Army broke the back of the Hitler *Wehrmacht* and opened the way for general anti-fascist victory. With the Axis now on the defensive, Wall Street's imperialist plans perked up again, and thenceforth American capital strove to transform the people's victory that was then clearly in the making into a victory for United States imperialism, one that would make it the undisputed master of the whole world.

Although Roosevelt personally very probably envisaged a post-war policy of peaceful co-existence with the Soviet Union, nevertheless the war policies of his Administration definitely reflected the world conquest program of the big monopolists of Wall Street. The heart of this imperialist program was to let the two most powerful obstacles standing in the path of American imperialism, Germany and the U. S. S. R., cut each other to pieces in the war. This cold-blooded, cynical policy was openly expressed at the time by many outstanding political figures, including Hoover, Truman, and others.

In action, the Wall Street policy manifested itself by the United States turning its guns chiefly against the lesser enemy Japan, and leaving the Soviet Union to fight basically alone against the main enemy, Germany. This, too, was why the vital Western European front, which could and should have been opened up in late

1942, was actually not launched until June 1944, after Hitler had been fundamentally whipped by the Red Army. The second front would not have started even then had not the Anglo-American imperialists been mortally afraid that otherwise the victorious Red Army, then driving the fatally wounded German army before it, would soon liberate and occupy all of Europe. The Western front, therefore, while militarily directed against a nearly defeated Germany, was politically aimed against the victorious Soviet Union.

WALL STREET'S SCHEME OF WORLD DOMINATION

After Stalingrad, as the victorious phase of the war began, Wall Street's imperialist program of world conquest, with the British as minor co-partners, grew more obvious and definite. In *The Communist* of November, 1944, (this was during the period of the Browder-Teheran opportunism and I had to write under severe limitations), I undertook to analyze Wall Street's developing imperialist plans as follows, in an article entitled, "Dewey and Teheran":

The United States is now far and away the most powerful capitalist country in the world. Mr. Dewey, if elected President, would try to transform this situation into American imperialist domination over the entire world. A Dewey Administration would not, of course, suddenly discard the Teheran agreement and embark upon a policy of individual action, as W. W.

Aldrich of the Chase National Bank, is advocating. Rather its course would be to try to make Great Britain into a sort of junior partner, and then, by a series of economic and political pressures, controls, and maneuvers, gradually to concentrate decisive hegemony in Washington.

I pointed out further that this futile program "would lead to economic chaos and in the direction of war."

Upon the conclusion of World War II, with the surrender of Japan in August 1945, the spirits of the Wall Street would-be world conquerors were high and superficially the world situation seemed to justify their optimism. The United States, unscathed by the war's devastation, had emerged from the great struggle financially and industrially far stronger than ever, whereas all the other great powers of the world had been seriously injured by the conflict. Germany, Japan, and Italy were lying flat, exhausted, devastated and broken, France was but little better off, Great Britain was greatly weakened, and the Soviet Union, with 20,000,000 war dead and half of its industries and cities destroyed, was apparently helpless.

Thus, the road to world conquest seemed to lie wide open for American imperialism. Its leading spirits believed they could now take charge of the world and manage and rebuild it to their own liking. The "American Century" appeared about to begin. Those countries that the United States could not dominate

directly
up with
it could
idate
some
which

Dewey

1944, b

man—

D. Roosevelt

upon

term—

Dewey

Street's

the bas

work

from th

Truman

North

Korean

The po

has bee

less str

ism—th

—to su

WORLD

DEM

But t

differen

confide

Staling

States b

the wor

encount

another

world c

upon th

of the

loving

emphat

directly and politically, it would buy up with its great wealth, and those it could not purchase it would intimidate into submission with its fearsome weapon, the atombomb, of which this country had a monopoly.

Dewey was, of course, defeated in 1944, but the new President, Truman—after the death of Franklin D. Roosevelt in April, 1945, shortly upon taking office for his fourth term—followed out substantially the Dewey program. To establish Wall Street's mastery over the world was the basic purpose of the whole network of American foreign policy from then on—atombomb diplomacy, Truman doctrine, Marshall plan, North Atlantic pact, Japanese treaty, Korean war, and all the rest of it. The post-World War II "cold war" has been nothing else than the relentless striving of American imperialism—that is, Wall Street Big Business—to subjugate a resisting world.

WORLD VICTORIES FOR THE DEMOCRATIC PEACE FORCES

But the sequel has turned out quite differently from what Wall Street so confidently planned and hoped after Stalingrad. Instead of the United States being able to seize control of the world, its imperialist policies have encountered one major defeat after another. Wall Street's program of world domination is being wrecked upon the rocks of the solid resistance of the rebellious, progressive, peace-loving peoples of the world. They emphatically have no love for the

"American Century," they are refusing to be enchained by American big capital, and indeed eight hundred million of them have broken with the capitalist system and are heading into a new, free, and scientific system of Socialism. The first and most decisive defeat of Wall Street's foreign policy was the swift and tremendous recovery of the Soviet Union after World War II. Whereas, the big capitalist countries—Britain, Germany, Japan, France, Italy, etc.—still remain in various degrees of crisis despite being subsidized by scores of American billions, the U.S.S.R., which did not get a dime of post-war American help and which faced incomparably heavier physical tasks of reconstruction than any other country, has made a complete recovery and is booming ahead at an unprecedented rate of development. Actually, total Soviet industrial production is now two-and-one-half times greater than it was in 1940, on the eve of the war. This stupendous Soviet economic recovery and advance spells final disaster to all of Wall Street's plans of world domination.

Another decisive post-war defeat of Wall Street imperialism was the victory of the Chinese revolution in 1949. The United States squandered several billion dollars trying to keep in power its puppet government, the ultra-reactionary Chiang Kai-Shek regime; but to do so was impossible. The crooks in that government divided among themselves

the American funds as fast as they got their paws on them; and the vast amounts of military help given to Chiang's army by the United States quickly passed into the hands of the ever-advancing People's Liberation Army. And nothing could be done to reverse this, to Wall Street, fatal course of events. The ultimate victory of the Chinese people's revolutionary forces four years ago under the brilliant leadership of Mao Tse-tung slammed the door shut forever against the cherished key phase of Wall Street's world plan of imperialism—the overrunning of Asia.

Still another blow to the world conquest schemes of the American monopolists was the establishment of People's Democracies in the early post-war years in Czechoslovakia, Poland, Hungary, Bulgaria, Rumania, and Albania, as well as the People's Democratic Republic in East Germany. To prevent revolutions in Central Europe by allied occupation, had been the major purpose behind the Anglo-American war-time invasion of Italy, but the reactionary scheme failed. The loss of these vital Central European countries to capitalism was a body blow to all the Wall Street imperialist schemes.

At the outset of World War II, the Socialist segment of the world's population encompassed about 200,000,000 people, but now it embraces some 800,000,000, or one-third of the entire human race. This enormous increase in the anti-imperialist, peace-loving, democratic, and Socialist forces of the world (not to mention those

in the capitalist countries themselves) is the basic measure of the failure of Wall Street's plans of world conquest. American imperialism cannot possibly overcome these gigantic forces of freedom—not by financial corruption, not by political intimidation, not by military force, and not by all these measures combined. These progressive regimes are the handwriting on the wall for imperialism in general.

INCREASING DEFEATS FOR AMERICAN IMPERIALISM

Wall Street imperialism in the post-war period has especially striven to build up a vast, all-inclusive, capitalist war alliance, which, at the appointed time, would be able to overrun the countries of peace, democracy, and Socialism. But this deadly threat to world peace and democracy is also manifestly failing. During the post-war years the United States Government has squandered some \$250 billion dollars in trying, here and abroad, to construct and to arm this presumably overwhelming world military power; but in this, too, it has not succeeded.

The United States has managed, of course, by economic penetration, political intimidation, and financial subsidies, to establish for itself a certain wobbly political hegemony over the capitalist world on the basis of a general anti-Soviet policy. But this hegemony, torn with conflicting capitalist antagonisms, is of the most shaky character, threatening constantly to collapse. Its dubious value

is to be
stand
and
again
States
ening
Ameri
Natio
Th
capita
Ameri
togeth
—of t
festat
effect
such
at. In
the U
not a
mem
bilitie
force
ples,
woul
Stree
from
at m
vide
Stree
confr
the
for a
a real
ican
Th
Unit
the f
posco
tions.
the s
howe
agen

is to be seen in the more independent stand being taken by Great Britain and a number of other countries against the demands of the United States, and also by the growing weakening of the hitherto rubber-stamp American majority in the United Nations.

The hodge-podge aggregation of capitalist countries that the Anglo-American imperialists have tinkered together during the past several years—of which NATO is the main manifestation—in no sense constitutes an effective anti-Soviet military alliance, such as Wall Street has been aiming at. In the event of a great war against the U.S.S.R. and its allies, most if not all of the European countries, members of NATO, would be liabilities rather than assets as fighting forces. The French and Italian peoples, more and more peace-minded, would not fight effectively for Wall Street, and the help it would get from Britain would be very limited at most. Even Germany would provide an unexpected surprise for Wall Street if the German people were confronted with another war against the U.S.S.R. And, in Asia, Japan for a long time cannot be built into a real fighting force, if ever, by American imperialism.

The Korean war in which the United States had to do the bulk of the fighting although this was supposed to be a war of the United Nations, was a mild forecast of what the situation would be in case Eisenhower, Dulles, and other Wall Street agents should succeed in precipitat-

ing the world war that they are so anxious for. Such a war, far from resulting in victory for Wall Street, would certainly deal a death blow to the world capitalist system.

This failure to build a great anti-Soviet war alliance constitutes a major defeat for the general political strategy of Wall Street imperialism for world domination. The concrete military phases of this broad political plan of conquest have fared no better. First, there was the strategy of the atom bomb monopoly. Undoubtedly, Wall Street put major reliance in this weapon. The general idea (expressed openly time and again by authoritative spokesmen of reaction) was to precipitate a "preventive" atomic war against the U.S.S.R. and its political friends, when a sufficient stockpile of the lethal bombs had been built up. A deadly shower of A-bombs on the decisive Russian industrial population centers would do the job, it was freely said at the time in Congress, in the press, and on the radio. But the announcement by President Truman, in September 1949, that the Soviet Union had exploded an atom bomb, knocked to pieces this whole murderous scheme. With its atom bomb monopoly broken, overnight Wall Street recast its entire military strategy, and initiated a build up of "conventional" armed forces here and in capitalist Europe. All this constituted a heavy setback.

Later came a similar failure of the hydrogen bomb monopoly. The warmongers of Wall Street had

greeted with great gusto the American tests which had demonstrated the feasibility of this country's hydrogen bomb, a murderous weapon many times more destructive than the atom bomb. True, the Russians had broken the A-bomb "monopoly," but they certainly could never make the H-bomb—it was confidently said on all sides. In the H-bomb, Wall Street was sure it had at last the great invincible, all-decisive weapon. But this criminal nonsense was also shattered when it was learned, in August 1953, that the Soviet Union also had the H-bomb.

Another major military defeat for the Wall Street strategists of world conquest was the failure of their imperialist war in Korea. Although denied at first, it is now admitted by a leading spokesman of the South Korean government, the Ambassador to the United States, that his government began the Korean war. The purpose of the war, obviously, was to be the stepping stone to a greater war for the overthrow of People's China and the conquest of Asia. But this scheme, too, back-fired. It was ruined by the indomitable fighting spirit of the Chinese and North Korean peoples, by the firm stand of the U.S.S.R., and the People's Democracies, by the reluctance of this country's European war "allies," and by the hatred of the great masses of the American people for this aggressive, reactionary war. The Korean war proved conclusively that revolutionary Asia cannot be conquered by reactionary Anglo-American

armed forces.

Of course, the Wall Street warmongers have meanwhile scored some victories in the post-war period, in their general drive for world power. They managed to shoot down the Greek people's revolution; they have, with the help of their allies—the Right-wing Social Democracy, the Vatican and local reaction generally—temporarily slowed down the progress of democracy and Socialism in France and Italy; they have slashed a certain amount of trade with the East; they have largely succeeded in bringing reaction (basically fascist) back into power in West Germany; they have sewed up an alliance with Franco Spain, and, most dangerous of all, they have deeply confused great masses of the American people by lying allegations to the effect that the Soviet Union constitutes a threat to world peace, and by covering up their own war intentions with violent Red-baiting and hypocritical protestations of peaceful intentions.

These "victories" of the Anglo-American war camp are, however, altogether minor in contrast to the basic defeats, as outlined above, that Wall Street and its war alliance have suffered. The grand total of the post-war experience of American imperialism in its drive for world domination is one of definitive failure, and this failure grows more decisive with the passage of each month. The great lesson of the post-World War II period is that American monopoly capital, no matter what it does, cannot possibly reduce

the wor

THE "

The V
ever, ar
for their
mastery
setbacks
spur the
A dang
enters r
ulation
made
failures
cut wit
of their

The
by Am
World
quest,
"preven
atomb
destroy
the ato
Street
vised a
also in
world-
largely
arms.
alliance
proddi
sively i
in the
and It
ing int
But
planne
out ab
have
project

the world to its imperialist sway.

THE "PUTSCHIST" DANGER

The Wall Street monopolists, however, are far from accepting defeat for their malignant program of world mastery. On the contrary, the very setbacks they have suffered serve to spur them on to even greater efforts. A dangerous element of desperation enters more and more into their calculations and activities. They are made reckless by their mounting failures and difficulties. They would cut with a sword the Gordian knot of their insoluble problems.

The first war strategy worked out by American imperialism in its post-World War II drive for world conquest, as we have seen, was for a "preventive war," based upon the atombomb. But when this plan was destroyed by the U.S.S.R. breaking the atombomb "monopoly," the Wall Street warmongers hastily improvised another. This was, as we have also indicated, the building up of a world-wide anti-Soviet war alliance, largely equipped with "conventional" arms. The general idea behind this alliance was that, under American prodding, it would march aggressively into an anti-Soviet war, much in the manner that Germany, Japan, and Italy took the offensive in leading into World War II.

But this offensive was more easily planned than realized. As pointed out above, the peoples of Europe have no taste for Wall Street's projected war. Consequently, the

grand anti-Soviet alliance, which the United States has been to such great pains, fabulous expense to build, wobbles about, full of weaknesses, hesitations, mutual antagonisms, and a growing spirit of neutralism. The weakness of the Anglo-American war alliance was emphasized by the forced ending of the Korean war, which considerably eased world tension and opened up new vistas of world peace.

Confronted by this situation, there is a grave danger that the Wall Street monopolists, frustrated in their war strategy for world conquest, may try, on the basis of a well-planned "putsch," to throw their unwilling alliance, willy-nilly, into war. This action could also, they hope, for the time being at least eliminate the growing nightmare of an economic crisis. The needful "putsch" to begin this war could, of course and as always, be conveniently blamed upon the Russians. Andrew Stevens was altogether correct in warning, in the main report delivered at the recent National Conference of the Party, that, "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 further progress toward peaceful negotiations."

A putschist policy is not a new thing for American imperialism. Faithfully obedient to Wall Street, the Truman Administration was throughout notoriously aggressive in

the deliberate stimulation of civil wars in countries refusing to do its bidding. In the early post-war period, at grave international risk, it definitely tried to provoke armed uprisings in Hungary, Poland, and Czechoslovakia. A little later on it took charge of the reactionary side in the Greek war, thereby creating an imminent danger of a serious war in South-Central Europe. The Truman Administration was also responsible for the war in Korea, which its puppet Rhee started, at the risk of a great war in Asia. It was ready too, to use the A-bomb and to extend the Korean war into People's China, and would have done so, had it not been stopped by a great worldwide protest against this contemplated outrage.

The Eisenhower-Dulles Administration, facing an ever-more difficult situation, goes even further than Truman did in putschism. Its so-called "liberation program" is nothing else than the systematic instigation of civil wars in countries where Socialist influence is strong or dominant. At the moment, its puppet head of the South Korean government, Syngman Rhee, is insolently preparing, in line with this policy of aggression and with the connivance of the U.S. State Department, to re-open the Korean war and therewith to create the extreme danger of a great war in China.

The most dangerous manifestation so far of the Eisenhower-Dulles putschist policy, however, was the June 17th "demonstration" in East-

ern Germany. This violent uprising, which was organized by American agents, was a ruthless attempt to launch a civil war in Germany. Had this plan succeeded, it would have been virtually impossible to keep the occupying powers in Germany out of the struggle. It might well have suddenly resulted in a general war, which was precisely the aim of the whole movement. To create such war putsches is the definite policy of the Eisenhower Administration, and the ensuing danger is especially great in view of the desperate mood of the Administration and its failures. One of the very worst aspects of the situation is that in this dangerous policy the Administration has the active backing of such labor leaders as Meany and Reuther—note their glowing enthusiasm for the support of the June 17th uprising.

The shocking recent rise of McCarthyism emphasizes the danger that the Eisenhower government, in a desperate effort to cut its way out of its mounting, insoluble difficulties, may try to launch a world war through a putsch. The McCarthyites, above all, are those who are deliberately for America's perpetrating some kind of June 17th or Pearl Harbor against the Soviet Union. It would be the gravest folly to ignore this serious danger.

