

political affairs

MAY 1955 • 25 CENTS



HERBERT APTHEKER

- [1] On Foster's "History of the
Three Internationals"

HERBERT E. BLUMBERG
and A. B. MACIL

- [9] Peace and the
1956 Elections

WILLIAM Z. FOSTER

- [20] Notes on the
Struggle for Negro Rights

ANDREW STEVENS

- [43] The Fight Against
White Chauvinism

WELCOME HOME, COMRADE BEN!



BENJAMIN J. DAVIS

Vol. XX

A

By H

Publ
ern H

"tha
"wh
in

May
and o
the p
their
tined
made
Party
class,
Comm
tory
How
redole
class
accou

• In

Re-ent
under
Publis
corresp
and C
PRINTS

A Theoretical and Political Magazine of Scientific Socialism

Editor: V. J. Jerome

On Foster's "History of the Three Internationals"

By Herbert Aptheker

Pablo Neruda, poet of the Western Hemisphere, writes of

*"that destined day . . .
"when the hope of the people flames
into pacans of joy."*

May Day, born here of suffering and of struggle, and evocative of the people's hopes—for 900,000,000, their triumph—symbolizes "that destined day." This May Day, 1955, is made especially memorable for our Party and the American working class, for it is the publication date of Comrade Foster's latest work, *History of the Three Internationals*.* How fitting it is that on this day redolent with international working-class fraternity should appear this account of the movement registering

that fraternity in its most mature terms!

Towards the close of this volume, Comrade Foster writes:

From the vast human panorama [of the past century] two decisive central facts stand forth: first, the spread, maturing, and decay of the capitalist system, and second, the tremendous advance of the world's working class towards Socialism.

It is nothing less than this vast human panorama that Comrade Foster unfolds in the quarter of a million words making up this book—really four volumes in one. First, he presents the origins of capitalism, the development of the industrial revolution, the beginnings of the modern working-class movement, the ap-

* International Publishers, N. Y., 580 pp., \$6.

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.

209

pearance and essential content of its philosophy — Scientific Socialism — and the main political events in the nineteenth century, all of which laid the groundwork for the founding, in 1864, of the International Workingmen's Association (the First International). Then, succinctly, Comrade Foster brings his reader the constitution and program of the First International, which laid the basis of the modern labor movement. He discusses the problems and decisions of each of its Congresses, the history and lessons of the Paris Commune, the content of the various groupings challenging Marxism for leadership of the working-class movement (Blanquism, Proudhonism, Lassalleism, Bakuninism), the split in the First International, its work in the United States, and, finally, an overall summary of the contributions and weaknesses of this first great international organization of working people, to its demise in 1876.

The second part of the volume analyzes the history of the Second International, from its precursors to its founding, in 1889, the notable expansion of the labor movement in its early period, and through the Great Betrayal—"the defense of the Fatherland" fraud—of 1914. Here again each of the Congresses is described, and the central questions of the time—the development of imperialism, mounting Right-opportunism and chauvinism, the growing international trade-union movement, the fight-back of colonial masses, the struggle against robber

wars, the appearance of Bolshevism and the historic role of Lenin—are presented in their historic context, explained, analyzed, brought to life.

Then, in part three, the reader will find illuminated the immediate origins and the founding (in 1919) of the Third (Communist) International, and the problems and history of the world-wide struggle against imperialism, for national liberation and for Socialism, conducted during the life of that International (to 1943). Here whole epics and great vistas are traced and offered in focus and with extraordinary brevity. Dominant, of course, is the incomparable grandeur of the Bolshevik Revolution, placed as it is within the context of the general crisis of capitalism. That general crisis is then further spelled out in terms of chronic economic instability, increasing imperialist disdain for bourgeois democracy, the appearance of fascism, the rising threat of new world-wide wars, and, on the other hand, the mounting tide of resistance on the part of ever wider circles of the world's people, led by working classes, guided by blossoming Marxist-Leninist parties. Of particular interest in this period of bourgeois falsification of recent history are the two chapters which Comrade Foster devotes to a discussion of the actual conduct of World War II. Here he recapitulates the monstrous nature of German fascist militarism, analyzes the matchless prowess of the Socialist Soviet Union, and describes the guerrilla warfare that arose out of the peoples' will for freedom in

Europe
where
spired

Comm
Final
is entit
of Soci
story o
for wo
the gre
cialist
close o
1954. T
nese Pe
mentou
eastern
forward
ments i
ica, th
Comm
union,
tions, t
sweep o
World
in the
there c
nism, a
drop o
United
events
necessa
ordinar
ter has

Comm
latest w
ing stro
told it
ness, so
with w
conclus
eminent

Europe and in Asia and that everywhere naturally came under the inspired and selfless leadership of Communists.

Finally, part four of the volume is entitled, "The Historical Advance of Socialism." Here is presented the story of the drive of U.S. imperialism for world domination pitted against the growth of democratic and socialist forces in the world from the close of World War II to the end of 1954. The historic victory of the Chinese People's Revolution and the momentous revolutions in central and eastern Europe and in Asia, the leap forward in national liberation movements in Africa and in Latin America, the world-wide expansion of Communist parties, of militant trade-union, women's and youth organizations, the unprecedented breadth and sweep of the crusade against a Third World War, the triumph of Socialism in the U.S.S.R. and the beginnings there of the transition to Communism, all placed against the backdrop of the rise of reaction in the United States—these tremendous events find their proper place and necessary emphasis in the extraordinary volume that Comrade Foster has produced.

Comrade Foster has told, in his latest work, literally the most exciting story in the world and he has told it with consummate persuasiveness, so that the serene confidence with which he expresses the thrilling conclusion of the entire work seems eminently fitting:

The world situation has already escaped the control of the erstwhile capitalist masters, and no longer can they do as they wish in international affairs. They now confront increasingly the unbreakable strength of the world's toiling masses. Capitalism is doomed and Socialism is marching on to universal victory—this is the great lesson of the past century.

* * *

To this *magnum opus*—in its theme and scope unique in world literature—Comrade Foster brings the necessary qualifications. In the first place, he has scoured the sources in half a dozen languages which bear on his subject matter. Moreover, this volume caps a writing career that has included thousands of articles, scores of pamphlets and a dozen volumes, with the last three, written since 1951, being full-scale and invaluable historical efforts—*Outline Political History of the Americas*, *History of the Communist Party of the United States*, and *The Negro People in American History*.

More significantly, the author of this volume, which deals with the problems and ideas and activities of the working classes of the world for the past century, has himself experienced the life of the producing masses, in his tasks as homesteader, seaman, stockyard worker, steelworker, railroad worker. His position as foremost trade-union organizer and tactician in the history of the American labor movement is an established fact and for over forty years he has been a leader in van-

guard political struggles, half that time as Chairman of the Communist Party. He has seen every state in our Republic and has lived in many of them; numerous are the countries that he has visited more than once. He has had first-hand relationships with the international working-class movement from the time, in 1909 in Germany, when he met, and disagreed with, Karl Kautsky.

Basic to everything, Comrade Foster is a class-conscious worker, as American as his hometown—Taunton, Mass.—with a fierce love of the masses and a consuming hatred for their exploiters and deceivers. Here, then, in training and background, in education and in experience is the fully matured Communist leader. It is such a leader, at the summit of his superb career, who has produced this *History of the Three Internationals*.

* * *

Foster's *History of the Three Internationals* traces the theoretical and organizational development of Marxism and Marxism-Leninism and, of course, in doing this, places that development within the context of world history. Its simplicity of expression will hide from many a reader the immense labors that were required to accomplish this task.

The development of which Comrade Foster writes proceeded in active and continual conflict with the ideology of the bourgeoisie and reflected itself in constant struggle on two fronts, against "Left"-sectarian-

ism and Right-opportunism. The entire history of this struggle, reaching back to the infancy of the First International, is analyzed in this volume.

From the earliest days Marx warned, as Foster quotes him: "The development of socialist sectarianism and that of the real labor movement always stand in inverse ratio to each other." In a paragraph notable for its succinctness even in this volume Foster, summarizing the particular errors of Bakuninism, actually generalizes the main familiar hallmarks of sectarianism throughout the past century. He writes:

Bakuninism made the basic errors of foreshortening and over-simplifying the revolution, of failing to understand the need for the dictatorship of the proletariat, of not understanding the revolutionary role of the working class, of grossly underestimating the importance of the workers' imperative drive for immediate reforms, of trying to make atheism a condition of working class unity in the struggle, and of ignoring the fundamental necessity for a strong political party. Therefore, it had to go down to defeat before Marxism, which was incomparably more realistic in all these respects.

In the struggle against Right-opportunism, of such transcendent importance in the history of the American labor and socialist movements, no one, of course, has played so outstanding a role as has Comrade Foster. His latest volume is notably rich in its exposure and refutation of this Right-opportunism in all its major

forms
out t
In
the r
foun
reform
can c

On
of th
stein
Marxi
featur
the r
ity of
spread
increa
ers, p
expan
and p
by th
rights
chise,
dle (e
etc.).
ments
gener
becom
gradu

Of
"His
portu
What
add
jectio
lution
teria,
of 'p
subsi
Of
tende
and
them:
union

forms and manifestations throughout the last century.

In this connection, Foster pinpoints the revisionism of Eduard Bernstein, fountain-head of Social-Democratic reformism generally and of American exceptionalism in particular:

On the basis of characteristic features of the early imperialist period, Bernstein arrived at the conclusion that Marxism was all wrong. Among these features, signalized by Bernstein, were the rapid expansion and relative stability of the capitalist system, the widespread growth of great trusts, the minor increases in the real wages of the workers, particularly the skilled, the great expansion of working-class economic and political organizations, the winning by the workers of certain democratic rights, especially regarding the franchise, and the growth of the "new middle class" (intellectuals, technicians, etc.). On the basis of these developments, Bernstein . . . developed the general idea that capitalism, instead of becoming obsolete and reactionary, was gradually evolving into socialism.

Of all this, Foster aptly remarks: "His program remains that of opportunist socialism down to this day. What essentially have since been added to it have been successive injections of Ebert-Noske counter-revolution, of Hitlerite anti-Soviet hysteria, and of Keynesian conceptions of 'progressive capitalism' through subsidizing industry."

Of great value are Foster's extended discussions of sectarianism and opportunism as they display themselves particularly in the trade-union movement. He offers incisive

histories and analyses of pure-and-simple trade unionism, of anarcho-syndicalism and of Marxist teaching on trade unionism, with the latter striving for the creation of a fully organized, completely united, militant, class-conscious and politically alert working class.

Historically, Foster demonstrates the fundamental meaning of both sectarianism and opportunism in terms of the ideological influence of the bourgeoisie and shows the disastrous toll they have exacted from the world's working masses. He demonstrates the organic relationship between economics and politics and how whenever one is separated from the other, both are distorted and the working-class movement as a whole suffers.

* * *

Foster places the whole history of the three Internationals within the center of the world-wide struggle for democratic advance that has marked the past century. He shows socialism as the logical culmination of the democratic aspirations of humanity—that in socialism one has the fulfillment of the sovereignty of the vast majority of the people and that this sovereignty becomes real, not formal; complete, not partial.

In doing this, Foster's latest book knocks into a cocked hat the whole viciously absurd ruling class caricature of the world-wide working-class and Marxist-Leninist movements as some kind of "conspiracy." He shows rather the conspirators to be that handful among the rich who

would knife freedom and destroy mankind (had they the power) rather than acquiesce in the objectively-developing revolutionary processes that are, willy-nilly, bringing the masses into their inheritance.

Similarly, the slander depicting Marxism-Leninism as something synonymous with advocacy of force and violence—as the savant, J. Edgar Hoover, and his informer-racketeers define it—cannot possibly survive an honest reading of this book. Here in principle and in factual detail is revealed the violent character of capitalism and of imperialism and the further fact that where violence has been present in the culminating stages of fundamental change, that violence has been first organized and first offered by the minute reactionary minority which chooses not to abide by the wishes of the vast majority—and without this wish deeply and widely held by the vast majority no fundamental change is possible.

Indeed, a special merit of this volume is the clarity with which it traces the development of the identity of the interests of the working masses with the interest of the nation. The nation, born in bourgeois-democratic revolutionary struggle, is more and more betrayed by an imperialist bourgeoisie, and its health and honor and safety fall ever more into the hands of the producing classes. Similarly, while the struggle for national self-determination is born out of the revolutionary development of a young bourgeoisie, that bourgeoisie,

in its decaying stage of imperialism, becomes the prisoner and destroyer of nations. Thus, it is the working class which today must lead in national liberation movements throughout the world and this whole new relationship also is sharply brought forward by Comrade Foster in his *History of the Three Internationals*.

Of course, in bringing forward the patriotism of Marxism-Leninism, Foster demonstrates that it is a patriotism having nothing in common with the jingoism of the imperialists and fully consonant with working-class internationalism. Just as the relations among the socialist nations of the world are of an entirely different order from the cannibalistic relations that have characterized imperialist international politics, so the patriotism of the Marxist-Leninist is in no way exclusive and in no way hostile to the interests or to the dignity of other nations. As Comrade Foster writes, "the labor movement is fundamentally international," and where the people are really and fully sovereign the interests of nations become complementary and in no way contradictory.

It is the non-exploitative and hence non-aggressive nature of socialism which makes it a force for true peace externally as well as internally. Therefore, as Comrade Foster shows, Communists have been the staunchest fighters for national well-being and international amity for over one hundred years, and their leadership in the world-wide battle

to p
in the
mor
matur
object
possib
univer
tral q
with
in thi
of av
lined
these

Inv
peace
cism,
of the
a spec
the F
of th
was t
jected
gress
front
chapt
unfol
policy

He
velop
policy
amin
intern
forme
for a
the U
demo
mean
coali
ally
group
velop

to preserve peace is new only in the sense that it is incomparably more powerful than earlier, more mature, more firmly grounded in objective developments which make possible the prevention of another universal holocaust. The whole central question of peace or war is dealt with in a masterly and balanced way in this volume, with the possibilities of avoiding major war soberly outlined and the tasks necessary to make these a reality spelled out.

* * *

Involved in these questions of peace or war, of democracy or fascism, of the working class as leader of the nation—questions posed with a special urgency in the period since the First World War and the onset of the general crisis of capitalism—was the new tactical orientation projected by the Seventh World Congress of the C.I. in the people's front policy. In two very stimulating chapters (44-45) Foster traces the unfolding and the history of this policy.

He shows it to be the logical development of the already established policy of the united front, and he examines it in its two main aspects—international and national. In the former field its perspective called for a great peace alliance between the USSR and the major bourgeois-democratic states, while nationally it meant the development of a broad coalition—workers, peasants, nationally oppressed and urban middle groups—to defeat fascism. The development of both these aspects, in

terms of the Soviet Union's leadership of a great and successful wartime coalition that crushed the aggressive fascist powers, and, in several countries, the appearance of the new People's Democracies are examined with freshness and insight by Comrade Foster.

This whole examination is of great value for the present, when, under new conditions, the problems present themselves of securing peaceful co-existence, and, especially in the United States, of developing a people's coalition sufficiently broad to prevent fascism.

* * *

In any history of the Three Internationals the struggle for a Marxist-Leninist Party must be a basic theme. This is notably true of Comrade Foster's volume. He demonstrates theoretically the need for an organized vanguard party of the working class, the fatal error of spontaneity and the absolute necessity, in terms of working-class liberation, of the existence and development of the Party of the new type, of the Communist Party. More significant is Comrade Foster's demonstration of how this fact was proven in the history of the working-class movements throughout the world for the past one hundred years. Everywhere, Marxist-Leninist parties vanquished foes on the Right and on the "Left" in debate and in life. Marxist-Leninist parties appeared and survived and developed because they were *necessary*—because they answered the needs of the people and classes they

served while all other parties were tested and found wanting. Exactly why and how this happened in country after country is shown in this volume and constitutes one of its most valuable contributions.

* * *

The above pages give, of course, only in broadest outline some of the main features of Comrade Foster's new volume. The book is invaluable, too, as a fine reference source. Here will be found the Inaugural Address and the Provisional Rules of the First International, the full text of Engels' speech at Marx's grave, the Dresden-Amsterdam Resolutions (1903) opposing Bernsteinism, the Stuttgart Resolution (1907) condemning imperialist war and the Basle Manifesto (1912) also against imperialist war. Here, too, are the call for the Third International, and Lenin's opening remarks at its original assembly—in a word, Foster's latest work is a gold-mine of source material the need for which is acute. Assembled in this single volume, many readers will find that this alone is an invaluable feature of the work which will save them hours of research in libraries.

The volume, too, may be tested in terms of particular subjects and will not be found wanting. Has Comrade Foster considered, for example, the role of youth, the ideas of Rosa Luxemburg, of George Dimitrov, the rising significance of the African liberation movements? . . . Readers putting the book to this test, the test of completeness, of imagina-

tive construction of the work so as to include a thousand different kinds of special interests, will not be disappointed; nevertheless this is accomplished without loss of symmetry.

* * *

The whole essence of Comrade Foster's newest work in history differs in quality from the main nature of imperialist history writing. The history writing of the decaying class is marked by cynicism and anti-humanism, by a contempt for reason, by a denial of the idea of progress, by a repudiation of the concept of causation, by, indeed, an effort to liquidate history. Exactly the opposite is true of Foster's masterwork. His book is filled with the meaningfulness of life; it is filled with confidence and strength, with love of freedom and hatred of fascism.

George Bernard Shaw once wrote of Karl Marx:

Nor is the future at all mysterious, uncertain or dreadful to him. There is not a word of fear, nor appeal to chance, nor to Providence, nor vain remonstrance with nature. . . . He has discovered the law of social development, and knows what must come. The thread of history is in his hands.

Comrade Foster has mastered the law of social development and, holding firm the thread of history, has woven a fabric worthy of his theme, stated in the volume's simple and inspiring last sentence:

"Capitalism is doomed and socialism is marching on to universal victory—this is the great lesson of the past century."

By A

WITH
gates
conver
it is c
the 19
was th
star g
of W
becaus
rean
minist
the ca
to co
"peace
the co
the ro
whose
even r
and ot
"police
Disc
Willia
York
The
hower
—and
plan in
assump
largely
greatest
suming
where

Peace and the 1956 Elections

By Albert E. Blumberg and A. B. Magil

WITH THE FIRST primary for delegates to the Presidential nominating conventions only ten months away, it is clear that the decisive issue in the 1956 elections will be peace. This was the case in 1952, when the five-star general who bore the standard of Wall Street's favorite party won because he promised to end the Korean war which the Truman Administration had begun. And it is the case today—and in the months to come—when the Eisenhower "peace" Administration has brought the country dangerously far along the road to a new Far Eastern war whose consequences would prove even more disastrous for our own and other peoples than the Truman "police action" in Korea.

Discussing the outlook for 1956, William S. White wrote in the *New York Times* (February 27):

The Republicans, if President Eisenhower were at the head of the ticket—and nearly every present political plan in both parties proceeds on that assumption—would be expected to deal largely in much broader issues. *The greatest of these would be peace, assuming, as it is assumed nearly everywhere here, that there will be no war*

and no spectacular economic decline before November of 1956. (Our emphasis—A.E.B. and A.B.M.)

The decisive role of peace as a national electoral issue was confirmed by the 1954 elections. With the economic decline bringing large-scale unemployment, reduced farm income and a general deterioration in mass living standards, and with the GOP tarred with McCarthyism, a Democratic landslide seemed inevitable. But in the closing weeks of the campaign, while the Democratic leadership continued to parrot the bipartisan war shibboleths, Eisenhower and the Republican high command, by demagogically talking "peace," succeeded in sharply reducing the Democratic victory. It was in this oblique way that the powerful peace sentiment of the American people expressed itself.

* * *

What have been the main developments since the 1954 elections? What is needed today if our people's deep desire for peace is to be converted into an active force able to defeat the Eisenhower Administra-

tion and the worst McCarthyites and war-mongers in both major parties in 1956?