THE NEED TO ALARM LABOR AND THE PEOPLE

Wall Street imperialism, with all its strength and cunning, is pushing on relentlessly for the accomplish-

ment of
through
halt and
peace
working
poorer f
ing de
many s
are: a)
in Kore
of Dull
re-open
to keep
expansi
c) to b
United
West tr
States'
to pull
aggressi
f) to w
econom
keeping
own fal
the basi
duction
and re-
to put a
war-fas
this co
policy o
a five-p
hower-I
internat
ing a
United
ful co-e
tries an
the pre
ernmen
evitabil

ment of its goal of world conquest through another world war. To halt and defeat this war drive, the peace forces in this country—the working class, the Negro people, the poorer farmers, and other peace-loving democratic elements — have many serious tasks. Among these are: a) to bring about a real peace in Korea, in the face of the efforts of Dulles, Rhee, and Company, to re-open the war in that country; b) to keep American warmongers from expanding the war in Indo-China; c) to bring People's China into the United Nations; d) to revive East-West trade; e) to slash the United States' monstrous war budget and to pull back U.S. forces from their aggressive bases all over the world; f) to work out an alternative peace economy to Wall Street's program of keeping the industries going, and its own fabulous profits rolling in, on the basis of the huge munitions production; g) to halt the rearmament and re-nazification of Germany; h) to put a stopper on the McCarthyite war-fascist hysteria now infesting this country; i) to insist upon a policy of top-level negotiations and a five-power pact to replace the Eisenhower-Dulles policy of intensifying international tension and of cultivating a war spirit; j) to orient the United States upon the basis of peaceful co-existence of the capitalist countries and the Soviet Union, instead of the present orientation of our Government upon the theory of the inevitability of a third world war. The

situation recently has grown more favorable for the success of the peace forces, and for compelling peaceful negotiations.

While fighting for these and other fundamental individual peace issues, it is also indispensable that the peace forces awaken the peoples, here and abroad, to the sinister putschist danger in Wall Street's war program, especially with the rise of fascist McCarthyism. It has been done before; it might be done again. The possibility of this desperate expedient becomes all the more menacing precisely, as we have seen, because of the basic failure of American imperialist foreign policy. The best protection against such a wild adventure is to awaken the masses to the danger.

The peoples of the world are winning the historic fight to maintain world peace, in the face of the attempts of Wall Street imperialism and its allies, to set the world aflame. This we have seen in our review above of the basic defeats suffered by Anglo-American imperialism during the fears of the "cold war." And now, especially since the big victory of the armistice in Korea, peace sentiment is rising still higher throughout the world. The contemplated war plans of Wall Street can be defeated. But to do this, there must be no underestimation of the desperate recklessness of the reactionaries who are engineering the drive of Anglo-American imperialism for world mastery.

A New Policy for France*

By Maurice Thorez

General Secretary, Communist Party of France

A REACTIONARY journalist recently wrote: "The slogan proclaimed by the Communists is becoming almost a keynote: this has to be changed!"

This time he spoke the truth. Let us note, however, that this is not a matter of a mere slogan but the unanimous demand of the popular masses, who have personal experience of the fatal consequences of the "Marshall Plan" and the Atlantic Pact. It is the demand of the popular masses who have convinced themselves from their own experience how right was the Communist Party which from the very outset exposed the policy so contrary to the interests of the nation and fought against this policy.

This cannot go on! Things must be changed! This was proclaimed by the entire people during the monster August strike movement and the recent peasant actions.

The mass scale, long and militant strike of the railwaymen, post office workers and civil servants is without precedent. It is but natural that while fighting unanimously against the emergency decrees and for higher wages, the strikers should

become conscious of the need to convoke Parliament and to effect a change in the Government's policy.

Since the ancient *Jacqueries* and the Great Revolution the French peasants have never conducted struggles on such a scale and in such a form. Small wonder then that the peasants who are being impoverished as a result of the agricultural crisis and threatened with complete ruin and expropriation, who are fighting against the reduced facilities for marketing their produce, against the sharp decline in agricultural prices, should take action in protest against the policy which strangles them by means of military expenditure, against the policy which ensures the big middlemen enormous profits and sacrifices the interests of French agriculture to the interests of the U.S. billionaires.

The new and significant feature is that the action taken by the workers, civil servants and peasants developed in an atmosphere of mutual

* Speech delivered at the close of a plenum of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of France, held October 22-23, 1953; reprinted from *For a Lasting Peace, For a People's Democracy*, Oct. 30, 1953.

under
worki
try f
which
tire r
few a
leadin
The
plovee
ants, t
intellig
victim
becom
of the
mand
mand
French
The
betwe
erty a
tion a
The
that e
ficultie
foreign
which
France
pender
It is
move
over c
reviva
buildi
army
sumes
Not
gent t
men
frustra
treatie
In

understanding and sympathy. The working people in town and country found solidarity in struggle which was the struggle of the entire nation against the privileged few and the foreign agents who are leading the country to ruin and war.

The workers, civil servants, employees in private enterprises, peasants, traders and handicraftsmen, the intelligentsia, war veterans and war victims, women and youth—all are becoming more and more conscious of the fact that their specific demands merge with the general demand for a complete change of French policy.

They all clearly see the connection between their privations and poverty and the Atlantic policy of reaction and war.

They are all becoming convinced that elimination of these grave difficulties calls for a change of our foreign policy, calls also for a policy which corresponds to the interests of France, a policy of national independence and peace.

It is necessary, first of all, to remove the mortal danger hanging over our country as a result of the revival of German militarism, of rebuilding the German revanchist army no matter what form it assumes.

Nothing is more important and urgent than to rally all patriotic French men and women in struggle for frustrating the Bonn and Paris treaties.

In this connection let us once

more expose the alleged dilemma advanced before our people. We are told "either we participate in the rearming of Germany within the framework of the so-called European Army or it is directed against us."

In reality, however, the rearming of Western Germany, which is not democratized or de-nazified, which is again under the rule of the warlords and is an advanced post of the U.S. warmongers in Europe, would in either case be directed against the interests of the cause of peace and, consequently, against France.

No "argument" can be more false and humiliating than that advanced by the Vichy-ites who allege that the weakness and decline of France compel it to agree to the rearming of Germany as an inevitable evil.

France is weak and in a state of decline only because on all questions its "European" and "Atlantic" rulers pursue the policy of national betrayal.

France experiences no shortage either of resources, opportunities or of friends, especially among the peoples who had also suffered from German militarism, who also seek protection from the threat of new aggression.

The carrying out of the Franco-Soviet Treaty, which is based on the fraternity forged in battle against the fascist invaders and which logically stems from geographical factors, would help our country to re-

gain freedom of action in the sphere of foreign policy.

It would be wrong to think that ratification of the Bonn and Paris treaties is inevitable. France can and must say: "No!" Unity and struggle outside and inside Parliament by all champions of national independence and peace can and must prevent the ratification of these injurious treaties!

We, in turn, are fully determined to leave nothing undone in or out of Parliament to ensure defeat to the instigators of the so-called European Army.

The policy that corresponds to the interests of France, calls also for an end to the war in Indo-China. At a time when an armistice has been successfully signed in Korea, the people of France fail to see why negotiations have not yet been started with President Ho Chi Minh to obtain similar results in Viet Nam.

The striving for a complete change in France's policy must find expression in greater unity and intensification of the struggle of all national and democratic forces, and unity of the working class is the prerequisite for building up such unity in this struggle.

The idea of unity and its practical results have in recent months become widespread among the masses who realize that it is their chief weapon. Simultaneously, reactionary circles and the Socialist leaders are more and more in fear of unity of the working people. They

have intensified their machinations and place many new obstacles in the way of unity.

With the connivance of some trade-union leaders, notorious for their splitting tactics, they did their utmost to arrest the development and split the united front which would have enabled the strikers to win complete victory. Similarly, with the help of big farmers who head some of the agricultural organizations, reaction succeeded in disorienting the peasants in a number of Departments to the extent that they did not take action.

The popular masses must never forget the many and varied means employed by the enemies of the people with the sole purpose of preventing what they fear most of all—the unity of all working people.

Communists should always remember that the building up of a united front of the working class is a difficult and ceaseless struggle. Communists should also remember that they must redouble their efforts in the struggle for unity.

As was correctly predicted at the previous plenum of the Central Committee "the profound forces of the nation are beginning to rise, forces which will determine the new course of events, which will ensure triumph in our country for the policy of peace and national independence, the policy of freedom and social progress."

A great responsibility rests with our Party. The working people,

democ
and w
its m
dence.
side t
ways
when
strugg
peace.
The
Comm
solve
and c
in car
The
this tr

democrats, all devoted French men and women look to our Party and its members with hope and confidence. Both in town and countryside the eyes of the people are always turned to the Communists when the issues are related to the struggle for bread, freedom and peace.

The people are expecting from the Communists correct decisions to solve the great present-day problems and especially look for their help in carrying out these decisions.

The Communists will live up to this trust, to this hope, which places

upon them new responsibilities. They will not fail to display patience and persistence. They will repeatedly explain things. They will display initiative and wisdom, courage and staunchness. They will rank among the best in organizing and effecting economic and political actions, of which the August strikes and peasant demonstrations were but the prelude.

In this way the Communists will prove themselves to be convinced and resolute fighters for a change of policy, which the people of France desire and will achieve.

The Lessons of Pearl Harbor

By Henry T. Goodwin

TWELVE YEARS AGO, on December 7th, the bombs of the Japanese militarists fell on Pearl Harbor. A typical fascist blitz had plunged America into the Second World War. President Roosevelt denounced it as "a day that will live in infamy." So it was—and still is. Less than six months had gone by since that other day of infamy—June 22nd, when Hitler had likewise launched his unprovoked blitz against the U.S.S.R. America, as well as the Soviet Union, found itself forced into a war of survival against fascism.

Pearl Harbor has entered into the consciousness of the American people as a day of national disaster. That is why the Eisenhower Administration, supported by the whole Wall Street propaganda machine, has been assaulting the ears of the country today with the cry of the danger of another Pearl Harbor—this time with Hydrogen bombs.

In an attempt to impress the people with the reality of the "danger," the Administration has gone to the length of announcing 70 "possible target areas" published on a map of the U.S. For all the reality that this adds to the supposed danger, they might just as well have announced 365 days in the year on which the

attack might take place, and published a calendar. The days are there, the cities are there, but this does not make them "targets."

But the highly advertised *Operation Candor* hardly got beyond this preliminary step before dissolving into utter confusion. It fell into the contradiction between the conflicting aims of creating a new high pitch of hysteria in the country, of denying that Socialism could do as well as capitalism ("They don't have our know-how"), and of concealing the aggressive character of the Pentagon's own war plans. It fell into the policy conflicts between the adherents of "Nato first," "Continental Defense" and "balance the budget first." As a result, with a fantastic outburst of conflicting statements the various members of the vaunted Eisenhower "team" proceeded to seize the ball and run off towards imaginary goal-lines in all directions.

Thus, for a characteristic example of "leadership" in the face of this self-stimulated panic, we can take Rep. Cole, Chairman of the Joint Congressional Atomic Energy Committee. Cole called the situation "desperate," and said, "I don't find it hard to choose between financial ruination for my country and atomic

devast
then c
made
pacity
did w
nally,
done
a Pea
'favor
(New
It v
standi
really
Harbo
dersto
Harbo
Street
aware
been
on th
of the
The
is th
pound
mind
publi
Vigil
tions,
"retal
more
rorizi
the se
It i
featur
troph
vigila
can o
writte
congr
taken
tion,
own

devastation." Fine alternatives! He then conceded that an error had been made of "underestimating the capacity of Russia all along." Where did we hear *that* before? And finally, a trial balloon: "If it could be done in any way 'other than pulling a Pearl Harbor ourselves' he would 'favor forcing a showdown now.'" (*New York Times*, Oct. 5).

It would contribute to an understanding of whether our country is really menaced by another Pearl Harbor if the American people understood the lessons of the real Pearl Harbor of 12 years ago. The Wall Street war propagandists are well aware of this, and as a result have been doing their utmost to impress on the people a totally false version of the lessons of Pearl Harbor.

The first of these phony "lessons" is that which is being constantly pounded onto the resistant public mind through radio, press and public pronouncements: "*Vigilance! Vigilance!*" Still more appropriations, still more taxes for aircraft, for "retaliatory" bases all over the world, more civil defense exercises and terrorizing games for the children in the schools!

It is true that one of the appalling features of the Pearl Harbor catastrophe was the astonishing lack of vigilance on the part of the American command. Volumes have been written and thousands of pages of congressional testimony have been taken in apparent efforts at explanation, but in reality to impose their own political explanations by the

anti-Roosevelt appeasers. Yet the only explanation that really stands up, is that the Army and Navy brass had been so besotted by their traditional conception of "Russia" as the real enemy, and their appeasement attitude towards the Axis, that the danger warnings did not actually register as an imminent reality, even when received. Thus the lack of vigilance was the result of a fundamentally incorrect political approach.*

Will vigilance, and still more and more aircraft, guarantee security against an atomic blitz today? No! "General Ridgeway, the new Chief of Staff, has already warned that there can be no airtight defense against atomic attack" (*New York Times*, Sept. 19). But the preaching of this lurid creed—that only the protection of the military machine is saving us from the horrors of super-Hiroshimas in New York and Chicago—is counted upon to override all opposition to the constant expansion of the military machine for Wall Street's own war plans.

More than that! If this *extreme* ("atomic Pearl Harbor") phase of Wall Street's myth of the menace of Soviet aggression really gains credence from the American people, then it can also serve to greatly intensify Wall Street's "internal security"

* MacArthur, in the Philippines, was even more culpable than the Hawaiian commanders. For the warnings from Washington mentioned that a Japanese attack might be expected—probably in *Southeast Asia*. Practically all MacArthur's planes were also destroyed on the ground at Manila at the same moment as the attack on Pearl Harbor. (See Chas. A. Beard: *President Roosevelt and the Coming of the War* (Yale Univ. Press, 1948).

drive, including suppression of all progressive forces as "Communists," control of the trade unions, the terrorism of McCarthy—in short the entire program of fascism. And the more the people can be drawn into participation in the frantic "vigilance" and civil defense campaign, the more they will begin to believe in the reality of the "menace," and submit to the constantly increasing tax burden and restriction of civil liberties. Or such at least is the reasoning of the Pentagon. No wonder the Administration feels called upon to take special measures because, with characteristic common sense, the American people show by their lack of response that they consider the "danger of an atomic Pearl Harbor"—a sudden unprovoked blitz coming from the Soviet Union—as strictly a phony.

The second—and major—phony lesson lies in the field of foreign policy. It is that which Secretary of State Dulles again announced in his American Legion speech: "What have we learned from World War I and World War II? That collective security deters aggression!" Therefore, the cold war, the Nato alliance, the Korean adventure, etc.

In this demagogic use of the slogan of collective security, Dulles is relying on the tendency of so many Americans to think mechanically, to see only the form and not the content. Through the false concept of "totalitarianism" invented for this express purpose, Americans have been given to believe that fascism

and Communism are "just the same," both "opposed to democracy"; that if fascism brings the menace of aggressive war, "so does communism," etc.

As Wall Street, throughout the Truman Administration developed its plans for World War III, the slogans of the anti-fascist war period, "collective security," "fight against aggression," "national unity," were drained of their progressive content and re-filled with reactionary content. From expressions of the interests and purpose of the American people, they became demagogic masks to conceal and embellish the interests and purpose of Wall Street. For the real menace of fascist aggression which appeasers like Dulles constantly belittled, and which culminated in the reality of Pearl Harbor, they have substituted the colossal myth of the "menace of Soviet aggression" and thus strive to lead America into a new disaster far greater than Pearl Harbor—the disaster of our own country's launching an aggressive war.

* * *

The gigantic failure lit up by the bombs of Pearl Harbor was not primarily a military one—a failure of vigilance and of military defense (though there are also military lessons to be learned, as we shall see later). It was primarily a failure of foreign policy.

A foreign policy can be in the national interest—that is, in the interests of the whole people—or in the

interest
a time
gressi
al inter
was th
in the
slave-o

In t
wars, h
had lo
and re
pation
world
dream
Russia
it the
capital

Thu
U.S. in
Street—
totally
interest
the A
securit
ests of
aims:
ist riv
Soviet

It w
icy th
Harbo

The
today
world
U.S.S.

to cov
class h
foreign
Soviet
viet R
tempt
refusa

interests only of the ruling class. At a time when the ruling class is progressive, the ruling class and national interests in general coincide. Such was the case during the Civil War, in the fight against the Southern slave-owners' confederacy.

In the period of the two world wars, however, the ruling bourgeoisie had long since become imperialist and reactionary. Its decisive participation and enrichment in the first world war had already given it the dream of world hegemony. And the Russian Revolution had also given it the nightmare of the doom of capitalism.

Thus the foreign policy of the U.S. imperialist bourgeoisie—of Wall Street—following World War I, was totally in conflict with the national interest of the U.S. The interests of the American people were in peace, security, trade, etc. The *class* interests of Wall Street were the twin aims: 1. to win out over its imperialist rivals, 2. to wipe out the new Soviet state.

It was this Wall Street foreign policy that led to the disaster of Pearl Harbor.

The Wall Street propagandists of today who try to ascribe present world tensions to the attitude of the U.S.S.R. since World War II, seek to cover up the evidence of ruling-class hatred that has misguided U.S. foreign policy since the origin of the Soviet state. U.S. policy towards Soviet Russia was marked first, by attempts at its destruction; second, refusal of recognition; and third, re-

jection of its proposals for collective security against fascist aggression.