Following November, monopoly capital, faced with a steadily deepening crisis in its policies of world domination, sought to offset the election results. On the one hand, it undertook to build up Eisenhower as the spokesman for peace and a "modus vivendi." On the other hand, it set about implementing its "positions of strength" policy with such measures as ratification of the Paris agreements for the rearming of Western Germany, the Southeast Asia war alliance, the military pact with Chiang, a NATO strategy based on atomic weapons, further militarization of the country through a "new look" U.M.T., and a series of blackmailing provocations around Formosa and the Chinese coastal islands.

Coupled with a new appeal for bipartisan support in Eisenhower's State of the Union message, these war steps were designed to redress the world balance as between the war and peace forces and extricate U.S. foreign policy from the morass into which it had been steadily sinking. The foreign policy crisis had become most acute in Asia where Wall Street's effort to halt by force the colonial liberation movements had met with a series of staggering defeats in China, Korea and Indo-China and alienated most of the rest of Asia.

SPOKESMAN OF MAIN MONOPOLY SECTIONS

In this effort the Eisenhower Administration was speaking for the main sections of monopoly—in William Z. Foster's apt phrase, the "war-when-ready" crowd, as distinguished from the Knowland-Radford-McCarthy "preventive war" clique. Unable at present to count on the support of its so-called allies, Wall Street has embraced a longer-term strategy.

This strategy, however, did not preclude but rather required a policy of seeking to heighten present world tension. Thus, in Eisenhower's Formosa resolution and in the Eisenhower-Dulles threats to use atomic weapons against China the tactical lines of the Eisenhowers and the Knowlands joined. The strategic motivation, however, was different. The war-now cabal saw in the manufactured Formosa-Quemoy-Matsu crisis an opportunity to precipitate immediate armed conflict. The Administration and its bipartisan supporters regarded this war provocation as essential to prevent further deterioration of American imperialism's position in the Far East, to improve Washington's "bargaining" status in future negotiations, and to strengthen the seriously weakened Asian flank in the global operations directed towards eventual world mastery by force.

* * *

What have been the consequences

of these
ures des
battered
has beco
tional t
period o
This h
atomic
East.
At th
emphasi
world t
altering
On the
folly to
potentia
crisis, a
remains
against
ening t
the wor
Americ
A se
ington's
been th
rialist a
dented
from v
the dis
Even th
ernmen
privatel
Quemo
A thi
incendia
fer op
penden
mitted
and Inc
ment f
peace a

of these tactics and the other measures designed to shore up a heavily battered foreign policy? One result has been a sharpening of international tensions after a considerable period during which they had eased. This has increased the danger of atomic war, specifically in the Far East.

At the same time it needs to be emphasized that the aggravation of world tensions has not succeeded in altering basic world relationships. On the contrary. Though it would be folly to underestimate the dangerous potentialities of the Far Eastern crisis, *what has also increased and remains decisive in the struggle against war and the policy of heightening tensions is the resistance of the world's peoples, among them the American people.*

A second consequence of Washington's increased aggressiveness has been the sharpening of inter-imperialist antagonisms and the unprecedented isolation of the United States from virtually all its "allies" save the discredited Chiangs and Rhees. Even the British and Canadian governments have publicly—and others privately—washed their hands of a Quemoy-Matsu war.

A third consequence is that these incendiary tactics have evoked stiffer opposition and greater independence from the so-called uncommitted nations like India, Burma and Indonesia. And the whole movement for national liberation and peace among the colonial and semi-

colonial peoples has reached new heights, as reflected in the historic Asia-Africa Conference at Bandung.

For us Americans the most important consequence of this policy of intimidation and blackmail may be found in developments at home. For all of Dulles' "ecclesiastical foxiness"—to quote the telling phrase of British Laborite, Richard Crossman—the Quemoy-Matsu provocations have not only alienated the "allies," they have divided the Administration itself. James Reston reported from Washington (*New York Times*, March 30) that "the Eisenhower Administration is split from top to bottom on whether to defend these islands."

What is more important, these provocations have produced the most significant rift in the bipartisan coalition on foreign policy since the launching of the Cold War. The very triumph of bipartisanship—when the democratic Congressional leaders blitzed through Congress Eisenhower's Formosa resolution in January—has begun to weaken the whole structure of the bipartisan relationship.

NEW TACTICAL RIFT

We are witnessing the beginning of a new tactical rift within the bourgeoisie. It is a reminder that capitalist unity is at best relative and limited. Rent by economic strife, monopoly capital covers up these conflicts by uniting politically against the workers and the people on both

domestic and foreign policy. However, when the people move into substantial opposition to the aims of the monopolists, the unity begins to crack and the underlying antagonisms come to the surface.

This is what has been happening in the sphere of foreign policy. The struggles of the peoples of Asia, Europe, Latin America and the United States against Wall Street aggression in Korea and Indo-China—together with the firm peace policy and peace initiatives of the Soviet Union, China and the People's Democracies—have precipitated and sharpened differences among our financial and industrial overlords.

These differences concern not ultimate objectives but tactics—when, where and how armed conflict is to be unleashed. The dominant monopoly groups, fearing to wage war in isolation from the "allies," support the Eisenhower bipartisan war-when-ready policy. Other big business interests, fearing delay will permit the world forces of peace, democracy and socialism to become too strong to be defeated, try to instigate immediate war through the Knowland-Bridges-McCarthy group in the G.O.P. and some of the Dixiecrats. Dulles is the chief Administration bridge to the Knowland group.

In recent weeks, under the impact of popular resistance to war, a further division is beginning to appear—this time within the major monopoly groups that speak through

the Eisenhower-Stevenson-Truman war-when-ready program. The attempt to use Knowland's methods to achieve Eisenhower's aims in the Far East has backfired so badly that cooler Wall Street heads are looking for a more moderate course that will extricate them from a highly dangerous impasse.

Politically, this is manifested in the growing opposition of some leading Democrats to certain aspects of the bipartisan foreign policy. This opposition reflects the pressure of mounting anxiety and popular protest against the prospect of atomic war over Quemoy and Matsu. It likewise is a response to growing criticism of the Democratic failure to challenge the Eisenhower Administration, especially on its adventurous course in the Far East.

The first break came on the Formosa resolution itself when thirteen Senators—all but one, liberal Democrats—voted against the resolution supporting restricting amendments. This was followed by the Senate vote on ratification of the pact with Chiang. On the two questions, a total of 21 Senators—one Republican and the great majority labor-supported Democrats—took issue in some form with bipartisan war policy on China.

With their ears to the ground Senators Morse, Lehman and Kefauver thereupon undertook an active public campaign for withdrawal from Quemoy and Matsu. The charges by Morse and Kefauver that

high c
were p
that
one of
it nece
of the
As a
to grow
in the
fears a
atomic
conflict
as sho
York
against
reached
duction
lution
Wro
ington
7):

Two
pressur
defend
China
sure or
particip
Toda
on noti
and ins
islands
into "
place a

ROLE
NA
The
ship co
With
Adlai
bi-part
mensio

high circles in the Administration were plotting war proved so telling that Vice-President Nixon, himself one of the worst warmongers, found it necessary to rush to the defense of the Administration and the G.O.P.

As anxiety and protest continued to grow in the shops, on the farms, in the churches—accelerated by new fears aroused by the “fallout” from atomic tests—the hesitations and conflicts grew in ruling class circles, as shown by the influential *New York Times*. The popular fight against a Quemoy-Matsu war reached a new level with the introduction of the Morse-Lehman resolution embodying this position.

Wrote James Reston from Washington (*New York Times*, April 7):

Two weeks ago the main political pressure on him [Eisenhower] was to defend the two island groups off the China Coast. Today the main pressure on him is to avoid United States participation in their defense. . . .

Today the President is being put on notice by many powerful politicians and institutions that a defense of these islands would carry a divided republic into “the wrong war at the wrong place at the wrong time.”

ROLE OF DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL LEADERSHIP

The Democratic national leadership could no longer evade the issue. With the belated April 11 speech of Adlai Stevenson the breach in the bi-partisan bloc took on a new dimension, for Stevenson is the titular

leader of the Democratic Party and its first choice for the Presidential nomination in 1956. The same Stevenson at the December meeting of the Democratic National Committee had called for a non-aggression pact between Eisenhower and Knowland and had urged the Democrats to be the “loyal opposition” and maintain unity with the G.O.P. on foreign policy. Four months later the pressure of the people—which he himself acknowledged—forced him to assume leadership of the opposition along the lines of the Morse-Lehman resolution.

Following this, the Americans for Democratic Action released a wire to President Eisenhower in which 47 leading individuals urged him not to go to war over Quemoy and Matsu. Among them were prominent Democrats like Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, Mrs. India Edwards, former vice-chairman of the Democratic National Committee, and Benjamin V. Cohen, ex-assistant Secretary of State and former representative to the UN. The signers also included two national union presidents, Kennedy of the Railway Trainmen and Zaritsky of the Hatters (AFL).

The Democratic Congressional leadership, Lyndon Johnson, Walter George and Speaker Sam Rayburn, who carried the ball for Eisenhower in January, have at this writing shown no disposition to follow Stevenson's lead. They insist on holding fast to every wretched letter of the bi-partisan dogma. James Reston

can still point out (*New York Times*, April 16):

Seldom in contemporary history has an opposition party been so slow or so ineffective in its criticism of major policies as the Democrats in the last two years . . . on the big issues involving civil liberties and peace and war their tardiness and timidity have been remarkable.

Senator George's initiative (March 27) in proposing big-power talks did have the effect of once more projecting this issue into the arena of public debate and of putting the Administration somewhat on the defensive. But he hinged his proposal on ratification of the Paris agreements, and neither he nor any other Democrat undertook a serious fight for it. Nor, it must be added, have the Senators leading the fight against involvement in Quemoy and Matsu taken up this issue or called for negotiations with China to resolve the Formosa crisis. Mass sentiment for peaceful negotiations is very strong, however. It has been given new impetus by the Soviet initiative in negotiating a solution to the Austrian question and by Chou En-lai's proposal for direct negotiations with the U.S. concerning tensions in the Far East. If organized, this sentiment can bring about growing differentiation on this key aspect as well.

The budding opposition to certain aspects of the bipartisan foreign policy takes on special significance

because it coincides with a growing partisan tendency among leading Democrats to challenge Eisenhower rather than concede him the 1956 elections. This is most clearly expressed by Senator Morse, who told the ADA convention in March that it was necessary "in the interests of peace that the Eisenhower Administration be turned out of office in 1956."

* * *

What, then, is the character of the differentiation that has emerged within the bipartisan coalition and the Democratic Party? It is important to define both its limits and its potentialities. Clearly what we have here is not an opposition to the bipartisan war program as a whole but only to specific aspects—its most bellicose features, as in the instance of Quemoy-Matsu. The rift is developing within the general framework of bipartisanship and does not challenge its reactionary premises.

Thus the same Senator Morse who led the fight against giving Eisenhower a blank check in the Formosa crisis voted to ratify the Southeast Asia war alliance and the Paris agreements. The Morse-Lehman resolution itself is limited to Quemoy and Matsu. It upholds the "right" of the United States to "defend" Formosa and the Pescadores. It is silent about negotiations with China and recognition of the Chinese People's Republic by the United States and admission to the UN. At the same time the resolution and

the St
entiate
hower
project
settle
placin
Washi
Chines
To
of the
take a
the he
When
clamo
Matsu
stacle
where
evitab
the fo
tion's
produ
By e
peace,
those
with
is tru
—the
moy-
pects
Mo
split i
the w
the fa
small
and c
base
unpre
vance
playin
organ
ment.

the Stevenson speech further differentiate themselves from both Eisenhower and the war-now clique by projecting some future peaceful settlement of Formosa's status, thus placing in question Chiang's and Washington's seizure of this part of Chinese national territory.

To see only the limited character of the tactical differentiation is to take a formalistic view and to miss the heart and essence of the matter. When millions here and abroad are clamoring: "Get out of Quemoy and Matsu," this creates a powerful obstacle to atomic war at the point where the danger is most acute. Inevitably such a struggle weakens the foundation of the Administration's entire aggressive policy which produced the Quemoy-Matsu crisis. By exposing the real enemies of peace, the struggle also helps teach those who are not yet ready to break with the war policy as a whole—this is true of the majority of our people—the need to move from the Quemoy-Matsu issue to other vital aspects of the fight for peace.

Moreover, the beginnings of a split in the bipartisan war party gives the workers and their allies among the farmers, the Negro people, the small businessmen, the professionals and others—who constitute the mass base of the Democratic party—new unprecedented opportunities to advance the cause of peace. By displaying independent initiative and organizing a broad people's movement, the organized workers can

utilize the growing conflicts within the ruling class and its two parties on foreign policy as well as domestic issues to effect a significant political change in 1956.

The labor movement can do this by linking itself with the emerging Democratic opposition to the most aggressive aspects of the Eisenhower-Cadillac Cabinet foreign policy. It can use its independent weight to deepen, expand and strengthen this opposition. The differentiation now unfolding in the bipartisan war camp contains in embryo the elements of a peace position which labor and the anti-Administration forces must expand if they are to win in '56.

LABOR'S DECISIVE ROLE

Labor is the key to the future of the breach in the bi-partisan war front and therefore to the outcome of the 1956 elections. To influence this question decisively labor must develop what it does not yet possess: *an independent active policy for peace.*

The workers desire peace as ardently as other non-monopoly sections of the population. In the past three years these desires have been occasionally reflected in convention resolutions, a few union publications, and statements by a limited number of top AFL and CIO leaders. In the main, however, there has been a great gulf between the peace sentiment of the rank and file and the position of the official leaders.

Today the prosperity-through-war illusions, sown by the trade-union leadership during the Korean war, have been very much weakened. In the shops and factories the Formosa resolution, the Quemoy-Matsu provocations, the atomic war threats and the H-bomb "fallouts" have aroused much discussion, anxiety and protest among the workers.

In this context there are a number of new factors that can favorably influence the development of peace activity in the labor movement.

(1) Of major significance is the pending merger of the AFL and the CIO. A united labor movement will represent a new great power both in economic struggles and in the field of political action. The process of unification will open up new opportunities for the rank and file to debate and influence the policy of the new united labor organization.

In this process there will be both negative and positive influences at work. The great positive influence is the unification of 16,000,000 workers—a force, however, whose potential can be realized only through concrete struggle around the policy content of unity.

The chief negative influence will be the AFL Executive Council. Both the AFL and CIO chiefs support the bipartisan war program. Their positions, however, are not identical. The foreign policy line of a Meany is hardly distinguishable from that of the war-now gang. The

CIO support of the bipartisan policy is less militant and reflects a certain measure of Social-Democratic accommodation to the peace moods of the workers both here and abroad. Thus the CIO convention last December sharply attacked the Knowland-Radford war-mongers and opposed involvement in a war with China. More pronounced differentiation on the peace issue has been expressed with increasing frequency of late by national leaders and publications of the AFL Meatcutters, Hotel and Restaurant Workers and Typographical Workers and the CIO Auto, Packing, Lumber, Clothing and Textile unions.

The unification of labor will provide opportunities for deepening and extending this differentiation on the peace issue as part of the fight for policy. These opportunities will be the greater to the extent that such broad questions as the Morse-Lehman resolution, the H-bomb and UMT (to which the CIO continues to be opposed) are immediately brought into the local unions and shops for discussion and action. These issues especially need to become part of the work of the AFL Labor's League for Political Education and the CIO-PAC so that peace and foreign policy questions may be placed in the forefront of united labor's political action program for 1956.

(2) With growing concern over the threat of atomic warfare and the phenomenon of mass unemploy-

ment
there
to pi
mand
peace
graph
Reuth
UAW
ing t
a nev
who
war,
and
atom
vein.
"W
our
asked
child
way
of th
tion
foug
there
that
way
Re
thro
men
that
of r
shift
ues,
the
caus
Fo
cent
state
the
us
wea

ment despite huge arms production, there is new strong pressure today to place the workers' economic demands in the context of peace and a peace economy. This was most graphically illustrated in Walter Reuther's opening speech at the UAW convention in March, keynoting the Auto Workers' struggle for a new contract. The same Reuther who in 1947-49 crusaded for the cold war, preached "guns and butter" and denounced petitions to ban the atomic bomb, spoke in a different vein.

"What good is a higher wage if our great cities are in ashes?" he asked. "What is the future of our children unless mankind finds a way in the world to prevent the use of these terrible weapons of destruction?" "Nobody can win a war fought with atomic H-bombs, and therefore what we need to realize is that we can win only if we find a way to avoid war."

Reuther rejected the thesis of jobs through war and urged full employment in a peace economy. Asserting that "the cold war reflects a contest of negative values," he called for shifting to "a contest of positive values, to a contest as to who can do the most towards advancing the cause of human betterment."

Foreign Minister Molotov as recently as February 8 had again stated the Soviet view: "We invite the United States to compete with us not in the production of atomic weapons, but in the employment of

atomic energy for peaceful ends."

Unfortunately, Reuther's left hand and right hand were evidently not acquainted with each other, for the convention foreign policy resolutions were, despite occasional positive statements, opposed in spirit to his speech. The seizure of Formosa and the Pescadores was upheld, Quemoy and Matsu were not even mentioned. While four-power negotiations were advocated, they were made contingent upon ratification of the Paris agreements for rearming Germany.

Nevertheless, Reuther's linking of the workers' economic demands and full employment with peace and a peacetime economy is a new element of great significance. It affords a broad approach in the trade unions for helping develop the fight for peace and against the reactionary war policies which run counter to it. This position likewise is a key to combatting the line of many Democrats who advocate even higher arms expenditures than the Administration.

Further, the UAW political resolution, by condemning Eisenhower's 1954 pre-election peace demagoguery and charging that "the Eisenhower Administration had brought us to the very brink of war on two occasions during that very year," points to peace as the central issue in the battle to defeat Eisenhower in 1956.

OTHER FACTORS

(3) The differentiation developing

within the Democratic Party on the bipartisan war policy is not only a response to popular pressure. It can also be a powerful factor in stimulating labor's peace activity. The fact that those who are opposing the most bellicose aspects of the Eisenhower-Dulles policies are for the most part the liberal, labor-endorsed Senators is not lost on the labor movement. The ovation accorded Senator Morse at the Pennsylvania state convention of the CIO in March is an index of rank and file sentiment.

Meanwhile, increased differentiation among the Social-Democrats on questions of foreign policy and civil liberties carries special significance because of the role of these forces in both the labor movement and the Democratic Party. Such differentiation was manifested at the ADA convention and is reflected in the columns of the *New York Post*.

(4) The increasing desire of non-labor peace groups, chiefly religious and pacifist, to cooperate with the labor movement is another favorable factor. It reflects greater concern about activity for peace and a greater appreciation of the decisive role of labor.

(5) Favorable factors are operating to bring labor's principal allies, the Negro people and the working farmers, more actively into the struggle for peace and for the defeat of Eisenhower in 1956. Thus some of the sharpest criticisms of the Formosa resolution have appeared in the farm

papers and in the Negro press. The impact of the Asian-African Conference among the Negro people is strengthening opposition to U.S. policy in Asia, Africa and the colonial world generally.

* * *

New opportunities are therefore present to develop the labor and people's fight for peace as the key to effecting a significant change in the 1956 elections. To achieve this objective will require sustained mass activity and proper tactics.

The main struggle must be waged against the threat of atomic warfare and against the most bellicose aspects of the Eisenhower foreign policy, those which most immediately endanger peace and which have aroused the greatest protest. At the same time the struggle must be for a positive alternative: negotiations, the banning of atomic weapons, peaceful coexistence, a peace economy and the social measures that it implies.

The political direction of the struggle requires: (1) Unrelenting fire against the Knowland-Radford-McCarthy gang of open war-mongers, McCarthyites and Dixiecrats; (2) Maximum pressure on Eisenhower to end all appeasement of the Knowlands, quit Quemoy and Matsui, negotiate a settlement of the Formosa question and all other problems with the Soviet Union and China, oust the war-now advocates from the Pentagon and fire their chief

ally, D
ity for
influen
they su
struggl
icy.

Broad
develop
Quemo
Resolut
questio
mission
bomb a
emphas
versary
Francis
and fo
and a
trade a
tiation
questio

Who
this ke
in no s
Comm
progre
trade
weakn
activity

favora
What
tire Pa
of the
peace
perspe
Progra
by all
order.