Thus the recently published *American-Russian Relations* by William Appleman Williams* serves as a useful reminder of history:

"It was under Wilson . . . that the policy of bitter antagonism towards Soviet Russia was formulated and implemented" (p. 177). Again:

[Secretary of State] Lansing . . . submitted to Wilson [Dec. 1917] . . . an embittered attack . . . that concluded with a strong recommendation not to recognize the Bolshevik Government *because of its class origin and structure* [italics added]. The President (who thought that "a great menace to the world had taken shape") "approved in principle," but "did not think that it was opportune to make a public declaration of this sort" (p. 116).

And again: "The Secretary [Lansing] was appalled at what he termed an effort 'to make the ignorant and incapable mass dominant in the world.'" (p. 117)

Following the participation of U.S. troops at Archangel and in Siberia in the 14-nation intervention against the Soviet Government, and U.S. support of the "*Cordon sanitaire*" (quarantine blockade—the 1920 version of "containment"), U.S. policy did not change, but instead froze into its inflexible attitude of non-recognition that persisted for 13 years. Thus in 1921, Herbert Hoover, then Secretary of Commerce, "ad-

* William Appleman Williams: *American-Russian Relations, 1781-1947*, Rinehart & Co., New York, 1952.

vised Litvinov that negotiations could be opened only after the Soviets announced 'the abandonment of their present economic system.' (p. 181)

Even after the recognition of the Soviet Government by Roosevelt, there was no fundamental change in the attitude of the U.S. Government to the Soviet Union. Negotiations on such basic questions as collective security against Hitler and Japan were blocked by Secretary Hull's repeated demand for preliminary settlement of such artificial questions as "Soviet propaganda" and such selfish group interests as payment of the Tzarist debts.

But this rigid hostility to the Soviet Union did not help U.S. imperialism in its own struggle against its rival Japanese imperialism. On the contrary, it left it without any adequate answer to the encroachments of Japan in the Far East.

Neither [Secretary of State Charles E.] Hughes [1921-5] nor his successors, including those who held the office in the decade of the thirties, were men without a choice. There were options available: firm collaboration with either China or Soviet Russia, or the formation of a multi-nation entente founded on a *rapprochement* with Moscow. But American policy . . . could not be cut to fit cooperation with revolutionary governments in either Peking or Moscow. . . . Contrary to the view that antagonism to Moscow was "secondary" to other aspects of Washington's Far Eastern policy until 1933, the determination to prevent the consolidation of the Soviet state was the very

source of the failure of that policy. (p. 184).

This was the essence of the appeasement policy: to make temporary sacrifices of imperialist interests—as well as the interests of their own nation—to the Axis, in the hope that the Axis powers would carry out the general capitalist class interests of attacking the U.S.S.R.

Thus, contrary to the McCarthyite propaganda of today that characterizes every plan for negotiation or for compromise of differences as "appeasement," appeasement did not mean negotiation or refraining from ultimatums. It was a calculated strategy with a specific political content.

It was not due to any "mistake" that Dulles and the other appeasers fought vigorously against collective security against fascism, while espousing with equal vigor today so-called "collective security" against "communism." It was because they preferred to risk national disaster rather than support collective security *with* the U.S.S.R., just as today they prefer to risk national disaster through their so-called "collective security" *against* the U.S.S.R.

Thus the foreign policy that in essence received the support of the U.S. government throughout the 20's and 30's, was a policy based essentially on *ruling-class hostility* towards the U.S.S.R., and prevented the U.S. from following the *national interest* of peaceful co-existence and collaboration for peace with the U.S.S.R. It was this foreign policy in

the period between the wars (culminating in Munich) that unleashed World War II, finally coming to fruition in Hitler's attack on the U.S.S.R. *but thus also making Pearl Harbor inevitable.*

The policy of peaceful co-existence with the new socialist state, was put forward almost from the first by Lenin and Stalin. This policy was fully in accord with American national interests, but naturally did not endear itself to the narrow class interests of the ruling bourgeoisie.

The Communist Party was thus acting fully in the interests of the United States when it fought from the first for recognition of Soviet Russia. The movement for Soviet recognition, which the Trade Union Educational League developed in the labor movement as one of the major points in its program, reached mass proportions in the 20's and early 30's.

In the fight for collective security against fascist aggression our Party likewise played a leading role. Not only did it contribute to bringing about the widest popular debate on a key issue of national policy in recent times; it also led in support of the first victims of fascist aggression; Ethiopia, Spain and China; it helped to organize the boycott against Japanese militarism.

There is no doubt that our fight for collective security had the support of the majority of the American people. But even under the Roosevelt administration the people were not able to make their voice decisive in this field over the reactionary class

forces.

And on the day of Pearl Harbor the Party pledged "everything for victory"—a pledge it carried out nobly. Thus, another major lesson of Pearl Harbor is the loyalty of our Party to the American people.

* * *

But there are also lessons to be learned from the Axis' side of the experience of Pearl Harbor—the side of the aggressors. And the chief of these lessons is: no matter how devastating the blow, *wars between major powers are not won by Pearl Harbors!* And this applies in the days of the H-bomb, equally as before.

To the Japanese militarists, Pearl Harbor was *preventive war*. They were concerned primarily with pursuing their imperialist conquests in China and Southeast Asia. Pearl Harbor was intended chiefly to keep out "interference" by the U.S. The immediate object was the destruction of the U.S. Asiatic Fleet and air power, and there was no attempt to follow it up with the invasion of Hawaii or of our Pacific Coast.

Despite the disastrous ultimate failure of the Pearl Harbor gamble, some of our preventive war dreamers have not learned this lesson, and still imagine that a preventive war against the U.S.S.R. (in the interest of "freedom," of course), commenced by a multiple atomic Pearl Harbor launched from "our" numerous encircling bases, would give them a one-shot victory. These are

the people who learn nothing from history.

In the Soviet Union, on the other hand, the "Pearl Harbor" and "preventive war" doctrines play absolutely no role. Not only is the foreign policy securely anchored on peaceful co-existence; the "blitz" concept is absolutely foreign to Soviet military policy. The blitz relies upon an elite. It is a concept developed by, and suitable to fascism, of winning a war in the shortest time without attempting the dangerous task of mobilizing the mass of the people or subjecting its own rule to the dangerous strain of protracted war.

The concept of socialist countries is the exact opposite. When forced into war, as the Soviet Union showed, it mobilized the entire mass of the people: it out-fought and outlasted fascist Germany. Similarly, Mao Tse-tung in China developed the policy of protracted war against the Japanese militarists.

The second lesson to be learned from the Axis' experience also centers around the question of co-existence. The Nazi generals who have been busy writing their autobiographies (for good hard cash from American publishers) profess to have no explanation whatever for Hitler's fatal decision to attack the Soviet Union and embroil Germany in a two-front war—the one thing that German military strategy was supposed to avoid at all costs. But the explanation is that Hitler did not expect to be involved in a two-front

war. He expected his attack on the Soviet Union *would free him* from his war against the West. He expected that the West, seeing their Munich policy at last bearing fruit, would at once return to the politics of Munich, and gratefully accept from him some type of peace. He made a fatal error in failing to understand the relations between the global contradictions. These relations were formulated by Stalin in classic form last year in his *Economic Problems*:

It is said that the contradictions between capitalism and socialism are stronger than the contradictions among the capitalist countries. Theoretically, of course, that is true. . . . Yet the Second World War began not as a war with the U.S.S.R., but as a war between capitalist countries. . . . Of course, when the U.S. and Britain assisted Germany's economic recovery, they did so with a view to setting a recovered Germany against the U.S.S.R., to utilizing her against the land of socialism. But Germany directed her forces in the first place against the Anglo-French-American bloc. And when Hitler Germany declared war on the Soviet Union, the Anglo-French-American bloc, far from joining with Hitler Germany was compelled to enter into a coalition with the U.S.S.R. against Hitler Germany. Consequently the struggle of the capitalist countries for markets and their desire to crush their competitors proved in practice to be stronger than the contradictions between the capitalist camp and the socialist camp.*

Hitler could not conceive of capi-

* J. Stalin: *Economic Problems of Socialism*, p. 29.

talist
thems
Unio
ance
capita
on th
Street
Dulle
land o
the C
Churc
under
tionsh
tions,
taking
of th
and t
the si
speech

In
not be
have l
rope a
the fr
with t
rope a
ence,

Un
tween
been l
fascis
earlie
volve
the p
predo
world
Th
both
well

J
Soviet

talist England and the U.S. allying themselves with the socialist Soviet Union. He relied on the preponderance of the contradiction between capitalism and socialism. He relied on the fascist sympathies in Wall Street, and such friends at court as Dulles *et al.* Later Hess flew to England convinced that with the help of the Clivedon Set he could "bring Churchill to his senses." But Stalin, understanding the dialectical relationship between the two contradictions, knew the real possibilities, and taking into account the sentiments of the people of England, France and the U.S. and their influence on the situation, he stated in his first speech after the invasion:

In this war of liberation we shall not be alone. In this great war we shall have loyal allies in the peoples of Europe and America. . . . Our war for the freedom of our country will merge with the struggle of the people of Europe and America for their independence, for democratic liberties.*

Under the surface of the war between the imperialist powers had been re-emerging the people's anti-fascist war that had been joined earlier in China and Spain. The involvement of the Soviet Union made the people's anti-fascist war the fully predominant characteristic of the world situation.

Thus the lesson of the experience both of the Munich appeasers, as well as of the fascist Axis itself, is

that efforts to unite the capitalist world in war against the Soviet Union may well crash on the rocks of the inter-imperialist contradictions as well as the resistance of the peoples. And this is the warning Stalin gave the war-mongers of today in his *Economic Problems*. Of particular importance is his warning regarding West Germany and Japan:

Only yesterday, these countries were great imperialist powers and were shaking the foundations of the domination of Britain, the U.S.A., and France in Europe and Asia. To think that these countries will not try to get on their feet again, will not try to smash U.S. domination and force their way to independent development, is to believe in miracles.*

Yet the Administration rigidly persists with true Munichite obstinacy, and over the misgivings and protests of Europe, in its plan to re-arm West Germany, and Adenauer demands that West Germany should also have the right to produce atomic weapons.

Even the anti-Soviet writer Hans Habe says:

"When we state that [re-armed] 'Germany will probably become the greatest power on the continent outside Russia'—as *Time* put it on June 9, '52, we feel we will be able to control this 'greatest power.' . . . We only think in terms of East and West. The Russians know the Germans better. They already reckon with a Third Force which might

* J. Stalin: *The Great Patriotic War of the Soviet Union*, p. 16.

* J. Stalin: *Economic Problems*, p. 29.

endanger both of us. It is therefore nonsensical to dismiss Stalin's famous policy statement . . . as a mere lie."*

In the Pacific a similar policy is being pursued. The Eisenhower-Dulles foreign policy is seeking to again build up Japanese militarism—the power that was actually responsible for Pearl Harbor, and that aroused such intense indignation among the American people. Vice President Nixon during his recent visit to Japan has flatly announced that America made a mistake when, as a result of its experience at Pearl Harbor, it insisted that Japan renounce war in its constitution and give up militarism. Over the resistance of the Japanese people, Nixon now insists that Japan rearm to resume—this time as an instrument of Wall Street—the policy of serving as a spearhead against the Soviet Union.

Thus the lessons of Pearl Harbor point out that the security and peace of our country depend not on still further increasing alarm and hysteria, on going through more motions of civil defense drills, or bankrupting the country to appropriate more billions for aircraft defense that cannot really defend, or on threats of "retaliation." They depend on a correct foreign policy—a policy in the national interest—a *policy of peaceful co-existence with the U.S.S.R.* An incorrect foreign policy, centered on the effort to build a world-wide military alliance against the U.S.S.R.,

brings in its train the military vulnerability and errors that were so evident both on our side at Pearl Harbor, and on the side of the Axis in the whole strategy that led to the attack.

The heart of our foreign policy today, even more than in the period between the wars, is the question of our relations to the only other power of comparable strength—the Soviet Union. The cold war—the campaign of inflexible hostility to the U.S.S.R.—has dominated the world situation for the last six years.

The Soviet peace initiative that was launched last spring, opened a new stage in the struggle for peaceful negotiation of international differences. The first fruit of this was the cease-fire in Korea. Following the cease-fire, Premier Malenkov further developed the position of the U.S.S.R. in his report last August:

"We firmly maintain that at the present moment there is no disputable or outstanding issue that could not be settled in a peaceful way on the basis of mutual agreement between the countries concerned. This refers also to those issues under dispute that exist between the U.S.A. and U.S.S.R. We have stood and stand for a peaceful coexistence of the two systems."

The peace initiative has been thus far effective, not only because of the strength of the world peace camp, but also because of the deep-going crisis in the Wall Street-Dulles foreign policy. The incompatibility of this foreign policy with the national

* Hans Habe: *Our Love Affair with Germany*, p. 179 (Putnam, 1953).

interests of the American people becomes ever clearer as this policy suffers one defeat after another on the international field, and continues to pile up intolerable burdens on the people at home. Thus the U.S.S.R.'s call for lessening of tensions met a heart-felt response here at home, even though less vocal than in Europe and Asia.

Already last spring, the popular response to the Soviet peace initiative was so great that Prime Minister Churchill found it necessary to publicly propose a new top-level Big Four Meeting. The squirming and maneuvering by Dulles and the Eisenhower Administration and the temporary success of their efforts to push this aside has only added to the growing outcry about the rigidity and inflexibility of our foreign policy.

More and more the idea is making headway that a new world war is not inevitable. There is the beginning of a process of unfreezing of all the political attitudes and relationships that had been jelled under the demagogic appeal of "national unity" in anticipation of such a war.

It was the "necessary" preparations for "defense" in such a war that were used to justify all the phases of American policy that weigh so heavily on the people—the war economy, the tax burden, the repressive legislation, the ideological and cultural regimentation.

Hence we can now expect to see a new spirit of resistance to the reactionary policies of the Administration

develop among the people, especially in the ranks of labor. Labor has always demonstrated its patriotism, and devotion to the country's interests in every real national crisis. But patriotism does not mean to follow the class interests of Wall Street down the road to national disaster. It means that labor should stand up and itself take the initiative in leading the nation along the road to peace and security.

That road is still far from an easy one. As Comrade Stevens put it in his report to the National Party Conference last summer, after reviewing these new features of the world situation:

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.

At the same time, however, he pointed out:

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 estimate as though the cold war could be ended by a single act at a single moment of time. Such an oversimplification would imply that we had underestimated the ability of American imperialism to maneuver 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. . . .

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. . . .

*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 mass pressure of the people is slowly mounting. The bankruptcy of policy shown in top circles of the Administration at the news of the Soviet H-bomb, has further dramatized the insanity of the war perspective. Even Eisenhower was forced to pay lip-service to this sentiment in his speech before the National Assembly of the United Church Women:

"The choice that spells terror and death is symbolized by a mushroom cloud floating upward. . . . In its wake we see only sudden and mass destruction, erasure of cities, the pos-

sible doom of every nation and society. This horror must not be" (*New York Times*, Oct. 7).

Returning from his world tour, visiting the countries that are supposed to be the members of our future world war alliance, Adlai Stevenson flatly admitted in his report on September 16th:

"The world is weary; there is universal anxiety and impatience to ease the tensions, to explore every possibility of settlements and conference by negotiation."

And Stevenson was forced to put his finger on the central question:

"There is uncertainty about America and our objectives. Is our objective to discover through negotiations ways to relax tensions, or is it intensification of the cold war; is it co-existence or is it extermination of Communist power?"

The lesson of Pearl Harbor is that a foreign policy based upon hostility to the U.S.S.R. brings disaster to America. This is the answer the American people must give to Stevenson's question. They must compel the Administration to replace the present policy with a policy of peaceful co-existence. With such a policy atomic weapons would be outlawed. The shadow of the mushroom cloud would disappear from the earth.

* Andrew Stevens: *New Opportunities in the Fight for Peace and Democracy*, p. 10, 12. (New Century, 1953).

By H

A
early
ther,
1832:Our
the cr
glory,
indust
men v
means
wages
concer
great
people
facturi
repres
means
growinCap
tion,
system
lossal
hoodsBy
of m
maga:
called
opene
ness r
civiliz
run th
ples.
biograp

Big Business Re-Writes American History, I

By Herbert Aptheker

A New England carpenter—and early trade-union leader—Seth Luther, said to his fellow-workers in 1832:

Our ears are constantly filled with the cry of National wealth, National glory, American system and American industry. . . . This cry is kept up by men who are endeavoring by all the means in their power to cut down the wages of our people. . . . The whole concern (as now conducted) is as great a humbug as ever deceived any people. We see the system of manufacturing lauded to the skies; senators, representatives, owners . . . using all means to keep out of sight the evils growing up under it.¹

Capitalism, based upon exploitation, requires glamorization. As the system ages and rots, the more colossal become the buttressing falsehoods.

By the '90's, with the appearance of monopoly capitalism, the first magazine devoted to "business"—and called *Business*—appeared. Its editor opened with this battle-cry: "Business runs the world. The world gets civilized just as fast as men learn to run things on plain business principles. . . . We shall yet have masterly biographies of the men of affairs."