Furt
concre
Party

ally, Dulles; (3) Independent activity for peace by labor and its allies, influencing the Democrats whom they support to extend the emerging struggle on peace and foreign policy.

Broad mass movements need to be developed around specific issues: Quemoy-Matsu (the Morse-Lehman Resolution), together with the related questions of Formosa and the admission of China to the UN; the H-bomb and disarmament, with special emphasis on the coming tenth anniversary session of the UN in San Francisco June 20-26; against UMT and for a program of social welfare and a peace economy; international trade and exchange; peaceful negotiation of the German and other questions.

Whether labor and the people play this key role in relation to 1956 will in no small measure depend upon the Communist and other Left and progressive forces, especially in the trade unions. The present grave weaknesses and inadequacies in peace activity can be overcome if the new favorable conditions are grasped.

What is necessary is that the entire Party develop an understanding of the central importance of the peace issue for realizing the 1956 perspective outlined in the Party Program. A restudy of the Program by all clubs would be very much in order.

Further, it is necessary to *organize* concretely the peace activity of the Party forces in the shops and com-

munities so that it develops in a planned way, with specific objectives and systematic guidance at all levels.

Detailed attention should be given to solving the many ideological and tactical problems arising in the course of peace activity in the labor and people's organizations.

Independent peace expressions on the part of the Left, including the Communists, are indispensable in stimulating broad mass activity.

The *Daily Worker*, and other Marxist and Left publications can play a major role. One of the chief tasks is to combat the main ideological premise of the bipartisan war program: the big lie of "Communist aggression" and "subversion."

* * *

The months that lie ahead are a challenge to every Communist, every progressive American. The tide of struggle against the cold war, the persecutions and the McCarthyite inquisitions is rising. Big Business and its government have been unable to destroy the Communist Party, unable to imprison the fight for peace and democracy. On the contrary, that fight is attaining new heights, and inseparable from it are the Communists. Events have proved that Wall Street imperialism is not omnipotent. It can be curbed and its war plans defeated. On the party of the American working class, the party of peace, patriotism and national salvation, rests the historic responsibility for giving leadership to the battle for America's future.

Notes on the Struggle for Negro Rights

By William Z. Foster

DURING RECENT YEARS, especially since the end of World War II, there have taken place very considerable changes in the status of the Negro people, economically, politically, and socially. This situation requires that we carefully evaluate and draw the necessary implications from these new features in the position of the Negro people. If we fail to do this boldly and precisely, we will be writing, not of the actual Negro problems of today but of those of yesterday. This means, too, that we need also to re-think through some of the older questions in this general regard.

In dealing with the American Negro question we must pay closer attention to its specifically American features. That is, while basing ourselves solidly upon basic Marxist-Leninist definitions of class, race, and nation, and their interrelationships, we must also be aware of the fact that the specific American conditions considerably mould and distort these factors among the Negro people. They even change the structure of the classes, and they give the nation a special contour. In noting these specific American features, however, we must be careful not to fall into

the ever-present danger of American exceptionalism, an error which would lead us falsely to conclude that the American Negro question is unique and without parallel elsewhere. This basic mistake would gravely disorient our Party.

Below are considered in outline a few of the most important problems in our Negro work, especially the newer ones, which should receive our close attention in the sense of the above remarks. The present wide discussion of the Negro question in general in our Party is an indication of the need for such a thorough Marxist probing in order to put our work among the Negro people upon a more realistic footing.

MIGRATION OF THE NEGRO PEOPLE

Particularly since World War I there has been a large migration of the Negro people away from the Black Belt and from the South in general, as we have often remarked. This migration has been especially heavy during and since World War II. In almost equal proportions this great exodus has flowed towards two main objectives—the cities and industries of the South and those

of the North. During 1940-50 alone an estimated 1,000,000 Negroes came North. The dynamic forces behind the great migration are: a) the repellent, worsening economic and political conditions prevailing in the Black Belt, and b) the attractive force of the great demand of the industries for workers during the wars and the preparations for new wars—with the supply of immigrants from Europe virtually cut off. Whether this exodus from the Black Belt will continue is problematical, basically dependent upon the economic situation.

The migration has had profound effects upon the geographic location of the Negro people. Before World War I a large majority of American Negroes lived in the Black Belt, but now the percentage there has been reduced to about one-third. Approximately one-third of the Negro people live in Southern cities, one-third in the Northern cities, and one-third in the Black Belt plantation areas of the South.

One of the most striking features of this big shift in the location of the Negro population is that it has greatly narrowed down the general Southern area in which the Negro people have constituted the majority of the population. It has reduced the economic base of the Negro nation as such. Whereas in 1900 there were 286 Negro majority counties and they were largely contiguous; by 1950 the number of such counties had dropped to 169, and they were far less in connected areas. The one-

time broad Negro majority region has not only been reduced in size, but it has also been considerably split into smaller, more detached areas.

One of the major conclusions we have to draw from this migration situation relates to the use of the major Negro national slogan of self-determination. As I said in my book, *The Negro People in American History* (page 559): "The conclusion to be drawn from this situation is not that the right of self-determination for the Negro nation is thereby invalidated, as opponents assert, but that more extensive territorial reorganization will be necessary when the time comes and the Negro people determine to exercise this basic right." We must be very categorical in our understanding that the Negro question remains a national question, which clearly implies the slogan of self-determination as our orientation slogan.

We must not underestimate the degree of national consciousness among the Negro people. We must always remember that among the American Negro people national consciousness is very largely expressed through racial slogans—this is one of the specific American features of this national question. Also expressions of a more clearly national character are by no means uncommon among the Negro people. Thus, very few Negroes will take it amiss when *Tide* (July 20, 1951), a leading Negro business magazine, says editorially: "As a people, Negroes

are a nation within a nation."

In the past, however, we have made serious Leftist sectarian errors by advancing the slogan of self-determination too much as a slogan of active agitation or even of action. We must give close study to this whole question of its relation to our general work. As I also said in my book (page 559), "The present Negro migration northward and towards the Southern cities, with the consequent loss of majority status in many Black Belt counties, confronts the Negro people and their political allies with the urgent necessity of raising and stressing the demand for proportional representation for Negroes. This may develop into forms of self-determination."

At present, as Jim Crow doors are being pushed open or partially broken down in various spheres, there is a widespread tendency to restrict Negro representation or participation to a token basis. Such limitations we must rigidly combat and insist that Negroes be given recognition in their full numerical and other strength. Of course, generally, trade unions and similar bodies may not demand Negro places proportionally on committees, etc., in a formal manner, but the question of proportional representation must nevertheless be kept in mind.

URBANIZATION OF THE NEGRO PEOPLE

In the very important migration of the Negro people during the past four decades the Negro masses, of

course, have been not merely changing their locality, but also their occupation. Substantially, in both the South and the North, they have moved from agriculture (in its most backward forms) into industry. Urbanization has led to greatly increased strength of the Negro press and mass organizations, and also to an intensification of the national struggle generally by the Negro people. This fact of going into industry is of extreme importance in connection with the status of the Negro people and also with regard to our Party's policies in Negro work. These are realities which our writers on the Negro question too often underestimate.

How rapidly the urbanization of the Negro people has taken place is illustrated by the fact that whereas in 1890, of the 7,500,000 Negroes at that time in the whole country, only 20 percent lived in urban communities; in 1950 some 65 percent of the 15,500,000 Negroes dwelt in cities and towns. In the South the ratio for the Negro people at present is that about 50 percent live in the cities and 50 percent in rural communities. In the North the Negro people are almost 100 percent city dwellers.

This situation makes the Negro people, who only a few years ago were overwhelmingly an agricultural people, now very highly urban; much more so in fact than the peoples in numerous capitalist countries. As against the roughly 60-66 percent of urbanization of the

Amer
can p
cent
62, Fr
genti
baniz
reflect
enorm
muni
the co
50 to
hand,
num
perce
ture,
Th
becom
trially
modi
\$15
far
work
of Jim
widely
they
nated
press
and
servic
they
gic r
cordi
II, I
comp
dustr
Negro
perce
about
ing
mari
cals,
groer

American Negro people, the American people as a whole has 64 percent of its population urban, Canada 62, France 52, Italy 44, Japan 38, Argentina 34, and India 17. The urbanization of the Negro people is reflected, on the one hand, by an enormous growth of the Negro communities in cities and towns all over the country, North and South (from 50 to 250 percent), and on the other hand, by a steady decline of the number of Negroes and of their percentage ratio in Southern agriculture, including the Black Belt.

The Negro people are manifestly becoming an important factor industrially. The Negro ghetto commodity market of today does some \$15 billion in trade annually; but far more important, the Negro workers have broken through a host of Jim-Crow barriers and penetrated widely into industrial jobs. Although they are still very grossly discriminated against in industry by being pressed into the unskilled categories and confined, as far as possible, to service occupations, nevertheless, they have come to play a very strategic role in the basic industries. According to *Time* magazine of May 11, 1953, Negroes are estimated to comprise some 11 percent of all industrial workers. In the coal mines Negro workers constitute about 25 percent of the total, in steel and auto about 15 percent, and in meat-packing plants about 30 percent. In maritime, railroad, lumber, chemicals, and other basic industries Negroes are also a big factor in the

working force. There is also a very small Negro labor aristocracy of skilled workers developing; this is, of course, as yet only a tiny factor, but we must note it nevertheless.

The urbanization of the Negro people, which means in practice largely their industrialization, radically changes their economic outlook, problems, programs, demands and struggles. A generation or so ago, when 80 percent of the Negro people lived in the South, the great majority under terrible share-crop conditions on the plantations, it was quite proper to speak of the Negro people as a peasant people and to place, as we did, the demand for the land as the central, all-decisive demand of the Negro people as a whole. But in the changed situation of the Negro people, who are now about two-thirds urbanized, it is incorrect to do so today.

The breakup of the plantation system and the distribution of land to the land-starved Negro agricultural laborers and sharecroppers is still the most vital single economic demand of the Negro people in the South. We must not underestimate the tremendous importance for the whole Negro people of the completion of the bourgeois revolution in the South. But we must also clearly realize that the majority of the Negro people in the United States are turning their economic attention to demands characteristic of an industrial people—on the workers' side for better wages, shorter hours, social insurance, the right to organ-

ize, etc.—always bearing in mind the special Negro aspects of these questions. In the latter respect, the organization of the workers in Southern industry into trade unions is a matter of the most decisive importance for the Negro people. Our Party's policy must reflect these changing economic interests of the Negro people, as well as their altered political status.