Said one of these "men of affairs", the steel baron, Andrew Carnegie, in 1899: "We accept and welcome, as conditions to which we must accommodate ourselves, great inequality of environment, the concentration of business, industrial and commercial, in the hands of a few, and the law of competition between these, as being not only beneficial, but essential for the future of the race."²

So: business civilized, and Big Business guarded Man's future. It remained only to sanctify it, and as the twentieth century dawned, William Lawrence, Bishop of the Episcopal Church in Massachusetts and a member of the Harvard Corporation, performed the rites: ". . . it is only to the man of morality that wealth comes . . . Godliness is in league with riches . . . Material prosperity is helping to make the national character sweeter, more joyous, more unselfish, more Christ-like."³

Though Big Business, then, was accepted, commended and declared sacred, "the evils growing up under it" continued to appear and even multiply, wherefore the process of

laudation continued and even intensified. In American capitalism's cocky Coolidge days, when Ford "vanquished" Marx, one read that the "job of administering this planet must be turned over to the despised business man . . . There is no country in the world so efficiently governed as the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. or the General Electric Co. Business has become the world's greatest benefactor." ⁴

Today, General Motors—and its aide-de-camp, General Eisenhower—having (again!) "annihilated" Marx, the same cacophony assails the ears. Now, in tune with the times, an hysterical quality pervades the discordant sounds. The Du Pont corporation, in its own sumptuously bound "history"—authored and printed by itself, but distributed by Scribner's—finds that the "American" economy has not so much defeated Marx as "absorbed" him, thus making the conquest final: "A century ago, Karl Marx dreamed and wrote of a Utopia where the people would own the tools of production and share in their output. His dream has come true, not in the Communist state founded on the theories he propounded so ardently, but in Capitalistic America." ⁵

From all sides comes the flood of words. The editors of *Life* magazine, like the Du Pont Corporation (happy coincidence!), devote an entire issue (Jan. 3, 1953) to "The American and His Economy", its theme being: "We are moving, not towards Social-

ism, but past Socialism . . . Our system is adapted, not to the past, but to the present and future." * The call has gone out for a "new" literature, too. John Chamberlain finds the leading American novelists of the past—Jack London, Sherwood Anderson, Frank Norris, Theodore Dreiser, Sinclair Lewis—singularly imperceptive writers who absurdly depicted the businessman "as a villainous creature." The time has come, rings Chamberlain's brave call, for "a pathfinder," for "a novelist (who) will go forth into the marketplace and use his eyes", unlike the above-named cliché-peddlers.⁶

Francis Ferguson, Professor of English at Rutgers University, speaks on "Drama and the Industrial Manager" at a College English Association Institute devoted to "Industry and the Liberal Arts" and held in October, 1953, on the premises of the Corning Glass Works in upstate New York. He tells his audience—businessmen and college teachers—of the glories of "that new figure in the contemporary scene, the 'statesman of industry'" and says that in the genius of that figure lies the salvation of the American theatre.⁷

What is called "Public Relations" has itself become Big Business. Its business is to glorify Big Business. Characteristic is the talk, "How Business Can Sell the American Way of Life to the American People" delivered by the "Public Relations" ty-

* See the refutation, "Life's Dream Picture" by Henry T. Goodwin, in *Political Affairs*, Feb. 1953.

coon, I
ference
tors, he
As F
(Septer

The
ing up
sales jo
fact, it
dustry
ably ac
million
budget
and an
employ
[likewi
it is ab
energy
manage

"The
of Inte
the ove
Americ
Putnar
Associ
becomi
lenge,
to rese
icans t
us and
Strik
of this
instrum
recent
thal fr
one w
. . .
than a
distribu
strengt

coon, Edward L. Bernays, at a Conference of Businessmen and Educators, held in October, 1950.

As *Fortune* magazine editorialized (September, 1950):

The free enterprise campaign is shaping up as one of the most intensive sales jobs in the history of industry. In fact, it is becoming very much an industry in itself. This year it will probably account for at least one hundred million dollars worth of industry's ad budget [income-tax deductible—H.A.] and an unknown but hefty share of its employee relationships expenditure [likewise—H.A.]. More to the point, it is absorbing more and more of the energy expended by top men in U.S. management.

"The great need," says Dale Cox of International Harvester, "is telling the over-all institutional story of the American system." Says Claude A. Putnam, President of the National Association of Manufacturers, with becoming warmth: "Today's challenge, today's dire necessity is to sell, to resell, if you will—to free Americans the philosophy that has kept us and our economy free."⁸

Strikingly reflective of the impact of this campaign and itself a potent instrument of the campaign is the recent conversion of David E. Lilienthal from a New Deal outlook to one which finds that:

... in Big Business we have more than an efficient way to produce and distribute basic commodities, and to strengthen the nation's security; we

have a social institution that promotes human freedom and individualism . . . Big Business is basic to the very life of this country. . . .¹⁰

The iteration and re-iteration, *ad nauseam*, of this line—that Big Business is the body and soul of America, its protector, developer and guarantor—springs from Wall Street's knowledge that the people in the vast majority are highly suspicious of the virtues of their savior. A nakedly Big Business Administration seeks a nakedly Big Business ideology. To wipe out the legal, political and social impact of the New Deal means to root out the ideology of the New Deal.

The monopolists remember well the collapse of 1929, and the election of Franklin Delano Roosevelt. They remember, very well indeed, the development, in the thirties, of militant mass organizations of the working class—employed and unemployed—the farmers, the Negro people, professionals and small businessmen, the battles they waged, the successes won, which together the people know as the New Deal.

The masses rallied to "drive the money changers out of the Temple." The investigations during the New Deal era of some of the "patriotic" activities of those money-changers—of the utilities, banks, munitions makers, of monopoly as a whole (in the TNEC reports, etc.)—began to open the eyes of millions of Americans to the parasitic, destructive,

corrupt, and anti-democratic nature of Big Business.

Big Business seeks to make the New Deal synonymous with treason. Columnist John O'Donnell, of the McCormick-Patterson chain of newspapers (to whom, in Hitler's name, F.D.R. awarded the Nazi Iron Cross) hails the Brownell-Eisenhower smear of the New Deal in the slanders against Harry Dexter White and in the attack upon Truman's loyalty for its "exposure" of "the Communist conspiracy of the Roosevelt-Truman era to overthrow the Government of the United States."

The monopolists seek the acceptance of Big Business ideology, in face of the impending economic crisis, the better to push forward the Big Business program of fascism at home and imperialist war abroad.

The mass suspicion and fundamental hostility to Big Business haunts its servitors and the specter hovers about their most arrogant declamations. David Lilienthal himself, the modernized, Big-Business Lilienthal, explicitly says that his aim is to dispel this specter. "Most Americans," he laments, "have a deep seated fear and an emotional repugnance to Big Business . . . a degree of cynical distrust of *all* business." He concludes: "We think negatively . . . We seem to be split personalities."¹¹

Benjamin Fairless, president of the U. S. Steel Corporation, regularly denounces what he calls the "Calamity Johns" who attack Big Bus-

iness. He analyzes such people in Lilienthal's terms: "They are people who are only suffering from what I would call a 'midget complex' and they think small."¹²

General Eisenhower, while serving his apprenticeship as President of Columbia University, expressed his devotion to Big Business and found it to be the bulwark of our nation. Yet, he confessed to some worryment. "Big-Business men" he said, "have been in position of leadership" for many, many decades, yet he would not "give a perfect and clean bill of health to many of the individuals who have operated Big Business." Why? Because these men in control "have not succeeded in this: making everybody understand that the thing we are competing about is the product we produce—let us say the Ford against the Chevrolet—and building loyalty around such competitive articles rather than loyalty of class against class."¹³

In all fairness, I feel impelled to remark that President Eisenhower, bearing in mind his noble perspective, seems to have somewhat stacked his Cabinet on the Chevrolet side!

* * *

It will not be amiss to indicate briefly how deeply rooted is the American people's fear and hatred of monopoly. Among those who have given expression to negative thoughts and manifested a "midget complex" were Presidents from Abraham Lincoln to Franklin Delano Roosevelt. To cite but two, it was Grover Cleve-

land who wrote, in 1902, after leaving the Presidency: "The tremendous growth of trusts, the immense business aggregations and the manner in which they stifle healthful competition and throttle individual enterprise cannot long pass unheeded by the voters of the land"; while Woodrow Wilson flatly announced in 1912, before becoming President: "The masters of the government of the United States are the combined capitalists and manufacturers of the United States."

The persistent anti-monopolist tradition is compounded of Jeffersonian equalitarianism, Populism and its protest against the merciless throttling of the small farmer and businessman by monopoly capitalism, and the special contributions coming from the people particularly oppressed as a whole, notably the Negro people. Most important, the tradition is composed of that profound anti-monopolist feeling emanating from that class—the working class—which stands in most direct and lasting opposition to Big Business. Embodying the basic anti-monopolist drive of this class is its science, Marxism-Leninism, which fuses, transforms, carries to a new high level all the detestation of Big Business that permeates American history.

From the working class a relevant quotation may be offered. The preamble to the constitution of the Knights of Labor, 1878:

The recent alarming development

and aggression of aggregated wealth, which, unless checked, will inevitably lead to the pauperization and hopeless degradation of the toiling masses, render it imperative, if we desire to enjoy the blessings of life, that a check should be placed upon its power. . . .

It is, in part, the vitality and tenacity of this tradition in the American labor movement, as well as, basically, the political and economic conditions of today, that explain why Senator Humphrey (D., Minn.) moved the delegates at the recent CIO Convention to cheer when he denounced "the financial barons" now "in the driver's seat" in Washington, who were "greedily looting the public's resources." It is this growing awareness among the workers—an awareness having profound roots in the historical tradition—of the menace that Big Business represents to prosperity, security, freedom and peace which most disturbs the monopolists.

Examples of the petty-bourgeois opposition to Big Business, especially coming from the farmers, are legion. Characteristic is this sentence from the Populist Party Platform, 1892:

The fruits of the toil of millions are boldly stolen to build up colossal fortunes for a few, unprecedented in the history of mankind; and the possessors of these, in turn, despise the Republic and endanger liberty.

One of the earliest Negro newspapers, the N. Y. *Weekly Advocate*,

back in 1837, included among its purposes opposition to "all Monopolies, which oppress the poor and laboring classes of our society." This is a theme running through the entire record of the Negro people.¹⁴

Central to the monopolists' effort to root out this tradition is the struggle to win over the mind of youth—naturally fresh, eager, brave, vigorous, challenging—bearers of the future. Of the myriad vehicles through which Big Business seeks to gain the intellectual allegiance of the youth we wish here to deal briefly only with one—the educational system, from public school through university.

The American ruling class suspects reason, and fears intelligence, for after all the final refutation of an unreasonable system is reason.

Thus, Eric Baber, a school superintendent in Illinois, finds that the main trouble with the schools is that they remain "concentrated too much on the intellectual aspect of education." This is wrong, he says, as "is evidenced by the fact that many \$20,000 to \$100,000 a year jobs . . . are held by persons with I. Q.'s of less than ninety."¹⁵ The editors of *Fortune* report that certain business firms now give prospective employees I. Q. tests in order "to eliminate people above a certain level."¹⁶

* These remarks are not to be taken as defending the scientific validity of these so-called intelligence tests—the tests have no such validity. But the material is quoted as indicative of the fear of intelligence per se.

The same editors, in another volume which, among other things, tells the corporation executive's wife how to "get along", admonish: "The good corporation wife does not make her friends uncomfortable by . . . excessive good breeding. And intellectual pretensions she avoids like the plague."¹⁷

The *New York Times* (October 25, 1953) quotes Dr. O. M. Wilson, executive secretary of the Fund for the Advancement of Education, as saying, directly: "Even in the business of education, the intellect has become suspect." Business men, says the paper, "shy away from those with Phi Beta Kappa keys."

Congressman Velde, chairman of the Un-American Activities Committee, in opposing a bill sponsoring public library demonstrations, summed it all up in one sentence: "The basis of all communistic and socialistic influences is education of the people."¹⁸ One knows now what the Hon. Mr. Velde has been seeking in his investigation of schools!

• • •

The capitalist stranglehold upon our educational system with its resulting chauvinism, jingoism, militarism, over-crowding, hounding of teachers, class and religious and racial barriers to admission, has been thoroughly documented and analyzed in numerous writings.*

Here we wish to note the intensi-

* Outstanding in this connection is Samuel Sillen's *Cold War in the Classroom* (N. Y., 1950) where references to the relevant literature will be found.

fied at
Business
nation
The N
facture
day in
ican p
Wilson
remark
eral M
Much
rectly
NAM'
has go
and h
ments
request
free B
ordin
reach a
school
in ma
ing. T
calls a
which
alists t
ican e
sembl
learn
result,
and t
with
eaterp
Cur
pletely
paign.
State
Educa
has b
new
grade

fied attention being given by Big Business in terms of its overt domination of the educational apparatus. The National Association of Manufacturers spends a million dollars a day in an effort to make the American people believe, to quote Mr. Wilson's immortal, if repudiated, remark, that "what is good for General Motors is good for the country." Much of this money is aimed directly at the nation's schools. Thus NAM's *Catalogue of Teaching Aids* has gone out to over 25,000 principals and heads of social science departments and this mailing alone brought requests for over 3,000,000 pieces of free Big Business propaganda. According to the NAM, their booklets reach almost 70 per cent of the high-school students of the country and in many schools are required reading. Today the NAM has what it calls a "College Speaking Program" which provides for "leading industrialists to carry the message of American enterprise before student assemblies at institutions of higher learning across the nation." As a result, scores of thousands of students and teachers "have been impressed with the benefits of the individual enterprise system."¹⁹

Curricula are currently being completely revised in line with this campaign. Thus, in 1953, the New York State curriculum for "Citizenship Education" for grades 7, 8, and 9 has been re-done. Indicative is the new "Unit" added for the ninth grade—"Our American Economic

System"—in which an idyllic transformation of monopoly capitalism is put over on the children as "American." Similarly, the "Unit" dealing with "Organized Workers" includes therein "employer organizations," and offers as the "responsibilities of the individual worker," (the employer has none) "maximum production" and "regard . . . for the public interest."²⁰

On the level of university education, of course multimillionaires have been and remain the trustees of universities and colleges. But the domination of these institutions by Big Business (merging with the military) is more blatant and complete than hitherto. Gilbert W. Chapman, president of the Yale and Towne Manufacturing Co., says: "American business has largely supplanted the individual private donor as a major source of university funds. Last year (1952) approximately \$60,000,000 was given to colleges by corporations."²¹

Indeed, the soliciting of money from corporations on behalf of colleges is itself now an organized large-scale enterprise. For example, there exists the Empire State Foundation of Independent Liberal Arts Colleges, representing twenty-two New York Colleges. Its Chairman of the Board is the president of Union College and this educator explains that his Foundation makes it possible for "the business corporations . . . to give financial help to liberal education without the agonies of deciding that

College A deserves help rather than College B."²²

• • •

We have seen that the roots of popular hatred of Big Business are very deep and that the tycoons know this. It is one thing, and important to them, to insist that monopoly capitalism is, indeed, the "American" way of life—to equate Wall Street with the spirit of the nation. But for Wall Street, intent upon its plans for a new global war and observing the world-wide decay of imperialism, it is vital that the people's past, the history of their country, be reshaped completely in the image of Big Business. He who controls the past thereby may better dominate the present and shape the future. Thus, history-writing is central to the ideological battle of our time.

• • •

Of course, in an economy dominated by the bourgeoisie, its scribes dominate the writing of the country's history. The historians whose writings form the core of this country's textbooks, whose opinions have been soaked up day after day and decade after decade by every literate American, have been from and for the capitalists.

Of one of them—Woodrow Wilson—his latest biographer remarks: "He had never known economic insecurity, or poverty, or dread of the future; never had he had any intimate contact with men of the working classes." Thus may they nearly all

be characterized: the Adamsons, Bancroft, Beer, Burgess, Channing, Dunning, Fiske, Hart, Mahan, McMaster, Oberholtzer, Osgood, Phillips, Rhodes, Schouler, etc.

As one of them, James Ford Rhodes, himself remarked, they conceived of history-writing as an "aristocratic profession" or "the rich man's pastime." These individuals—whose fathers were well-to-do Congregational divines (Bancroft), or state adjutant-generals (Schouler), or secretaries to such as Henry Clay (Fiske), or who were themselves wealthy capitalists (George L. Beer in tobacco, Rhodes in iron), or ghost-writers for Presidents (Bancroft for Johnson, McMaster for McKinley), or in-laws of President-makers (Mrs. Rhodes was the daughter of Mark Hanna), or rear-admirals (Mahan), or editors of frankly Big-Business organs (Oberholtzer)—wrote history in very much the same way as bourgeois judges have traditionally interpreted and administered the law, and for very much the same reasons, except that the historians have been even less amenable to mass political pressure than have been the judges.

Naturally, such individuals had "a somewhat careful solicitude for the preservation of wealth," as has been remarked of Schouler; of course in their books the "wage-earner and farmer rarely appears" as was said of McMaster. Certainly one like Fiske would detest the Populists and Rhodes thought of workers as "always overbearing and lawless," while to

Oberh
verital
and
rabble
Clear
Haym
for "t
scaffol
The
histori
and a
that t
—who
another
anima
We
more
this n
maste
Yes
and
shift.
Amer
of tha
in the
vious
ideolo
ters'
facin
in an
up al
expan
mand
a new
slavoc
no se
was l
sive.
whel
ing a

Oberholtzer labor-organizers were veritable demons, guilty of "follies and excesses," who turned "foreign rabble" into "murderous mobs." Clearly, such "wretches"—like the Haymarket Martyrs—were destined for "their not unmerited end on the scaffold!"²³

The works of all the "standard" historians exude ultra-nationalism, and a white chauvinism so vicious that they write of the Negro people—when mentioning them at all—as another might write of offensive animals.