CHANGED CLASS COMPOSITION

Migration and urbanization (industrialization) and hastening class differentiation have profoundly changed the class composition of the Negro people. Four decades ago the Negro people, with four-fifths of their number in the South—the great mass on plantations—was made up overwhelmingly of virtual peasants, and the industrial working class, petty bourgeoisie, and bourgeoisie were relatively tiny. Whereas now, with two-thirds of the Negro people living in cities, South and North, the whole class situation has drastically altered. All the Negro classes characteristic of capitalism—working class, middle class, and capitalist class—have grown rapidly; whereas the peasantry has declined heavily percentage-wise.

But these expanding classes of the Negro people have by no means grown at a uniform rate. This is also a matter of extreme importance to consider in working out policy for our work among the Negro people. Obviously, the Negro working class

has grown and is growing the most rapidly. The middle class is also expanding—Negro college enrollment in 1950 was up 2500 percent over 1930 (*Tide*, July 20, 1951). The bourgeoisie is also growing. But the proletariat is growing fastest of all. This is because the workers are less confined economically by the walls of the ghetto than are the other classes. The workers have won the right to work, although by no means fully, in many of the white man's industries; whereas the Negro professionals, although increasing in numbers and slowly breaking their way into society at large, are still largely confined to a Negro ghetto clientele. The Negro bourgeoisie, which is mainly a petty bourgeoisie by general standards, is still the most confined of all the classes to the ghetto. It, too, is expanding with the growth of the Negro communities, but it is hedged about with greater limitations than either of the other classes, being practically barred from the great national industries.

The inevitable result of urbanization and industrialization, with its consequent class differentiation, will be to sharpen up the class antagonism of the Negro workers against the white bourgeoisie in all fields. There will also be—a minor factor—an increase in class antagonisms within the ranks of the Negro people. This will be true despite the fact that today the great mass of Negro workers are employed by white capitalists. This factor is still relatively minor, but it is one that is

bound
the d
classes
be, w
inter
the s
tional
a wh

LEAF
NE

As
indica
Negro
and t
cution
and
again
be b
class
class
act u
elem
thing
in the
all ov
reliab
front
This
the p
been
great
tion
tung.
worki
of the
Cer
ally t
er of
not c
for it
decid

bound to grow in importance with the development of the respective classes. One of our major tasks will be, while actively defending the class interests of the Negro workers, at the same time to maintain the national unity of the Negro people as a whole.

LEADING ROLE OF NEGRO PROLETARIAT

As the Communist Party Program indicates, the national front of the Negro people against Jim Crowism and the other special national persecutions to which they are subjected, and as far as possible the front against McCarthyism and war, must be broad enough to include all classes—workers, peasants, middle class and bourgeoisie. To realize and act upon this basis is of the most elementary importance. Another thing we must never forget is that, in the fight of the oppressed peoples all over the world the only basically reliable force to lead the national front of the people is the proletariat. This is one of the great lessons of the period of imperialism, and it has been taught again and again by such great leaders on the national question as Lenin, Stalin, and Mao Tse-tung. It applies also to the Negro working class in the national front of the American Negro people.

Certain factors are necessary actually to make the proletariat the leader of the national struggle. It cannot come about merely by wishing for it, talking about it, or formally deciding it. One important factor

in bringing about the necessary worker leadership is the growth in size of the working class. This condition is being met by the rapid expansion of the Negro proletariat. Another factor is that the working class must strengthen its position in industry and the unions. This also is taking place—the Negro workers are less confined than formerly to purely service occupations and have become a real industrial proletariat. Still another factor necessary for proletarian leadership is that the workers in all Negro organizations and elsewhere bring their ideas and problems to the fore and in this way strengthen the whole fight of the Negro people. This, too, is taking place to a much larger degree than we are commonly aware of. But all this will not avail without a solid building of the Communist Party in the ranks of the Negro people.

We have at least one dramatic example of the Negro workers exercising a leading role among the Negro people. This was with regard to the trade union question. It is a matter of knowledge that for many years, due to the Jim-Crow policy of the trade unions, the large majority of the bourgeois and petty-bourgeois leaders of the Negro people took an anti-union position. They urged emphatically that Negro workers should not join the trade unions. But the latter never really shared this position. They continued to press for admission into the unions. Not only did they finally succeed in this objective—to the ex-

tent that there are now at least 1,500,000 Negro workers in the unions—but in doing this they drastically changed the line and policies of the whole Negro leadership on this vital question. This is an example of what we mean by the leading role of the proletariat.

Undoubtedly at this time the Negro workers are coming forward as a leading force in the Negro liberation movement, but as yet they are far from being dominant. The petty-bourgeoisie and bourgeoisie are still its leaders. It is our Party's task, within the framework of National Negro unity, to develop all the leadership potentialities and opportunities of the workers.

ROLE OF THE NEGRO BOURGEOISIE

The ghetto bourgeoisie is the traditional bourgeoisie of the Negro people, with roots running back beyond the Civil War. As remarked above, it has expanded recently with the general growth of the Negro urban communities; but it still remains a fringe bourgeoisie, blocked from genuine industrial expansion and also facing an ever-greater competition from the white bourgeoisie for the increasingly important Negro market. The one-time widely held dream of Negro nationalists to build up a rounded-out Negro economy has proved illusory and has been abandoned.

One of the most marked characteristics of the present situation of the Negro people is that the Negro bour-

geoisie is under heavy, unprecedented attack from the rival imperialist white bourgeoisie. What is involved in this struggle is the control of the Negro national market (with \$15 billion yearly) and the political domination of the Negro people. It is necessary that we give close study to all the ramifications of this struggle.

The imperialist capitalists, for the more effective penetration of the Negro market, which is largely one of retail trade, are using a variety of means. They are setting up connections with the important Negro banks and insurance companies; they are establishing chain stores with Negro managers in the ghettos; and they are advertising heavily in the Negro press. Sylvia Porter in the *N. Y. Post* (Dec. 3, 1954) states that Wall Street hopes for one billion yearly in Negro investments. The imperialists are trying not only in some cases to exterminate the Negro bourgeoisie, but also largely, if not mainly, to change its character—to make it organically dependent upon the imperialist bourgeoisie. These trends for white control have a direct historical relationship to the earlier white penetration of Negro organizations and movements, but the latter were directed more towards securing political control over the Negro masses than the direct conquest of the national Negro market, as is the case today.

Lenin in his famous colonial theses at the second congress of the Communist International, held in

1920, p
bourge
under
the n
quent
special
China,
this c
tional
bourge
colonia
Latin
found.
such
among
United
even t
a colo
papers
Pittsbu
fender
ready
big im
biles, c
whiske
practic
nifican
most I
wing o
ly, the
again
geoisie
latter's
Ebony
quently
Negro
Negro
have to
Americ
The
the cor
geoisie

1920, pointed out how the imperialist bourgeoisie in the colonial countries undertakes to control and dominate the national bourgeoisie and frequently succeeds. Later on, in the special conditions prevailing in China, Mao Tse-tung characterized this corrupted section of the national bourgeoisie as the comprador bourgeoisie. In all colonial and semi-colonial countries of Asia, Africa, and Latin America this tendency is to be found. Undoubtedly, there are also such tendencies being cultivated among the Negro people in the United States by the big bourgeoisie, even though, of course, they are not a colonial people. Important Negro papers such as the *Amsterdam News*, *Pittsburgh Courier*, the *Chicago Defender*, and especially *Ebony*, are already so full of advertisements of the big imperialist outfits for automobiles, electrical appliances, cigarettes, whiskey, food products, etc., as to be practically dependent upon them. Significantly, this trend is among the most Republican, most conservative wing of the Negro press. Interestingly, these journals frequently polemicize against the so-called ghetto bourgeoisie as stand-patters, because of the latter's "pro-segregation" tendencies. *Ebony* attacks them sharply and frequently as having vested interests in Negro segregation. In analyzing the Negro bourgeoisie, however, we have to bear in mind its pronounced American specific features.

The above tendencies to accept the controls of the imperialist bourgeoisie are at present not the domi-

nant ones in the Negro bourgeoisie and petty bourgeoisie, but they are the most dangerous in the ranks of the Negro people. And they are definitely on the increase. We, therefore, must not ignore them, but on the contrary, must carefully evaluate and combat them. They provide much of the economic and political base for the considerable body of apologists for the American Jim-Crow system that has grown up in recent years among Negro intellectuals—those who take the shameful position that "things are not so bad for the Negroes in the United States." The latest disgraceful example of this tendency was Rep. Adam Clayton Powell at the Bandung conference.

The Negro bourgeoisie generally is not revolutionary; it is not aiming consciously at the national liberation of the Negro people—although such help as it may give to the struggle can objectively have this effect. The time was, however, when the Negro bourgeoisie, although very small, was militantly revolutionary, during the Abolitionist fight, during the Civil War, and during the Reconstruction period. The Negro bourgeoisie may possibly become so again with the further increase of the fascist danger and the sharpening of the attacks against the Negro people. In general its present outlook is reformist.

As a whole the Negro people constitute a very important section of the democratic, peace-loving forces of the American people—despite

conservative and reactionary elements in their ranks. On the question of peace, although there are numerous Negro red-baiters, Soviet-haters and warmongers, these by no means exercise such a decisive influence among the Negro people as do, for example, the pro-war bureaucrats in the labor movement. The support of the bipartisan war policies by Negro leaders, even among the bourgeoisie, is by no means as widespread, aggressive, and unconditional as that in corresponding white circles. As many of our writers have pointed out, their support is but a wavering one. Very often their attitude is one of silence on foreign issues and of obvious sympathy for the peoples either threatened by or under the heel of American imperialism. They distinctly have a fellow-feeling with the oppressed peoples of Asia and Africa. On the question of fascism, notwithstanding their opportunists, the Negro people are in the forefront of the opposition—a Negro fascist would be almost a contradiction in terms. On the general questions of economic and political reforms, the leadership of the Negro people, in the press and elsewhere, generally takes a constructive position.