Well, one might inquire: what more could Big Business want? Is this not an historiography after the master's own image?

Yes; but with age the image alters, and the demands correspondingly shift. The present situation of the American imperialists reminds one of that of the American slaveowners in the 1850's. Certainly, in the previous generation the slavocratic ideologists had justified their masters' system, but with that system facing increasing threats from within and from without and being eaten up alive with its own necessities to expand or die, the slaveowners demanded, and got, from their penmen, a new note. They demanded and got slavocratic ideology which was in no sense defensive or apologetic. It was brazen and mounted an offensive. Slavery now became an overwhelming good, the decisive civilizing agent, the preserver of culture,

the savior of freedom, the secret of the nation's strength and growth. To illustrate the shift one need but compare the writings of two pro-slavery Virginians—Thomas R. Dew of the 1830's and George Fitzhugh of the 1850's.

So with the American imperialists of today—again a ruling class in decay and in crisis, being driven mad by the incurable failing of its social system. The past history-writing was not sufficiently strident and arrogant in its defense of monopoly capitalism; not sufficiently slashing. Nothing namby-pamby now. We, the big bosses, the tycoons, we are the noble, creative ones, the heart and soul and skeleton and brains and blood of America, and we're so good that we ought to have the world.

And no one must question this. Of course, with Marxists we do not debate. Here, as Dr. Joseph Goebbels and Dr. Sidney Hook have so well put it, one faces a police problem and one jails, not debates. But the liberals and the muck-rakers like J. Allen Smith and Vernon L. Parrington and the young Charles A. Beard, with their qualms and picayune concern about "honesty" and "decency" and other balderdash are also quite trying. They vacillate, they spread seeds of doubt, they are not sufficiently aggressive. We do not want a "defense", we want a positive, passionate assertion of the indispensability of our class. We want, in a word, say the imperialists now, a

written-history which identifies our needs, and deeds, our schemes and dreams with the needs and deeds and schemes and dreams of America. Make us America!

Which historians have undertaken this task? What are their arguments? How shall their arguments be met? With these questions* we shall deal in the next issue of *Political Affairs*.

NOTES

1. Seth Luther, *Address to the Workingmen of New England* (Phila., 1836).
2. Andrew Carnegie, in *North American Review*, June, 1899.
3. Bishop Lawrence's remarks, uttered in 1900, are preserved in his autobiography, *Fifty Years* (Boston, 1923), pp. 13-14.
4. E. E. Calkins, *Business the Civilizer* (Boston, 1928), p. 295.
5. *Du Pont The Autobiography of an American Enterprise* (Wilmington, 1952), p. 136.
6. John Chamberlain, in *Fortune*, November, 1948.
7. See the *Saturday Review*, November 21, 1953, pp. 44-45. An entire section of this issue is devoted to reporting the proceedings of the Institute.
8. Quoted by *Fortune* editors in *Is Anybody Listening?* (N. Y., 1952), p. 4.
9. G. Bromley Oxnam, *Personalities in Social Reform* (N. Y., 1950), p. 106.
10. *Era* (N. Y., 1953), pp. ix, 3.
11. D. E. Lilienthal, *Big Business: A New*
12. Lilienthal, Cited Work, pp. 3, 4, 6.
13. *N. Y. Times*, October 19, 1951.
14. *Proceedings of the Academy of Political Science* (N. Y.), May, 1950, pp. 144-45.
15. H. Aptheker, ed., *A Documentary History of the Negro People in the United States* (N. Y., 1951), p. 164; see also pp. 666-69, 856.
16. *Saturday Review*, November 21, 1953.
17. *Fortune* editors, *Why Do People Buy?* (N. Y., 1953), p. 121.
18. *Fortune* editors, *Is Anybody Listening?* (N. Y., 1952), p. 112.
19. Quoted in *UE Steward*, September, 1953.
20. Gilbert Geis, in *The Progressive*, March, 1950.
21. *Curriculum, Leaflet No. 2* (State Education Dep't., Albany, 1953), p. 29.
22. *Saturday Review*, Nov. 21, 1953, p. 36.
23. Documentation for quotations from and data concerning these historians will be found in my "History and Reality", in *Mainstream*, vol. I, no. 4, 1947.

* For other aspects of the fascination of American historical writing see my "The New Conservatives" in *Masses & Mainstream*, April, 1953.

By M

COAL

any o

ica, re

the ar

Instab

lessnes

its dis

sic inc

ly an

nomic

they a

count

Nov

vance

all the

indust

metho

frantic

with c

at hor

throth

tries.

nomic

petitic

ened,

miner

won

heigh

carry

catastr

Her

of the

alway

gain

Some Problems in Coal Mining

By Mike Meadows

COAL MINING, probably more than any other major industry in America, reflects most sharply and clearly the anarchy of capitalist production. Instability, insecurity, chaos, planlessness and chronic "sickness" are its distinguishing features. This basic industry also mirrors more quickly and more thoroughly the economic stresses and storms long before they are felt in other fields of the country's economy.

Now, a social system in an advanced stage of decay is intensifying all the inherent contradictions in the industry that flow from a capitalist method of production. There is a frantic and senseless competition with other energy sources and fuels at home, while efforts are made to throttle production in other countries. As the spectre of another economic crisis comes closer, the competition within the industry is sharpened, and the attacks on the coal miners—on their union, their hard-won gains, their pension plan—are heightened to force the workers to carry the burden of the oncoming catastrophe.

Here, too, from the very infancy of the industry, the class struggle has always been at its sharpest. Every gain made by the miners in wages,

mine safety, in working conditions, as well as the very existence of the union itself, have been won in bitter and often bloody conflicts with the coal barons over many decades. The miners have been traditionally the most militant section of the American proletariat. They have no illusions as to the humanitarianism of the coal operators. If John L. Lewis now enjoys a position of respect and prestige among the workers of our country, it is because in the later stages of his career he has not hesitated to lead the miners boldly into fierce and difficult battles for important economic improvements. Even now the UMW union is girding itself, financially and otherwise, for the difficult struggles it envisions in the near future.

The status of the industry and of the men who work in the mines in capitalist America is in glaring contrast to that in the countries of people's democracy and Socialism. There the coal industry is vigorous and thriving, and the main problem is how to improve and extend production. There the coal miners are the most honored and respected citizens of the country, their representatives occupying positions in even the highest governmental bodies. Their stand-

ard of living—the care for the health, welfare, education, cultural needs, etc.—is steadily rising, and the curse of unemployment has been banished. Small wonder that the U.S. government forbids American miners and other workers to visit the Soviet Union.

THE "SLUMP" IN COAL PRODUCTION

For over a year and a half the warning signals of the approaching economic storms have been presenting themselves ever more insistently. Most miners feel that we are again on the verge of another "depression." They tie this in directly with the present Administration. The memories of the Hoover "depression" of the thirties are still fresh in their minds.

The mine owners are also keenly aware of the mounting difficulties in the industry. R. T. Todhunter, President of the Barnes and Tucker Co. of Barnesboro, Pa., stated (*Coal Age*, May 1953) "The next few years may be tough. . . . I'm satisfied we're in a bad slump right now and I can't see anything but the survival of the fittest." A fitting outlook for life in the capitalist jungle.

Unemployment in the coal mining areas is emerging as the No. 1 problem. Mines are closing down on all sides—especially the smaller, less mechanized mines—and laying off men by the thousands. Others are working two and three days a week. Mass purchasing power is curtailed, and "ghost" towns have again made their appearance.

In the first quarter of 1953 (as reported by the *New York Times*, June 14, 1953) two major industries showed a sharp drop in net incomes in relation to a similar period in 1952. They were: Farm machinery a drop of 31%, and coal and coke producers a drop of 61%. This took place at a time when all the rest of the basic industries still showed an over-all increase of 9% over the previous year. These two industries show clearly the crisis features of our economy, and the serious problems that lie ahead.

RECENT DECLINE IN COAL PRODUCTION

The annual capacity of bituminous coal production in the U.S. is conservatively estimated at 800 million tons of coal. Actual production during the past five years was as follows: 1948: 599,518,000; 1949: 437,868,000; 1950: 516,311,000; 1951: 531,872,000; 1952: 459,132,000.

The peak of post-war production was attained in 1948. The following year there was a decline of 161 million tons, reflecting the general economic decline in the country that year. The war in Korea and the enormous demand created by the armaments production stimulated economic activity and served to check the decline.

But in 1952, with war production at peak levels, the production of coal took a nose dive to the 1949 level. The first six months of 1953 have witnessed a continuation and in fact, a sharp acceleration of this trend in

the co
mated
will
35 mi
The
from
produ
of Per
of a c
of ye
miner
has d
miner
59%
same
tion a
The
tion a
702,00
296,00
The
lems
is inc
produ
level.
one t
were
claim
Empl
Barre
trage
mine
GRO
CO
Th
spec
out t
ening
duce
try.
Th

the coal mining industry. It is estimated that in West Virginia there will be a further drop in 1953 of over 35 million tons under the 1952 level.

The area suffering most sharply from the effects of a decline in coal production is the anthracite region of Pennsylvania. It is part and parcel of a continuing decline over a score of years. Since 1930 the number of miners employed in the anthracite has dropped from 150,804 to 61,000 miners in December 1952—a drop of 59% in the working force! At the same time the drop in coal production amounted to 46%.

The figures for anthracite production are: 1948: 57,140,000; 1949: 42,702,000; 1950: 44,077,000; 1951: 39,296,000; 1952: 37,075,000.

The serious extent of the problems facing the workers of this area is indicated by the fact that the 1952 production was far below the 1949 level. It was a decline of more than one third. During April 1953 there were 27,572 coal miners who filed claims with the Pennsylvania State Employment service in the Wilkes-Barre area. These facts mirror the tragedy and the problems of the coal miners.

GROWTH OF CONCENTRATION

The slump in coal production is speeding up the process of wiping out the small producers and strengthening the position of the big producers and monopolies in the industry.

There are at present some 9,300

coal mines in the U.S., indicating a lack of large scale concentration. However, in the past decade a decisive change has been taking place. Of the total production in 1951, the 50 biggest mines accounted for 12.5% and in 1952 for 13.8%. While the decline of production in 1952 for the industry as a whole was 12.4%, this group of 50 big mines had a drop of only 3%, and even this was caused by the two-months long steel strike.

Of the 50 biggest mines, fifteen are so-called "captive miners," owned outright by the giant steel corporations. Theirs is the decisive voice in the coal mining industry.

In addition to this, fifteen of the 50 big mines are brand new, having been opened and put into operation since 1945. These new mines are equipped with the most modern machinery for the extraction, cleaning and processing of coal. The outlook now is that hundreds of smaller producers will be closing down operations.

An outstanding example of the growth of concentration in coal mining is the Pittsburgh Consolidation Coal Co. It was formed immediately after the war as one of the mergers executed by the now Secretary of the Treasury, George M. Humphrey of Cleveland. This giant combination was created by the merger of the Renton mines (George Love), Consolidation Coal Co. of West Virginia (Rockefeller), Pittsburgh Coal Co. (Mellon) and the Hanna Coal Co. of Ohio (Humphrey). It has large scale operations in Ohio, Pennsylvania and West Virginia.

In 1951, the Pittsburgh Consolidation produced 28,160,000 tons of coal and showed a net profit of \$16,039,319 equivalent to \$7.44 a share. In 1952 it produced 26,344,000 tons of coal, and had a net profit of \$14,866,393—equivalent to \$6.86 a share. These figures are typical for the industry and reflect the enormous profits squeezed out of the workers by the giant corporations in this field.

MECHANIZATION AND JOBS

Coal mining has been the last basic industry in America to be affected by the advance of technology and mechanization.

How does this trend affect the miners' jobs? According to figures compiled by the Western Pennsylvania Operators Association (*Pittsburgh Post-Gazette*, May 26, 1953), twelve years ago there were 72,000 coal miners employed in the ten counties of western Pennsylvania. Today there are less than 37,000 miners still employed, several thousand only part time. This is a drop of 48% in the total working force in a matter of twelve years. In the same period the drop in production was less than 24%.

The coal miners are therefore confronted with a three-fold problem (1) a steady decline in over-all production of coal due to a decline in demand for coal; (2) steadily increasing mechanization and modernization of mine production, which requires proportionately less men to operate them (3) the appearance of crisis features in the whole national

economy, reflected particularly in coal production.

It is against the background of this general economic situation that the coal miners and their union have been striving to gain improvements in their general working and living conditions.

MILITANCY OF THE MINERS

The coal miners have gone far in gaining improvements in wage levels, increasing their purchasing power and raising their living standards. In this respect they have been pace setters in the basic industries.

These gains have been won by militant and determined struggles. The coal barons, backed up by the power of finance capital nationally, have used their entire economic and political power to beat down the miners. They used the courts, injunctions, the Taft-Hartley Act, government seizure of the mines for strike-breaking purposes, all the vast machinery of coercion of the government apparatus, including the FBI as well as the threatened use of the armed forces (1947).

The miners have had ample opportunity to test their unity and their organized strength in countless fierce struggles against the power of the masters of the coal industry, and the entire ruling class. They know full well that these struggles are not ended, that they will have to fight even harder for the existence of their union in the days ahead. Already the Southern coal operators are openly threatening to challenge

union
It i
UMW
unco
peal
bor A
TAF
Th
large
refus
itself
John
nity
law p
gress
most
has
right
cause
a sco
to a
amer
ly cr
and
idea
that,
union
tion
its o
Th
base
tions
union
ence
the c
alize
and
the
They
are
atta

union organization in their mines.

It is no accident therefore, that the UMWA has waged a consistent and uncompromising battle for the repeal of the Taft-Hartley Slave Labor Act.

TAFT-HARTLEY ACT

The UMWA is one of the few large unions in our country that has refused to accept and accommodate itself to the vicious T-H Slave Act. John L. Lewis has lost no opportunity to blast and to denounce the law publicly and before various Congressional Committees, with the most scathing condemnation. He has called upon Congress for outright repeal of the vicious Act because: "It has been a pestilence and a scourge, and these many proposals to amend it are futile. You can't amend a rotten apple." He has sharply criticized the leaders of the AFL and CIO for going along with the idea of amendments. More than that, the UMWA is the only major union that has rejected the extraction of anti-Communist oaths from its officers at all levels.

These actions of the UMW are based upon very realistic considerations affecting the welfare of the union. They draw on their experiences of the past and are estimating the difficulties lying ahead. They realize that the full strike-breaking and union-busting potentialities of the T-H have not yet been utilized. They know that the coal operators are sharpening their knives for the attack. Big Business is, in fact, seek-

ing to amend the T-H to prohibit industry-wide bargaining.

The union is now experiencing ever increasing difficulties in organizing the non-union mines. A large portion of the strip mining operations in Kentucky, West Virginia, Ohio and Pennsylvania are unorganized. They produce about 25% of all the coal. Sharp struggles have developed in the course of efforts to unionize them. In Clay County, West Virginia, some 500 men have been on strike since September, 1952 for union recognition in their mine. All the old strike-breaking methods of the past have been revived—including the use of armed thugs, and terror. A number of the miners have been framed on murder charges in the shooting of one of the thugs. Similar struggles are going on in many other places.

The main weakness of the UMW campaign against the T-H law has been that the same degree of militant expression and opposition has not been generated in the locals, districts and communities, as in the top levels of leadership. It is not enough for Lewis to make scathing denunciations in Washington. His eloquent statements must be given mass support and solid backing in every local, in every community. Congressmen must be made to feel the mass pressure of the people in their districts. Otherwise scathing denunciations lose their substance.

To date this has not materialized to any important degree. The UMW leadership has not organized the campaign down below in the dis-

tricts and locals. But the need of such local actions is obvious if Lewis' call for the repeal of the T-H Act is to be brought to realization. It is of vital importance that the union get the ball rolling at local levels at the earliest possible moment so as to influence the coming session of Congress.

The campaign for repeal of the T-H Act can also provide a solid basis for united labor action, and community actions locally. This is especially true for the steel locals and mine locals. Such unity can be developed in action—on specific issues. The miners are in an excellent position to initiate and to cement such mass actions.

WELFARE AND RETIREMENT FUND

One of the outstanding achievements of the UMWA, flowing from their militant struggles in the post-war period, was the establishment of the Welfare and Retirement Fund. This fund is financed by the payment of a specified sum from each ton of coal mined under a union contract. The present contract which went into effect Oct. 1, 1952 set this payment at 40 cents per ton of coal. The revenue for this fund is now collected on approximately 88% of the bituminous coal produced in the U.S.

The benefits provided by this Fund to its members are of inestimable value to the men who dig coal. The rate of deaths and injuries in the coal mines far exceeds that of any

basic industry in America. During the 1952 fiscal year alone, the expenditures for hospital and medical cases paid from the Fund totalled \$49,996,517. The building of hospitals and the establishment of medical centers in mining areas is another splendid recent action financed by the Welfare Fund. These are important steps in providing the long-needed medical service to the men in the mines.