In the matter of equal rights for Negroes, the Negro people naturally display their greatest unity and progressive spirit. The fight against Jim Crow is the deepest expression of their national feelings. Even the most unreliable comprador elements among the bourgeoisie and petty-

bourgeoisie in their own slippery manner take some part in the fight against the most outrageous features of Jim Crowism. Thus *Ebony*, which is on the extreme right, nevertheless, bitterly assails many aspects of Jim Crow. Negro conservatives take this stand of at least partial opposition because, betray as they may, as Negroes they cannot escape personally the whips and scorpions of Jim Crow. Here the racial factor is a decisive element in determining their attitude.

The substance of all the foregoing is that the Communist Party Program is correct in proposing to unite the Negro people as a whole, including the bourgeoisie and petty-bourgeoisie, in the broad Negro-white coalition, "to join hands in a common fight against the ravages of economic depression, against the menace of McCarthyism, for jobs, peace, equal rights, and democracy." It is among our most basic tasks to help realize this Negro national unity in the highest degree possible, jointly with other democratic forces in the vitally important national elections of 1956.

In carrying out this Negro national unity policy we must bear three propositions in mind:

- 1) We must work for the leadership of the Negro proletariat in the Negro people's movement; 2) while cooperating with the Negro bourgeoisie in general insofar as it fights for constructive measures, we must not tail after it in an acceptance of its leadership; 3) we must actively

oppos
elemen
people
of dis
to the
the R
critica
which
of refe
rialism
dange
the M
which
the n
"Left"
our w
fronts
RACE
FO
One
persist
work
consid
fight
neglec
ous, a
ens of
must
The
menta
we n
elemen
tional
factor
to bea
there
oppre
of rac
ture.
menti
the F

oppose the treacherous comprador element in the ranks of the Negro people. That is, we have to, on pain of disaster to our Party's work and to the Negro struggle, avoid both the Right danger of following uncritically after the Negro bourgeoisie, which would lead us into the swamp of reformism, and therewith of imperialism; and also the "Left" sectarian danger of refusing to cooperate with the Negro bourgeoisie in general, which would tend to isolate us from the masses. Both the Right and "Left" dangers are now present in our work, and we must fight on two fronts against them.

RACIAL FACTOR IN FIGHT FOR NEGRO LIBERATION

One of the long-time and most persistent weaknesses in our Negro work is our failure to take into full consideration the racial factor in the fight of the Negro people. Such neglect is both harmful and dangerous, as it greatly confuses and weakens our Negro work. This mistake must be corrected.

The Negro question is fundamentally a national question, and we must never lose sight of this elementary reality. But it is a national question with a strong racial factor in it, and it is important also to bear this fact in mind. In history there have been many examples of oppressed nations where the question of race did not enter into the picture. Among such examples, we may mention the Irish under the British, the Poles under the Tsarist Great

Russians, the French Canadians under the English Canadians, and the Koreans under the Japanese. When the question of race occurs, as with the American Negro people, the national oppression is greatly deepened, sharpened, and complicated. Here I shall not attempt to define the concept of "race," as that has been done adequately, I believe, in my books, *The Negro People in American History* (pp. 473-475) and *Outline Political History of the Americas* (pp. 553-571).

The terms "race" and "nation" are not mutually exclusive, as some of our writers on the Negro question seem to think. On the contrary, in the situation of the American Negro people, they are very much interlocked and interrelated, and it is very necessary that we do not confuse them. The racial element has long been practically ignored by us, especially in a theoretical sense. This is a serious error, for the question of race is important. Without the racial factor Negro national oppression never could have assumed the particularly horrible aspects that it has in the United States. It is absurd to analyze the Negro question if the racial angle is ignored or denied, as is so often the case.

Except for the racial aspect, specifically the color question, it would have been impossible to make slaves of the Negro people in the first place. The continuance of slavery over the centuries also would not have been possible. And at the present time, without the race element, the main-

tenance of compulsory ghettos and the whole Jim-Crow system could not be kept up. Also the ratio of absorption of the Negro people into the general mass of the American population would proceed at a much more rapid rate than is now the case. The question of race affects every phase of the Negro national question. One of its most important effects is that in the face of the Jim-Crow system, it provides a tremendous bond of solidarity among the oppressed Negro people. It forces everyone with even the slightest discernible trace of Negro descent under the dual persecution of the Jim-Crow system. It is a factor that makes even Negro pro-imperialist betrayers of the basic interests of the Negro people give some sort of grudging support to elementary anti-Jim Crow reform measures, as the color bar hits them too, and they cannot escape it as individuals, no matter how rich or servile they may become.

The question of race bears down so heavily upon the Negro people that overwhelmingly, they consider it the basic problem they confront, practically ignoring all the elementary considerations of Negro nationhood. And perhaps 99 per cent of the American people have the same opinion—that the Negro question is purely a racial matter. Although we Communists have over recent years played down the question of race, it is a fact nevertheless that our main practical slogans

in this general field are anti-racist in character—that is, those relating to the fight against *white* chauvinism.

At this point a sharp word of warning is necessary if mistakes are to be avoided regarding the element of race. We must not, in dealing with the racial factor, use it as some sort of substitute for the national question. This is the course of the reformists and it has nothing in common with the policy of the Communist Party. We must, in analyzing class and racial factors in the Negro question, understand above all that the Negro question in its essence is basically a national question.

In the early days of our Party, inheriting the previous wrong line of the Socialist Party, we erroneously considered the Negro question to be simply a class question. A few years later, we came to consider it to be primarily a racial question. Still later we got to understand it as a national question, but in doing this we unwisely discarded almost altogether considerations of the racial factor. This was a mistake which we must now correct; otherwise we cannot have a sound Negro policy. We must understand and deal with the Negro question in its three-fold complexity—as a *class* question, a *racial* question, and overall, a *national* question. We cannot discard any one of these three factors without falling into theoretical and practical confusion.

THE
WH
Wh
basis
super-
ple, i
which
is idl
basic
the N
time
this i
very l
is pr
made
today
this r
stand
other
count
white
jor e
Marx
The
be on
is the
ure o
again
prete
is the
tion,
frequ
white
white
also
the d
amon
there
white
ranks
advan

THE FIGHT AGAINST WHITE CHAUVINISM

White chauvinism, the ideological basis of Jim Crowism and of the super-exploitation of the Negro people, is a deadly political disease which must be resolutely fought. It is idle to think of accomplishing basic and lasting results for and with the Negro people unless at the same time a struggle is waged against this ideological poison. One of the very best achievements of our Party is precisely the fight that it has made over the years and is making today against white chauvinism. In this respect the Communist Party stands far in the forefront of all other general organizations in this country. Our Party's fight against white chauvinism is one of the major expressions of its fundamental Marxist-Leninist character.

The greatest menace we have to be on guard against in this respect is the Right danger. This is the failure or refusal in general to fight against white chauvinism under one pretext or another. Such a failure is the mass weakness on the question, and as we know, this weakness frequently goes to the extreme among white workers of actively practicing white chauvinism. Then there is also the negative fact, illustrating the deep extent of white chauvinism among the American people, that there are more than a few traces of white chauvinism even in our own ranks, although our Party is far in advance of other organizations as

to being free of this poison. The fight against white chauvinism is one we must make constantly, not only among the white masses, but also in our own Party. The Negro people expect our Party to be clean of poisonous white chauvinism and to set an example in this respect.

There is also the "Leftist" danger, which can do grave damage too in the fight against white chauvinism. We had a big dose of this deviation during the past few years. This was mainly the tendency to separate the fight against white chauvinism from the struggle for equal rights for the Negro people—that is, to restrict the anti-chauvinist fight to a sort of inner-Party campaign. This mistake was expressed ideologically by the general idea that our Party was unable to fight for Negro rights until it first cleansed itself completely of all traces of white chauvinism. This was a dangerously sectarian notion, which was intensified by certain Negro bourgeois nationalist tendencies that were also present. Such sectarianism can only lead our Party into distorted and fantastic conceptions of white chauvinism and undermine our fight against it, cripple the Party's mass struggle for Negro rights, and weaken its influence among the Negro masses—all of which this "Leftist" mistake did in a very marked manner. In correcting this glaringly wrong policy, however, some have hopped to the other harmful extreme, to the Right, of slackening in general the fight against white chauvinism.]

In the matter of the fight against white chauvinism three important considerations, closely related, should be restressed. The first is that the fight against white chauvinism must be greatly strengthened, both without and within our Party; the second is that the only way this struggle can be waged effectively is on the basis of a mass fight for Negro rights, a fight which must be greatly stepped up on all fronts. Without a fight at the same time for Negro rights, the fight against white chauvinism becomes empty. The third consideration is that the struggle for Negro rights and against white chauvinism must go ahead simultaneously, it being impossible to separate the two aspects of the one general struggle for Negro liberation without falling into the most serious Right opportunist and "Left" sectarian errors. The supreme thing we must understand is to increase drastically our general fight for Negro equality in all fields and to tie in skillfully with this a relentless struggle against every manifestation of white chauvinism.

ON THE QUESTION OF THE RECENT REFORMS

During the past dozen years, and especially in the period since the end of World War II, the Negro people and their white allies have won a number of reforms in their fight against the outrage of Jim Crowism. These reforms have been advertised all over the world as marking the virtual ending of Jim-Crow persecu-

tion in the United States. This is a gross misrepresentation. At most the reforms have merely blunted some of the most jagged edges of the Jim-Crow system. The Negro people remain grossly discriminated against in industry, in politics, in law, in the arts, in housing, in travel, and in every other phase of American life.

In every case it will be seen that the relief granted to the Negro people by these reforms is but partial, and that even this partial relief is at best uncertain and precarious. While it is a fact that there have been no public lynchings during the past three or four years, it is also a fact that there continue many brutal shootings of Negroes in the South and elsewhere, and police violence against Negroes is a crying evil all over the country. It is also true that there has been a partial desegregation of the army, but nevertheless Negro soldiers are still abused in the South, few Negroes reach the status of officers* and subtle forms of discrimination prevail through all branches of the armed services. Also in recent years, because of trade union action, Negroes have had some better access to jobs in industry, including the skilled trades; but they are still heavily discriminated against. The old rule of the last to be hired and the first to be fired still generally applies to their situation.