In addition to this the Welfare Fund has undertaken to provide old age pensions. During the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, there were 45,339 retired miners on the rolls who received pensions totalling \$51,762,639. However, it must be emphasized that, good as this is, it is by no means sufficient to meet the growing problems of unemployment in the coal mines.

The coal operators have never reconciled themselves to the Miners Welfare and Retirement Fund. They will, without a doubt, attempt to smash it and wipe it out at the first opportunity. They anticipate that the oncoming hard times and unemployment in the coal industry will provide that opportunity. The decision of the Bureau of Internal Revenue, recently made, *that the miners' pensions are taxable as personal income*, is a first step in that direction. The union must now, in good time, gird itself for these attacks. The attempt to tax the miners' pensions is an issue of concern to all labor. Joint actions to defeat this, and other taxes on the people, should

be la
tion i
public
now t
they

THE

In
the m
a lon
ment
produ
gaged
impos
cially

Als
keepi
UMV
vario
struct
way,
flood
count
ects i
hydro
ducin
electr
Valle
the
comp
finds
the
whic
of th
As
more
advan
the
beco
have
ing
ings

be launched at all levels. The taxation issue is a mass issue. The Republicans promised tax cuts—but now they are increasing taxes where they hurt the most.

THE FIGHT FOR JOBS

In an effort to protect the jobs of the miners, the UMWA has waged a long battle against the encroachments of all other fuels for energy producing purposes. It is now engaged in a vigorous campaign to ban imports of cheap oil residues, especially from Venezuela.

Also in pursuing its objective of keeping down all competition, the UMW has actively participated in various campaigns against the construction of the St. Lawrence Seaway, and the construction of great flood control projects throughout the country. In all instances such projects include the construction of giant hydro-electric plants capable of producing enormous quantities of cheap electric power like the Tennessee Valley Authority. In engaging in the futile fight against "industrial competition" the UMW very often finds itself in alliance with some of the most profit-hungry monopolies, which care not at all for the welfare of the miners or the people generally.

As mass unemployment becomes more menacing, various panaceas are advanced to meet the problem. In all the coal areas where lay-offs have become widespread, local movements have been initiated aimed at "bringing in new industries." Mass meetings are held and finances raised.

Proposals have been advanced to make a gift of factories to companies that move in, financed by collections from the people. A strange sight indeed—buying factories for the capitalists out of the meagre resources of the unemployed!

These movements have been initiated by the most conservative elements and received considerable support from the miners. Progressives have, by and large, ignored them. But the fact remains that these schemes have in many places gotten strong mass backing. The workers are looking for some positive program to meet their problems and, in the absence of anything better, may be temporarily swept into such utopian class-collaborationist schemes. There are many honest, sincere people participating in them.

It is clearly a responsibility of all progressives not to ignore or isolate themselves from such movements, no matter how confused. We must be with the people to be able to point out the fallacies, and to win them for a correct program of struggle.

As lay-offs spread in the coal fields, the miners are reacting in a militant manner, resorting to stoppages, slow-downs and other means of protest. Seniority is rapidly coming to the fore as an important issue. One example of many in the recent period was the week-long stoppage in two captive mines of the Jones and Loughlin Steel Corporation in Washington County. 490 miners were furloughed by the company because of overproduction. 3,500 men in the

two pits walked out in protest. The company then agreed to employ some of the men in its steel mills in Aliquippa, Pa. This of course meant a wage-cut for the men, besides long hours of travel to work each day. Also as lay-offs develop in steel they will be the first to go since they lack seniority. In the process of the lay-offs, the company also tried to weed out some of the older men, but the stoppage enforced the seniority clause in the mine contract. The management also tried to keep seven of the foremen by laying-off instead miners with much longer seniority. This too was defeated.

In some cases when lay-offs threatened, the men voluntarily agreed to reduce the work week for all, as a mark of solidarity. Of course this is an unsatisfactory solution since it drastically cuts down the income for all those affected.

THE 30-HOUR WEEK

Stimulated by these events, there is now emerging a new demand throughout the coal fields—the demand for a *thirty hour week*, with no reduction in pay. The miners now consider this as the key issue to fight for in the next period. To a certain degree it is considered to be even more important than the wage increase issue. It is generally expected that in the next contract negotiations the U.M.W.A. is going to make this one of its central demands.

Of course the 30-hour week issue (at the same pay) is not a new demand in the coal fields. Before the

war the miners fought consistently for a reduction of the work week. It was one of the most popular demands, and they did succeed in winning a 35-hour week. They gave up their demand temporarily during the war. Now the time has come again to place it in the center of a program to safeguard the jobs and interests of the men who dig coal.

It is necessary to make this demand a mass issue. It should become the concern of every U.M.W. local, of district conventions, as well as of the mining areas generally. Steps should be undertaken to secure the cooperation of all other unions also. The repercussions have extended far beyond the mining industry. The steel workers and the auto workers are also giving serious thought to the 30-hour week, in view of the expected growth of unemployment there. The workers consider this issue as far more practical than the guaranteed annual wage projected by the leaders of these two unions. Progressives should guard, however, against any attempt to play off one against the other. Both issues can be advanced in a program to better the conditions of the workers.

The 30-hour week can become an issue of joint action, especially of the steel and coal unions. Joint actions of the Mine and Steel Unions would be far more formidable, and their united strength secure far greater benefits, than is the case now. Unity of action below, *i.e.*, in the locals and districts, can help to advance general labor unity much better than

discuss
the top
A con
to a
coal ar
ideas p
forces,
can m
connect
for the
tic worl
financ
been a
military
propria
one hu
used. A
made t
make i
program
cause o
tion.

UNEMI
COM

Paym
ensatio
importa
tiate h
In th
-West
he pres
state leg
fits for
the We
mple,
ments t
minor
There
assage
Move
not yet

discussions that are limited only to the top officials.

A comprehensive program is needed to meet the jobs question in the coal areas; not the futile, utopian ideas promoted by some reactionary forces, but a realistic program that can muster mass support. In this connection there is a burning need for the development of a major public works program. How can this be financed? Enormous funds have been appropriated by Congress for military purposes. Of these huge appropriations there are still more than one hundred billions that are unused. A mass demand should be made to transfer this money and make it available for a public works program which would serve the cause of peace, and not of destruction.

UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION

Payment of unemployment compensation now assumes an extremely important role in alleviating immediate hardships caused by lay-offs.

In the main coal producing states—West Virginia and Pennsylvania—the pressure has been the greatest on state legislatures to increase the benefits for the unemployed. A bill in the West Virginia hopper, for example, calls for an increase in payments to \$30 a week plus \$4 for each minor child, a total of \$46 a week. There are good prospects for the passage of the bill.

Movements of a broad nature have not yet developed to guarantee the

passage of such measures. In most UMW locals the task is still relegated to the district leaders and lobbyists in the state capitals. Experience shows that only real mass action and pressure can bring results. It is quite possible to bring the U.M.W., C.I.O., A. F. of L. and independent unions into joint local and statewide actions on just such legislative issues.

A good demonstration of this kind of united action was given in West Virginia. On taking office this year, Governor Wm. C. Marland immediately submitted a program to the legislature to increase the educational facilities of the state, to undertake a huge program of building roads "to get the farmers out of the mud," etc. To finance this program he proposed the passage of a "Severance Tax On Natural Resources." This was a tax on the corporations exploiting the great natural resources of the State.

The Governor himself led a fight for the adoption of his program. The State organizations of CIO, UMW and AFL actively supported and participated in the fight, their representatives appeared before committees of the legislature, mobilized their membership in the locals, etc. Passage of the program was only blocked by desperate maneuvers in the Committees that prevented the bills from reaching the floor. But the fight is not ended and even stronger efforts are expected to be taken in the next session of the State Assembly.

In the elections of 1952 the UMW of West Virginia had played in many respects a decisive role, as a labor

force within the State Democratic Party. The miners' support guaranteed the election of Marland, himself a former coal miner, as Governor of the State. The backing of the miners also sent Harley Kilgore and Mathew Neely to the Senate, and some liberal-minded Democrats to Congress. This applies equally to the State legislature.

Another example of independent electoral activity (within the Democratic Party) is Washington County, Pa. For the past decade a county organization of Labor's Non-Partisan League has been in existence. Besides the U.M.W. it also includes the C.I.O. and A. F. of L. on a county level. The miners have an important voice in the affairs of the county administration, and have elected a number of their candidates to key posts.

There are many such examples. It indicates the possibilities for constructive electoral activities in the mining areas, and the need to devote close attention to the development of a legislative program to meet the needs of the people. Such a program should include such issues as a sharp reduction of taxes on the workers, public works program, mine safety legislation, improved old age and unemployment benefits, improved medical and health services.

Of particular consequence would be demands for state and local F.E.P.C. legislation.

In raising this issue and the demand for equal rights of the Negro people generally, it must be stressed

that much remains to be done on this question within the U.M.W.A. itself. Although a large part of the union membership is Negro and there has been a healthy tradition in the past of Negro leadership on a local level, there are no Negroes in the top leadership of the Union, and practically none on a district level. This is a major problem that needs grappling within the fight for inner union democracy. It must become the concern of the entire membership. Such a program can help to unite and activate the main sections of labor and the Negro people in a joint electoral movement.

FOREIGN TRADE

The mounting economic difficulties in the mining areas make it imperative that the issue of foreign trade be brought to the fore. This can be done in the most concrete manner.

The greatest potential market in the world today is not in armaments, but in peaceful trade, especially with the Soviet Union, China, and the People's Democracies. China alone needs a colossal number of tractors, heavy trucks, rails, locomotives, electric generators for hydro-electric power plants, etc. These are items we make in abundance. Trade with China alone can give jobs to three million American workers.

This can materialize only under conditions of peaceful relations and coexistence with the Socialist world. The possibilities for peaceful settlement of all international problems

are pr
miners
play
for pe
with
Ver
bring
the m
ship h
on int
not h
tive r
miner
verita
teria.
of the
sify th
to the
for pe

THE

The
increa
vangu
minin
help t
strugg
imme
show
that t
not ar
ly un
achiev
must
velop
and t
miner
respo

are present and growing. The coal miners, in their own interest, can play an important role in the fight for peace and friendly cooperation with all countries.

Very little has been done so far to bring these facts to the attention of the miners. The U.M.W.A. leadership has taken a reactionary position on international questions, and does not help the miners to play a positive role. On the other hand the miners are being deluged with a veritable Niagara of vicious war hysteria. It is essential that all sectors of the progressive movement intensify their efforts to bring the truth to the miners in the fight for jobs, for peace, for security.

THE PARTY'S TASKS

The Communist Party should now increase its work and its role as the vanguard of the working class in the mining areas. We should not only help to develop a correct program of struggle on the burning, everyday, immediate issues. We should also show truthfully and convincingly that the miners' basic problems will not and cannot be solved permanently under capitalism. This can be achieved only under Socialism. We must analyze concretely the basic developments of capitalist economy, and their impact on the lives of the miners. That is a specific political responsibility of the Party. Living

experience itself will bear out our conclusions, not least among the miners.

In this connection we should draw on the actual facts as to the status of the coal miners in the Soviet Union and the People's Democracies—the honored position they occupy in the economic, social and political life of their country. We should show how the scourge of unemployment, and the misery it brings, has been banished; we should show the great care and concern of the people's governments for the health, culture and general well-being of the miners and all working people. We should increase the flow of literature into the mining areas a hundredfold.

Lewis and the top leadership of the union are firm supporters of the capitalist system. We Communists fundamentally disagree. We advocate the social ownership of all means of production in our country, including the coal mines. Only under a system of collective ownership, under Socialism, with the working class in the leadership, can all the problems of well-being and security for the American people be solved permanently.

We recognize and honor the traditions and the great contributions made by the coal miners in the labor movement of America. We are confident that they will play a no less honorable role in the great struggles that lie ahead.

The Mexican-American Question

By James Burnhill

(An earlier article by the same author, "The Mexican People in the Southwest" appeared in Political Affairs for September.)

WHAT IS THE character of the Mexican minority in our Southwest? Carey McWilliams, in his study *North From Mexico* (N. Y., 1949), begins his answer as follows: It has "been rooted in space—in a particular region—over a long period of years. . . . Mexicans were *annexed by conquest*, along with the territory they occupied, and in effect their cultural autonomy was guaranteed by a treaty."

McWilliams also emphasized the "spatial relation of Mexico to the Southwest, the proximity of the border, the closeness of the parent group, are all important factors."

And further:

The Mexican minority, actually a majority in some areas, occupies a unique relation to the land, the culture, and the institutions of the region. Like the Indians, the Mexicans were "here first." It is misleading, therefore, to assume that they occupy a relation to the majority element which is like that, say, of Poles in Detroit or Italians in New York. Eighty-five percent of the Spanish-speaking people reside in a belt of territory about 150 miles wide, paralleling the border, and extending from Los Angeles to the Gulf of Mexico.

It is in this area that the great

bulk of Mexican migration since 1900, that brought to the Southwest nearly ten percent of the total population of Mexico, has settled.

The 1938 estimate of Mexican population in the U.S. made by the National Resources Board was three million. Subsequently there has been a large influx from Mexico, but precise figures are lacking. In addition, of course, there has been a normal population growth. In the three years, 1947-1949, "illegal" residents numbered from 500,000 to 600,000.* Despite mass deportations, reaching the fantastic figure of 565,000 in 1950, there is no doubt as to the ever-swelling numbers of the Mexican minority, now reaching an estimated figure of four million.

"A STRONGLY MARKED NATIONAL MINORITY"

These four million people constitute what Foster defines as a "strong-

* "Illegal," of course, is a misnomer, as is the chauvinist term "wetback," for these workers are openly admitted to the U.S. by the immigration officials who periodically let down border restrictions at the regular "ports of entry" when the big farmers demand additional labor. "Non-contract laborers" would be a more accurate term to describe these hundreds of thousands who are openly recruited to labor in the U.S. but kept outside even the limited protection of the "labor contract" and in an "illegal" status so they can be deported when their labor is not in demand.

ly mar
"grew
War o
immig
integr
been
strong
crimin
their c
status
easier
to im
are a
Englis
the ou
again
role.
"Mexi
race a
of the
tance
Spani
equat
consci
The
have
tural
cultur
chara
foods,
stant
old M
both
devel
forts
pletel
The
can p
in w
evolv
300 y
own

ly marked national minority" which "grew as a result of the Mexican War of 1846-48 and because of recent immigration from Mexico." Their integration in the U.S. nation has been retarded and prevented by strong national prejudices and discrimination which serve to re-enforce their oppressed economic status. This status of inequality has been all the easier for the American imperialists to impose as the Mexican people are a Spanish-speaking people in an English-speaking nation. Also, from the outset, white chauvinism directed against the Indian people played a role. As McWilliams points out: "Mexicans are related to Indians by race and culture with the Indian part of their cultural and racial inheritance being more important than the Spanish. Mexicans were consistently equated with Indians by the race conscious Anglo-Americans."

The Mexican people in the U.S. have a common tradition and cultural heritage and language. This culture, manifested in distinctive characteristics of music, arts, crafts, foods, films, festivals, etc., is constantly influenced by contact with old Mexico. The Mexican people both stubbornly defend and further develop their culture against the efforts of the U.S. bourgeoisie to completely obliterate it.

The cultural heritage of the Mexican people is indigenous to the area in which the majority reside, has evolved over a period of more than 300 years and, of course, bears its own distinctive characteristics as dis-

tinguished from the characteristics of the "mother" nation.

Finally, it must be emphasized that the Mexican people have made an invaluable contribution to the history, the economic development, the industrial and agricultural techniques, and to the general cultural development of the Southwest.

There is a strong tendency to ignore or deny the specific elements of the oppression of the Mexican people as a national minority and to reduce the question solely to a matter of class oppression. This is true even of some Communists and certainly is widely prevalent in the labor movement.

No one, of course, will deny that the vast majority of the Mexican people are exploited as workers, especially as agricultural wage workers. But there is the added fact that they are most sharply and brutally exploited, subject to inequalities in wages, trade-union rights, etc., and that this can only be explained by the fact that they are subject to a special form of intensified exploitation as Mexican workers—members of a national minority.

The struggle for trade-union organization, for decent and equal conditions and rights for the Mexican workers, therefore, immediately involves more than a "simple" economic struggle. It involves *special demands* against inequalities, against wage differentials and for equal pay for the same work, for full seniority and upgrading rights, etc. Moreover, it necessarily involves a struggle

against the chauvinist prejudices that have hitherto prevented the labor movement from undertaking fully the trade-union organization of Mexican workers and defense of their economic, social and political rights. Nor can the fact be ignored that these questions involve the full equality of Mexican workers as trade-union members including the right of election, and the actual election, to positions of leadership in the labor movement.

From these observations one must conclude: a) the chauvinist error of regarding the questions confronting the Mexican people as "class" questions alone, leads to an inability to conduct an effective struggle against the specific forms of special oppression that face the Mexican people; b) it renders the labor movement itself incapable of uniting the working class on the basis of equality of the Mexican workers in the trade-union organizations; it weakens the position of the working class as a whole.

THE NEGRO QUESTION AND THE MEXICAN QUESTION

Frequently, an incorrect comparison is made between the position of the Mexican question in the United States and that of the Negro people. Such a comparison negates the fact that the Negro people in the South (specifically in the Black Belt) constitute an oppressed nation, not a national minority. It leads to underestimating the Negro question,

to blurring over its special features and the fundamental issue of the full rights of the rising young Negro nation. This comparison can only obscure the decisive importance of the question of an alliance between the American working class and the Negro liberation movement, as well as the question of establishing unity between the Negro people and the Mexican people in the United States.

On the other hand, if the comparison is made with the inference that the Mexican people also constitute a nation within the United States, this too is wrong.

Torn away and forever cut off from their various homelands on the African continent, the Negro people were forcibly settled in the U.S. For over 300 years they have been kept—first as slaves, then in virtual peonage—as the labor force on the plantations of the South. They were not, as were the majority of the Mexicans in the Southwest, cut off from their home country merely by a political boundary. The South was their only homeland, and it was in the South that they developed their common struggles and the inner ties characteristic of a nation.

With the Mexican minority in the Southwest, the historical development was different, even as regards the extensive areas of Mexican majority along the border. The majority of Mexican population is a product of relatively recent immigration kept from absorption in the adopted country by a set of special barriers; on the

other
Mexi
trav
the U
try.
ist in
the o
of re
some
clos
ican
mon
other
in th
demo
towa
teristi
that
comm
a nee
hood.
level
of th
cohes
comm
In
pariso
positi
that o
the B
lar in
ties.
a com
ularly
nation
chauv
direct
MAIN
OF
Wh

other hand a substantial number of Mexican people have traditionally traveled back and forth between the U.S. and their "mother" country. The Mexican communities exist in considerable isolation one from the other with a relatively low level of relationship and communication; some observers remark that often a closer kinship is felt in a given Mexican community to an area of common origin in Mexico than to another remote Mexican community in the U.S. The Mexican minority demonstrates but little of the trend toward a class stratification characteristic of rising nationhood and of that inner bond that a developed common economic life provides as a necessary prerequisite of nationhood. Nor is there the same high level of organization characteristic of the Negro people, despite the cohesive local life of the Mexican community.

In many respects, however, a comparison can be made between the position of the Mexican people and that of the Negro people outside of the Black Belt, as both suffer similar inequalities as national minorities. There is the strongest basis of a common bond of struggle, particularly against the vicious system of national chauvinism and white chauvinism that is fundamentally directed against both peoples.

MAIN CHARACTERISTICS OF MEXICAN PEOPLE

What are the main characteristics

of the life and conditions of the Mexican people in the Southwest?

1) The overwhelming majority are reduced to the status of wage workers on the land, with a substantial number employed in mining and railroad labor. Paid the lowest level of wages, often with lower wage differentials in the same industries, the Mexican workers constitute with the Negro workers the most oppressed sections of the working class both on the land and in industry in the Southwest. This is reflected further in the very small development of a bourgeois class stratum whose position and ideological influence is, however, buttressed by the influence and even capital investment of the highly developed bourgeoisie of Mexico. There is some development of a middle-class, restricted pretty much to small merchants.

2) The Mexican people, who are in their majority an urban-dwelling people, are forced both in the cities and as migratory workers into segregated communities. Here abominable housing and sanitary facilities create terrible living and health conditions as demonstrated in a very high incidence of such diseases as tuberculosis and a very high infant mortality rate.

3) This system of exploitation and discrimination is maintained by police brutality and the denial of the most elementary democratic rights. The large number of "illegal" Mexicans, for which the U.S. government and employers are them-

selves responsible, is seized upon as a pretext for terrorizing and intimidating the entire Mexican people.

From the outset the Mexican people have been deprived of political rights and adequate representation at all levels of government, from hundreds of local communities to Congress, where these more than four million people have but one representative.

This general disfranchisement and inequality still prevail despite the increasing political consciousness and militancy of the Mexican people. The political disability takes on fuller significance when it is appreciated that the Mexican people constitute over half the population of New Mexico; half the population of Tucson, Arizona; and that a million and a half reside in Texas and, in a contiguous area of 24 Texas counties, form from 50% to 70% of the population.

4) The Mexican people are subject to a systematic effort to rob them of their own language, reduce them to a status of illiteracy, and to deprive them of their own cultural heritage. This is reflected in the inadequacy of educational facilities, the fact that children of migratory workers get virtually no schooling, and denial of the right to education in the Spanish language through the refusal to establish systematic bilingual education even in areas of Mexican majority.

5) Re-enforcing this system of oppression there have been deliberately developed the vilest forms of na-

tional chauvinism and white chauvinism among the American people generally.

CONCLUSIONS ON POLICY AND PROGRAM

The policy and program of the Communist Party necessarily must flow from an analysis of the specific conditions and historical background such as this article, and the preceding one, *begin* to project. The Communist approach to all phases of the national question must always be *concrete*. It can never be dealt with in generalities. With respect to the question of national minorities, as Stalin pointed out in his classical work on the national question, the struggle should be directed toward the removal of those inequalities that stand in the way of the eventual integration fully into the life of the nation within which the national minority exists. In other words, it must be a struggle to establish full *equality* in the social, economic and political life of the nation for the national minority, including the rights to its own language, religion and culture.

McWilliams, in dealing with a number of Mexican-American organizations such as the "Service Clubs," "Unity Leagues," etc., declares that these organizations "unlike various Left-wing efforts to organize the Spanish-speaking people . . . have their roots, not in international politics, but in the basic needs of the Spanish speaking community."

This
tion o
which
the ba
ple. T
ceeds
with t
nation
on the
corpor
inist s
with t
tion f
of thei
policie
relatio
can im
Moreo
fundar
can pe
whole,
strugg
Mexica
an inv
workin
The
ate Co
set for
Nation
stated

The
to un
against
superior
discrim
full so
pledge
of Me
and na
litical
and th
We

This is not a correct characterization of the Communist approach, which does proceed precisely from *the basic needs* of the Mexican people. The difference is that it proceeds to struggle for these needs with the invaluable guide of international working-class experience on the national question that is incorporated in Marxist-Leninist-Stalinist science. It insists upon dealing with these basic needs, not in isolation from, but within the context of their relationship to "international policies," in this case, particularly in relation to the specific role of American imperialism in the world today. Moreover, it also proceeds from the fundamental interests of the American people and working class as a whole, of their responsibility in this struggle and their relationship to the Mexican minority which constitutes an invaluable ally of the American working class.

The main elements of an immediate Communist Party program were set forth in resolutions of the 14th National Convention in 1948 which stated:

The Communist Party pledges itself to undertake an unceasing struggle against all forms of anti-Mexican race-superiority propaganda, for an end to discrimination in employment and for full social and political equality. We pledge ourselves to fight for the election of Mexican candidates to local, state and national office, to demand the political representation they are entitled to, and the unqualified right to vote.

We support the Mexican people in

their demands for the right fully to use their own language, Spanish, and the freedom to exercise and develop their culture. We further pledge to fight for all Mexican-American veterans to get the full use of G.I. benefits; to undertake a struggle for the extension of Social Security benefits to agricultural workers; and to demand that adequate federal, state and local appropriations be made to launch a real health and housing program in the Mexican communities and for decent wages and working conditions and special housing and educational facilities for migratory workers.

The fight for such a program must, of course, be based upon full consideration of the growing movement among the Mexican-American people. One highly significant development has been the relatively recent emergence of the Southwestern Council on Education of the Spanish-Speaking People, headed by Dr. Sanchez, of the University of Texas. This body is an outgrowth of various studies and institutes, conducted largely by the universities, that began to develop during World War II. It represents the main body of intellectuals, middle class elements, political figures of the Mexican-American communities, as well as non-Mexican supporters of the movement. Highly significant is the participation of large numbers of recent university graduates, mostly former G.I.'s, who, by and large, are militant in defense of their rights. This group has won a substantial mass base largely through the "GI Forum" clubs, centered in Texas, claim-

ing a membership of some 20,000 in 600 local groups that are engaged primarily in a struggle at the local level around issues of community needs and welfare.

Influenced by liberal and Social-Democratic currents, this movement centers attention on the question of "developing leadership," but also shows a considerable awareness of the necessity of tackling the fight against the oppressed economic status of the Mexican people.

Basically this movement reflects the pressure of a growing militancy among the Mexican-American people, dissatisfaction with mere "token representation," the demand for more effective leadership and organization. It also reflects an increase in the numbers and influence of the intellectuals and petty-bourgeoisie, mainly from the ranks of young ex-GI's. All in all, it is one of the major currents within the movement for full equality of the Mexican-American people.

Another important fact to assess is the present role of a number of the long established organizations among the Mexican-American people. These have rarely attained a mass base in the past and have varied in relative influence in different areas. Among these groups, reflecting primarily petty-bourgeois and bourgeois origin and leadership, have been those sponsored by Mexican Consuls, local Chambers of Commerce, the League of Latin American Citizens, unity leagues, some fraternal mutual benefit

groups, the Community Service Organization, and also numerous temporary local united committees on various issues.

There has been some tendency in Left circles to write these off as of no importance. But quite the contrary is true. The general upsurge among the Mexican-American people will also influence these movements, increase their influence and activity in many areas.

Most significant in this connection is the role of the Community Service Organization in Los Angeles in spearheading the mass campaign for registration and representation that culminated in the election of Councilman Roybal. This was a signal achievement to which all elements of the community contributed. The resulting political strength of the Mexican people of Los Angeles is further attested by the re-election without opposition of Councilman Roybal in the recent election. A new, highly organized and politically effective movement was thus developed, within which a key role is played by the C.S.O. (and similar groups) and within which trade union and Left forces also participate and influence developments.

Obviously new conclusions should be drawn both with respect to the role of the Right-led organizations and the forms in which an all-embracing unity can be established in Mexican-American communities.

The role of the largely Left-led National Association of Mexican

Amer
be re
suffer
tende
contri
and i
Mexic
move
cultu
there
as a
tions,
cise i
Certa
for t
occup
itself
ship
tions
ences
Mexi

Th
cant
can-A
base
that
sectic
work
is in
indus
Mine
Unio
work
tute
recen
Mexi
was a
ing s
years

Americans (A.N.M.A.) should also be re-evaluated in this light. While suffering from numerous sectarian tendencies it has made important contributions in various struggles and in building unity among the Mexican people and with the labor movement. It also serves to stimulate cultural activities. Erroneously there have been tendencies to see it as a substitute for other organizations, rather than a means to exercise initiative and struggle for unity. Certainly it would be a grave error for the Left to become solely pre-occupied with A.N.M.A. or to allow itself to be cut off from membership and activity in the organizations that exert the broadest influences among the people of a given Mexican-American community.

* * *

The most important and significant development among the Mexican-American people is the strong base of trade-union organization that has been established among sections of the Mexican industrial workers. The main expression of this is in the metal mining and smelting industry where the independent Mine, Mill and Smelter Workers Union comprises some 15% Mexican workers who in many respects constitute its most militant section. The recent hard-fought Bayard, New Mexico strike of Mexican workers was an example of this militant fighting spirit which has behind it many years of efforts by the Mexican

miners to achieve trade-union organization.

The M.M.S.W.I.U. is outstanding as concerns representation of Mexican workers in the union leadership at the local level, with dozens of these workers coming forward as leaders both in their union and communities. This is true despite such major shortcomings as the lack of representation of Mexican workers on the International Board.

That the basic organized workers among the Mexican people can play a decisive role was amply demonstrated in the 1952 elections in New Mexico when these workers provided the backbone of the coalition that re-elected U.S. Senator Chavez in the face of a determined effort to defeat him.

Considerable numbers of Mexican workers also are organized in unions of the C.I.O. and A. F. of L. among cannery, agricultural, packing, steel, furniture, oil, garment and other industries. The full integration of these workers into the trade-union movement and its leadership would greatly strengthen these unions and also enlarge considerably the core of working-class leadership in the Mexican people's movement generally.

ORGANIZING THE AGRICULTURAL WORKERS

However, the great bulk of the Mexican workers are the non-industrial wage workers on the land and in the food processing industries.

It is impossible to conceive the full unfolding of the struggle for the rights of the Mexican-American people without the organization of this major and decisive section. This, in short, is the key task yet to be undertaken. A number of considerations in successfully undertaking this momentous organizing task include:

1) Important sections of the trade-union movement need to lend their full support, and as the basis for this, conduct an energetic struggle against anti-Mexican chauvinism in their own ranks, so that these workers can be brought into the main stream of the labor movement and be assured of its support. At the present moment the decisive question and starting point should be full support to those unions in the field such as the National Farm Labor Union of the A. F. of L., the A. F. of L. Cannery Workers Union and A. F. of L. Teamsters Union, and the struggles they are developing. Without full recognition of the need for developing leadership from the ranks of the Mexican workers, and conducting activities in the Spanish language, such efforts cannot succeed.

While stressing the necessity for this task, of organizing the agricultural workers, to become the concern of the main forces of the labor movement, the past history of trade-union organization and struggle also teaches another lesson. The importance of the contribution of the Left and Communist movement to these struggles must never be forgotten.

Today, also, they can play an important and even decisive role in initiating and developing movements and organizing activities among the agricultural workers. The same pioneering and militant spirit that imbued Communist work in this field in the '30's would once again achieve tremendous results and this initiative and spirit should be fully developed.

2) Broad support from the widest sections of the Mexican people and the non-Mexican people's forces is also required to create the atmosphere making it possible to break through the traditional anti-labor, strike-breaking domination of the big agricultural interests. There is a basis for such unity, especially in the fight on broad issues such as legislation to extend social security coverage to agricultural workers, support to measures for meeting the plight of the Mexican people and agricultural workers generally with respect to housing, health and educational conditions.

The Communist Party considers the fight for a minimum wage and for social security coverage as basic objectives. It is for extending full trade-union rights and economic benefits to Mexican workers whether they are citizens or not. It calls for a halt to the deportation mania, now intensified under the McCarran-Walter Act, against Mexican nationals. It calls on the labor movement to oppose the policies of the Eisenhower Administration for continuing this contract labor system and the reactionary proposals of the

Preside
tory L
of nor
more
partm
paigm.

At t
for ur
united
ican-A
point
nists i
can-A

Ever
rected
in the
Mexic
els. A
are of
affect
repres
vice C
cation
ple, t
and th
ican-A
gressiv
A.N.N
tentio
table
nume
class
pensal
viding
wider

Unc
numb
Amer
reach
first o
equal
in go

President's Commission on Migratory Labor to deal with the problem of non-contract workers by giving more powers to the immigration department for its deportation campaign.

At this time, the conditions exist for unfolding the broadest type of united movements among the Mexican-American people. This is the point of departure for the Communists in their work among the Mexican-American people.

Every effort should now be directed toward achieving such unity in the fight for the rights of the Mexican-American people at all levels. A number of major questions are of vital concern to and directly affect such varied groups as are represented by the Community Service Organizations, Council on Education of the Spanish-Speaking people, the "G.I. Forum," A.N.M.A., and the unions with substantial Mexican-American memberships. Progressive organizations such as the A.N.M.A. can, by turning their attention in this direction, play a notable role far beyond their present numerical strength. The working-class forces are certainly an indispensable factor in initiating and providing the consistent backbone to wider movements.

Undoubtedly in the near future a number of the questions facing Americans of Mexican descent will reach new and higher levels. The first of these is the fight for full and equal citizenship and representation in government, especially as it will

be expressed in the 1954 Congressional and State elections. While the demand for full equality has been expressed primarily in the fight against police brutality and deportations, against discriminatory practices of all kinds, the movement for representation has assumed widespread proportions and will grow as various other movements develop around social and economic problems. The successful development of this movement will depend not alone upon the degree of organization, unity and political activity among the Mexican people but especially on the extent to which the trade-union movement and other progressive forces move into the fight.

Second, there is a need to develop the broadest possible united struggle against the deportation drive that is now heightened by the McCarran-Walter Act. This can unite the whole of the Mexican-American people, but also must be taken up by the widest movement of labor and people's organizations. This is a vital front of struggle against McCarthyism and the fascist danger. But it will necessarily also develop into a wider struggle against the pro-war and other reactionary policies of the Eisenhower Administration.

Third, is the question of defending the cultural rights of the Mexican-American people from what Foster calls the "strait-jacket" that the American imperialists want to impose upon all national cultures. Involved in this is struggle against the

chauvinist distortions of Mexican culture. On the other hand, a growing movement of the Mexican people will also bring an upsurge in the expression and development of this culture. In this respect, Marxists among the Mexican-American people have a special responsibility in developing these cultural expressions and forms with a content expressing the interests of the Mexican people and of the working class.

FOR WORKING-CLASS UNITY AND ALLIANCE WITH MEXICAN-AMERICAN PEOPLE

The interests of the American working class require a correct approach to the Mexican question. This is not, as some liberals would put it, a matter of finding ways in which the Mexican people "can help themselves." The struggle for a status of equality for the Mexican people is of basic interest to the working class and people's movement. Unless this is understood the unity of the working class in the U.S. will be impaired and a major ally in the people's struggle against Wall Street's program of war and fascism will not be fully mobilized.

In the first instance, the Mexican workers play an important role in a number of basic industries such as mining and smelting, steel, oil, packing and railroad and are among the most exploited section of these workers. The full integration in the labor movement of these workers, and a struggle for their special needs,

will greatly strengthen the unity and militancy of these important class organizations.

Secondly, the wage workers on the land constitute an important section of the working class and a bridge between the working class and the poorest sections of the farmers. Of the roughly four and one-half million agricultural workers in the U.S. a significant proportion are Mexican workers, while in the Southwest they constitute a majority.

Third, the Mexican-American people constitute a powerful potential ally of the American working class to be won for the people's coalition against war and fascism. The Mexican people in the U.S. are strongly anti-imperialist, and certainly have no stake or interest in Wall Street's war program for which an entirely disproportionate number of their sons are mobilized.

The struggle against fascism has a special significance to these people, who are denied the most elementary democratic and civil rights. Therefore, the fight for equal rights for the Mexican-American people must necessarily also merge with the broadest people's fight against war and fascism. And likewise, the demand for full representation at all levels of government for the Mexican-American people, and the putting forward of candidates representing them, will enhance the struggle to elect candidates committed to a labor and people's program, including Negro and labor candidates.

Of special significance in building

a broad
sue of
people
people
Progra
ern Re
correct
equalit
Mexica
In t
Mexica
Jim C
work
practic
should
in the
Rocky
the lil
try we
tus of
The
ghetto
crimin
resent
mon
Mexic
allianc
Street
rected
Fin
firm
ple in
in est
class
of th
imper
Comm
move
lead
Street
Mexi
the U

a broad people's coalition is the issue of unity between the Mexican people in the U.S. and the Negro people's movement. The Common Program put forward by the Southern Region of the Communist Party correctly includes the demand for equality to the million and a half Mexican people of Texas.

In the basic industries employing Mexican workers the fight against Jim Crow practices against Negro workers and similar discriminatory practices against Mexican workers should go hand in hand. Certainly in the metal mining industry of the Rocky Mountain area, breaking down the lily-white character of the industry would likewise advance the status of the Mexican mine workers. The fight against police brutality, ghetto housing, job and school discrimination, and the demand for representation in government are common issues facing both Negro and Mexican people. The heart of this alliance is the fight against Wall Street's race-superiority doctrine, directed against both peoples.

Finally, the establishment of a firm alliance with the Mexican people in the U.S. is an important link in establishing unity of the working class and peoples of all the nations of this hemisphere against "Yankee imperialism." In this respect the Communists and the trade-union movement of the U.S. must take the lead in exposing the role of the Wall Street imperialists in relation to Mexico and the Mexican people in the U.S. as a flagrant example of the

entire policy of the U.S. government toward Latin America.

Some of the liberals talk of the Mexican people of the Southwest as a "bridge to good will" in Latin America. Essentially this amounts to endorsing an effort to use representatives of the Mexican people in the U.S. to cover up for U.S. imperialism. Actually the question must be put differently. The correct attitude toward, and a higher level of struggle for the rights of the Mexican-American people on the part of the American working class will facilitate the development of an alliance of our working class with the peoples of Latin America.

The Communist Party has made important contributions to the struggles of the Mexican people in the U.S. and the fight for full equality over a period of many years. Yet the situation is not satisfactory on this score, nor with respect to the status of membership and influence among the Mexican-American people.

To a degree this reflects a lag in the Party in establishing fully its theoretical position and policy on the Mexican question and the consequent penetration into the ranks of the Party of anti-Mexican chauvinism. At one time in the past the Mexican question was placed in our Party as "a Spanish-speaking question," thus negating the specific aspects of the question and diluting it in an unscientific general characterization essentially similar to the position of Social-Democratic and re-

formist elements.

Likewise during the period of Browder revisionism, with the treatment of the Mexican question as a "national group question," there was no correct approach and no specific attention to the Mexican membership of the Party in such respects as their right to speak Spanish—a necessity to their full integration in the Party.

The resolutions adopted by the 1948 Convention and especially the publication of Foster's *Outline Political History of the Americas* marked a departure from past errors and neglect, but the application and further development of the indicated policies are yet inadequate.

How is it necessary, specifically, to develop further the position of the Party?

The Mexican question should be subjected to further Marxist study in its concrete aspects, history and development, and its relationship to American imperialism as well as to the basic interests of the American working class.

This should not be the domain of "specialists"; on the contrary, the entire Party should be familiar with the main aspects of the question. Nor is this an "academic" task. The Party position will be hammered out in ideological struggle in the political arena where it must actively contend with reactionary bourgeois ideology as well as with various liberal and Social-Democratic concepts.

The fight for a full theoretical understanding and position is, therefore, closely related to the fight for

ideological and political leadership in the working-class movement generally and among the Mexican people. The current books and movies dealing with the Mexican people should be subjected to Marxist criticism, as was done, for example, in relation to the Mexican people with the film "Viva Zapata" in the *Daily Worker* and *Masses & Mainstream*. This should be directed when necessary against such chauvinist errors by progressives as the reference in George Marion's *Bases and Empire* to the Mexican war and subsequent expansionism as "a bright page in history" and the similar error of Meridel Le Sueur in *Wilderness Road*.

One of the serious handicaps historically in the development of the movement of the Mexican people has been a lack of Marxist ideological leadership over a long period of time. The Marxist position has exerted a profound influence upon the Negro people's movement, for instance, over a period of decades going back to the Civil War. The Communists should undertake to bring this deficiency in relation to the Mexican question to a decisive end.

Primarily the Communist position must be regarded as a guide to action in the struggles and movements around the Mexican question, and as a weapon with which to eradicate all manifestations of anti-Mexican chauvinism from the ranks of the Party. The test of policy is, therefore, its application within the Party and by the Party in its work in

the la
It is
the Co
the lea
suppor
strugg
cessful
the lab
a con
against
and fo
Mexica
tion to
people
tion of
ship in
Such
Party
more
Mexica
ing nu
progra

the labor and people's movement. It is of foremost importance that the Communist trade unionists take the lead in conducting the practical struggle in the labor movement for support of the Mexican people's struggles. A precondition for successfully conducting this struggle in the labor and people's movement is a *concrete* struggle in the Party against manifestations of chauvinism and for a correct position on the Mexican question, for special attention to work among the Mexican people, for the more rapid promotion of Mexican comrades to leadership in the Party.

Such a fight for the position of the Party will also enable the Party to more effectively work among the Mexican people and to win increasing numbers to the Party and its program. It would facilitate the

necessary task of presenting Party material in the Spanish language more extensively. It would enhance the influence and possibilities for leadership by Mexican members of our Party within the main stream of the Mexican people's movement. It would enrich their contributions to the development of the culture, including popularization of the history and traditions of the Mexican people in the light of Marxist understanding.

Finally, it can be said that the ability of our Party to come to grips theoretically and practically with the Mexican question in the United States will be a test of the ability of our Party to apply more fully and consistently the Marxist-Leninist-Stalinist approach to the national question.

Index for 1953

Appelle, Anthony (with Jerome Golden)—Notes on the New York Elections, July, 43-56.

Aptheker, Herbert—Big Business Re-Writes American History, I, December, 29-38.

Bitelman, Alexander—Stalin and the Party, April, 43-54; New Economic Dangers and How to Meet Them, May, 30-47.

Bradley, Hugh—The N.A.A.C.P. Convention, November, 54-60.

Brewster, Frank—As the 83rd Congress Meets, January, 10-21.

Burnhill, James—The Mexican People in the Southwest, September, 41-52; The Mexican-American Question, December, 50-62.

Brown, Wilbur H. (with Charles P. Mann)—The South Today, and Labor's Tasks, October, 31-49.

Colton, Peter—On Labor and the Democratic Party, June, 49-58; The Eisenhower Congress and the 1954 Elections, November, 36-53.

Communist Party of Bolivia, Central Committee—What Must Be Done in Bolivia, August, 29-36.

Communist Party of the Soviet Union, Central Committee—The Death of Joseph Stalin, April, 1-3.

Communist Party, U.S.A., National Committee—On the Conviction of the Thirteen Communist Leaders, January, 1-4; On the Loss of Stalin, April, 4-10; May Day Manifesto, May, 1-5; The Rosenbergs: Heroes of Democracy, July, 1-4; Resolution on the Situation Growing Out of the Presidential Elections (final text), July, 5-16; The Truce in Korea, August, 1-7; Restore Democratic Rights!, October, 1-4; Unity Can Rout McCarthyism, December 1-3.

Dennis, Eugene—Lenin, Stalin and the Mid-Century (reprinted from *Political Affairs*, March, 1950), April, 26-31.

Douglas, Sam (with Mark Logan)—The Anatomy of McCarthyism, June, 10-25.

Editorial—Defend *Political Affairs*!, February, 1-4.

Fletcher, R. D.—Some Electoral Experiences in New Jersey, January, 41-51.

Flynn, Elizabeth Gurley—He Loved the People, April, 43-46.

For a Lasting Peace (periodical)—Leninism—Militant Banner of Working People of the World, January, 5-9.

Foster, William Z.—Stalin and American Imperialism, February, 5-15; Malenkov at the Helm, April, 19-25; Stalin and the Co-Existence of the U.S.S.R. and the U.S.A., May, 6-10; Fighting War with Peace and Democracy, June, 1-9; Left-Sectarianism in the Fight for Negro

Rights and Against White Chauvinism, July, 17-32; The Explosive Situation in Latin America, August, 8-14; The 34th Anniversary of the Communist Party, September, 1-9; "The Negro People in American History" (table of contents of forthcoming book), October, 22-30; Marxism and the American Working Class, November, 1-19; The "Putschist" Danger in American Foreign Policy, December, 4-13.

Gannett, Betty—Stalin: Architect of Socialism, April, 55-61; (with V. J. Jerome)—The People Can Win the Battle for Peace, May, 11-15; Towards a Society of Abundance, November, 20-35.

Golden, Jerome (with Alex H. Kendrick)—Lessons of the Struggle Against Opportunism in District 65, June, 26-37; (with Anthony Appello)—Notes on the New York Elections, July, 43-56.

Goodwin, Henry T.—Life's Dream Picture, February, 35-45; Reader's Guide to William Z. Foster's *History of the Communist Party of the United States*, September, 67-97; The Lessons of Pearl Harbor, December 18-28.

Gottwald, Klement—The Prague Treason Trials, February, 46-50.

Hastings, Frederick C.—Basing the Party in the Shops, May, 18-29.

Henderson, Samuel T.—White Chauvinism and Bourgeois Nationalism, January, 52-63.

Hosek, Pauline—Some Problems in the Fight for Peace, May, 59-65.

Jefferson, Don—How Southern Comrades Fight Against White Chauvinism, January, 23-40.

Jerome, V. J.—He Built into the Future, April, 62-68; (with Betty Gannett)—The People Can Win the Battle for Peace, May, 11-15; Lessons for Americans (review of *Letters to Americans*, by Karl Marx and Frederick Engels), September, 54-66. See also, *Letters from Readers*, October, 61.

Kammari, M. (with F. Konstantinoff)—Science and Superstructure, February, 51-65.

Kendrick, Alex H.—The Eisenhower-Dulles "Liberation" Nightmare, April, 82-96; The Eisenhower Government and the Fascist Danger, May, 48-58; (with Jerome Golden)—Lessons of the Struggle Against Opportunism in District 65, June, 26-37.

Konstantinoff, F. (with M. Kammari)—Science and Superstructure, February, 51-65.

Lenin, V. I.—Preface to "Letters to Sorge," November, 61-65.

Letters from Readers—January, 64-65; June, 65; October, 61.

Logan, Mark (with Sam Douglas)—The Anatomy of McCarthyism, June, 10-25.

Magill, A. B.—Mexico: Gathering Storm, August, 15-28.

Malenkov, Georgi M.—The Stalin Heritage, April, 11-14.

Mann, Charles P. (with Wilbur H. Brown)—The South Today, and Labor's Tasks, October, 31-49.

Mao Tse-tung—A Great Friendship, April, 15-18.

Meadows, Mike—Some Problems in Coal Mining, December, 39-49.

National Committee, C.P.U.S.A.—(See Communist Party, U.S.A., National Committee.)

Parker, Alex—For a New Approach to Our Concentration Tasks, October, 15-21.

Perry, Pettis—The Defense of the Party is Defense of the Bill of Rights, September, 28-40.

Rosen, Samuel—Zionism and Bourgeois Nationalism, June, 38-48; July, 57-65.

Saunders, Evelyn T.—The Leaders of New China (review of **Red Dust: Autobiographies of Chinese Communists**, by Nym Wales), August, 60-65.

Socialist Unity Party of Germany, Central Committee—Recent Events and the Party's Immediate Tasks, August, 52-59.

[**Stalin, Joseph**]—Reader's Guide to Eco-

conomic Problems of Socialism in the U.S.S.R., by Joseph Stalin, June, 66-96.

Stevens, Andrew—New Opportunities in the Fight for Peace, September, 9-27; Perspectives for Political Action, October, 5-14.

Swift, John—The Struggle for a Mass Policy, February, 16-34; On Stalin's Method, April, 69-81; The Left and the Struggle for Labor Unity, July, 33-42; August, 37-51.

Tilden, Philip M.—Lenin's Materialism and Empirio-Criticism and the Crisis in Physics Today, October, 50-60.

Thorez, Maurice—A New Policy for France, December, 14-17.

U.S.S.R., Council of Ministers (Joint Statement with Presidium of Supreme Soviet and Central Committee of C.P.S.U.)—The Death of Joseph Stalin, April, 1-3.

Weinstone, William—Brother Bill McKie (review of **Brother Bill McKie**, by Phillip Bonosky), June, 59-63.

Wilkerson, Dorey A.—Women Who Work (review of **Women Who Work**, by Grace Hutchins), October, 62-65.

Winston, Henry—Stalin: Champion of Lasting Peace (reprinted from **Political Affairs**, January, 1950), April, 32-42.

Unsigned Contributions—An American Worker's Tribute (to Stalin), April, 47; Reader's Guide to **Economic Problems of Socialism in the U.S.S.R.**, by Joseph Stalin, June, 66-96.

STATEMENT REQUIRED BY THE ACT OF AUGUST 24, 1912, AS AMENDED BY THE ACTS OF MARCH 3, 1933, AND JULY 2, 1946 (Title 39, United States Code, Section 233) SHOWING THE OWNERSHIP, MANAGEMENT, AND CIRCULATION OF

Political Affairs, published monthly at New York, N. Y., for October 1, 1953.

1. The names and addresses of the publisher, editor, managing editor, and business managers are: Publisher, New Century Publishers, Inc., 832 Broadway, New York 3, N. Y.; Editor, V. J. Jerome, 832 Broadway, New York 3, N. Y.; Managing Editor, None; Business Manager, Joseph Felshin, 832 Broadway, New York 3, N. Y.

2. The owner is: (If owned by a corporation, its name and address must be stated and also immediately thereunder the names and addresses of stockholders owning or holding 1 percent or more of total amount of stock. If not owned by a corporation, the names and addresses of the individual owners must be given. If owned by a partnership or other unincorporated firm, its name and address, as well as that of each individual member, must be given.) New Century Publishers, Inc., 832 Broadway, New York 3, N. Y.; Joseph Felshin, 832 Broadway, New York 3, N. Y.

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

4. Paragraphs 2 and 3 include, in cases where the stockholder or security holder appears upon the books of the company as trustee or in any other fiduciary relation, the name of the person or corporation for whom such trustee is acting; also the statements in the two paragraphs show the affiant's full knowledge and belief as to the circumstances and conditions under which stockholders and security holders who do not appear upon the books of the company as trustees, hold stock and securities in a capacity other than that of a bona fide owner.

5. The average number of copies of each issue of this publication sold or distributed, through the mails or otherwise, to paid subscribers during the 12 months preceding the date shown above was: (This information is required from daily, weekly, semiweekly, and triweekly newspapers only)

JOSEPH FELSHIN, Business Manager

Sworn to and subscribed before me this 29th day of September, 1953.

MANUEL LICHTENSTEIN

(Seal)

(My commission expires March 30, 1955)

NEW AND FORTHCOMING TITLES

NEW OPPORTUNITIES IN THE FIGHT FOR PEACE AND DEMOCRACY <i>by Andrew Stevens</i>	(New Century)	.25
NEXT STEPS IN THE STRUGGLE FOR NEGRO FREEDOM <i>by Hugh Bradley</i>	(New Century)	.15
ORGANIZING THE PARTY FOR VICTORY OVER REACTION <i>by Alex Parker</i>	(New Century)	.25
ANARCHISM OR SOCIALISM? <i>by Joseph Stalin</i>	(International)	.35
LETTERS TO AMERICANS: 1848-1895 <i>by Karl Marx and Frederick Engels</i>	(International)	\$3.50
FILM IN THE BATTLE OF IDEAS <i>by John Howard Lawson</i>	Cloth \$2.00; Paper \$1.00 (Masses & Mainstream)	
THE CRISIS OF BRITAIN AND THE BRITISH EMPIRE <i>by R. Palme Dutt</i>	(International)	\$5.50
BURNING VALLEY <i>A novel by Phillip Bonosky</i>	(Masses & Mainstream)	\$2.75
POEMS BY NAZIM HIKMET	Cloth \$2.00; Paper \$1.00	
CHINA'S NEW CREATIVE AGE <i>By Hewlett Johnson</i>	Cloth \$2.50; Paper \$1.50 (International)	
MCCARTHYISM AND THE BIG LIE <i>by Milton Howard</i>	(New Century)	.05
THE CASE OF PUERTO RICO: <i>Memo to the United Nations</i>	(New Century)	.05
THE 50th ANNIVERSARY OF THE C.P.S.U.	(New Century)	.15
JOSE MARTI AND CUBAN LIBERATION <i>by Carlos Rafael Rodriguez</i>	(International)	.20

Distributed by

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

Eud

6
6
9
.