There is, it is true, also a tendency

* Defense Department statistics (*N. Y. Times*, April 24, 1955) show that although enlisted Negro soldiers amount to 13.7% of the total in the Army, Negro officers account for only 2.9% of Army officers. In the Navy, Air Force and Marines Negro officers amount to less than 1% of the total.

to put up occasional Negroes as candidates on Republican and Democratic tickets; but this is still only on a token basis, with the Negro people falling far short of being proportionately represented. The decision of the U.S. Supreme Court calling for desegregation of the schools is very important; but this order is very far from being enforced, especially in the South. The same limitations are also to be seen with regard to such advances as the Negro people have been able to make against the Jim Crow barriers in the arts, in the theater, in sports, etc.

In evaluating these reforms we must beware of two dangers—the "Leftist" danger, which would underestimate them and sweep them away as of no real importance, and the Right danger which, overestimating them, would hail them as virtually signaling the end of the Jim-Crow system. One thing we must be careful about is to evaluate these gains, limited though they may be, as the Negro people understand and feel them, which is that they are important. It is easy for whites, who do not feel personally the terrors, injuries, and humiliations of the horrible Jim-Crow system, to brush the reforms aside. But it is a fact that, despite all the shortcomings of such reforms, the Negroes hail every alleviation, however small, of the rigors of the Jim-Crow system. For example, they rightly saw it as a real victory for the Negro people when Marian Anderson was able to sing in the Metropolitan Opera House,

the first Negro to appear there during its 70 years of existence—notwithstanding the fact that gross discrimination against Negroes still prevails in this and other cultural institutions.

Such concessions as they have won, far from satisfying the Negro people, distinctly encourage and spur them on in their determination to fight for more. This is as it should be. The Communist Party must let no opportunity pass to cultivate and strengthen this fight of the Negro people. It should re-double its efforts in this direction, and it should combat all tendencies to self-satisfaction and to rest upon our oars.

In relation to the situation of the American Negro people perhaps the most favorable development is the growing feeling of friendliness of whites for Negroes that is to be observed. This is noticeable in the better relation between white and Negro workers in industry and in the unions, in the friendly reception given to pioneer Negro students in various Southern Jim-Crow colleges, in the mass heroizing of Negro ball players, and the like. While hailing these gradually improving personal relations, we must never minimize the remaining deepseated and widespread white chauvinism which, as we well know, infects the white people and is quite capable of flaring up into terrible race riots and lynchings. This poisonous white chauvinism we must fight ceaselessly.

In speaking to the Negro masses regarding the anti-Jim-Crow reforms

which they have won in recent years, there are two things that we must make clear. The first of these is that these reforms have been relatively superficial and have not struck at the heart of the Jim-Crow system. And the second thing to warn against is that even these limited reforms are in a very precarious situation in view of the dangerous state of reaction in this country and consequently they must be defended militantly by the Negro people and their white allies as a basic and most vital part of the general defense of civil rights. The Program of the Communist Party does a great service in stressing the threatened situation of the Negro people and the imperative necessity for an active fight for the defense and improvement of their conditions.

In the Black Belt of the South the Negro agricultural population, besides being deeply impoverished, is also in an increasingly unstable economic situation. Certain long term tendencies are at work there against the Negro people. One of these has been the tremendous expansion of the cotton industry—at least 15 times over—since 1865. This expansion has in the main gone to the West, to the rich lands of Texas, Oklahoma, Arizona, New Mexico, and California, where the Negroes are a lesser factor—leaving the bulk of the Negro cotton producers in the less productive Black Belt. Mechanization, which is already playing an important role in cotton production, also works against the Negro farmers,

sharecroppers, and laborers because they are unable to buy the tractors, cotton-pickers and other expensive machines. In the case of a severe economic crisis all this could work out disastrously for the Negro cotton producers, as the less productive Black Belt would be hit with catastrophic force.

The position of the Negro workers in industry, both in the South and the North, is also particularly precarious. The "prosperity" of the past few years that has attracted so many of the workers into the industrial areas is largely based on sand. Although Negro workers have secured a certain status on the job seniority lists, they are as a group disproportionately at the bottom. They are still basically discriminated against in both hiring and firing. During the great economic crisis of 1929-33 the ratio of the Negroes to the white unemployed was about two to one, and in another economic crisis it would probably also again approach this ratio. In the present army of 4,000,000 unemployed the Negroes constitute decidedly more than their proportion in the working class. The looming danger of an economic crisis is a deadly threat to the great body of the workers as a whole, but it is doubly so in the case of Negro workers. It would more than wipe out such slight economic gains as the Negro workers have made in recent years. It could also tend to reverse the migration tendency and force large numbers of Negroes back to the Southern Black Belt.

The element of precariousness especially applies to the Negro people in the field of civil rights, where some recent gains have been made against the Jim-Crow system. Especially the growth of strong fascist trends in this country is a deadly threat to the meager and stunted democratic liberties of the Negro people. For American history teaches the clear lesson that any reactionary force which menaces the liberties of all the people, as in the case of fascism, operates with double and triple force against the Negro people, who are always a major target for the forces of reaction. Thus, it would be the gravest folly to ignore the growth of such sinister anti-Negro organizations as the White Circle League, the National Association for the Advancement of White People, and the many other actual and looming attacks upon the Negro people. Our Party must doubly warn the Negro people against illusions that the exploiters will voluntarily give up the Jim-Crow system which, as Victor Perlo estimates, brings them in yearly at least four billion dollars in super-profits. The situation demands that our Party multiply its efforts in the fight for the fullest economic, political and social equality for the Negro people.

Curiously enough, even some of the recent reforms the Negro people have won carry a threat to certain Negro national institutions. Thus, the entry of Negro baseball players into big league baseball, a real victory which was pioneered by the Communist Party, has had a cata-

strophic effect upon the leading Negro baseball leagues by depriving them of their best stars and thousands of their patrons. By the same token, the Supreme Court's decision on school desegregation will eventually radically change the elaborate system of Negro schools and colleges in the South by bringing into them considerable numbers of white students. Other Negro organizations will also be affected by these new trends, which we must note and study.

PRESSURE OF WORLD DEMOCRATIC FORCES

Now we must confront one of the most complex aspects of the present situation of the Negro people in the United States. This is to determine just how and why the Negro people have been able during the past dozen years to win the recent limited reforms after fighting in vain for them through many decades. Obviously, the first phase of the answer to this question is that the Negro people themselves have greatly broadened and stepped up their anti-Jim Crow fight during recent years. They have been enabled to do this because of various factors.

By moving into the cities in millions they have become an effective election force, notably in the strategic states of the North. By joining the unions in masses they have enormously and favorably increased their cooperative contacts with white workers—the million-and-a-half Negro trade unionists are in themselves

a powerful anti-Jim Crow force. By building the NAACP into a large and active mass organization they have increased their political power. By broadening their united front relations with various progressive white groups and organizations, particularly with the progressive trade unions, the Negro people have enormously strengthened their fighting capacity. And they have fought actively, as above indicated, in an environment where great working masses of our people are steadily becoming more understanding of, and friendly to, the Negro people.

White allies of the Negro people in their fight for justice have vastly multiplied in the past decade. In all this struggle against Jim Crow, the militant pioneering role of the Communist Party has been of basic importance. Its influence, not only in the past, but also at present, must not be minimized. The Party's current fight for Negro rights, for world peace and against fascism more deeply influence the masses than we often realize.

The ever-increasing numbers and activities of the Negro people and their white allies undoubtedly have been of decisive importance in winning the concessions that the Negro people have secured recently. Nevertheless, of itself, this force was not enough to secure these reforms. There is another great factor of decisive importance, which also must be taken into account. This is the tremendous pressure which in recent years has been brought to bear

against the American Jim-Crow system by the gigantic world forces of democracy, trade unionism, national colonial liberation, and socialism.

All over the world, especially during and after World War II, these vast forces, with the workers in the lead, have kept up a drumfire of opposition and condemnation of the Jim-Crow persecution of the Negro people in the United States. This has been especially strong on the part of the great non-white peoples of Asia, now breaking the fetters of colonial slavery, who know from bitter first-hand experience the arrogance of white-chauvinist exploiters and oppressors. The condemnation of Jim Crow has been also severe in the white nations of Europe, where every act of oppression of the Negro people is vigorously condemned by large sections of the people.

A powerful organizing force in developing this world condemnation of Jim Crowism has come from the progressive elements of the American Negro people—one of the greatest strokes in this respect being the publication and presentation to the United Nations of the famous book, *We Charge Genocide*, by such fighters as Paul Robeson, William L. Patterson, and Dr. W. E. B. Du Bois.

The Communist Party of the United States has also done much to awaken the workers of the world to the injustice inflicted upon the Negro people in this country. And in the great colonial and semi-colonial lands, in the countries of peo-

ple's democracy and socialism, and in the capitalist nations of Europe, the outstanding leaders of the campaign everywhere against Jim Crowism are the respective Communist Parties.

American imperialism, despite all its strength and arrogance, has had to pay real attention to this powerful international condemnation of Jim Crowism. For it has proved disastrous to Wall Street's pretensions of democracy, pretensions which are indispensable for its program of imperialist aggression. It is a matter of common knowledge that everywhere the agents of American imperialism go they are highly embarrassed and seriously impeded by the taunts and protests of the various peoples against the outrageous manner in which Negroes are abused and mistreated in the United States. Jim Crow has turned out to be a millstone around the neck of the Wall Street would-be world conquerors. While the Jim-Crow system stands out so flagrantly in the United States, Wall Street's pretensions of being the world champion of democracy are patently absurd, and its program of establishing its international domination is made much more difficult.

Consequently, the imperialists have had to do something about the matter. This has taken the form of easing up a bit on some of the worst features of Jim Crowism. Undoubtedly international embarrassment for American imperialism over the Jim-Crow system has been and still

is a most powerful factor in conceding the Negroes such limited reforms as have recently taken place. In this respect the aim of the Washington government is not to abolish Jim-Crow segregation and persecution, but simply to smooth over some of its most scandalous features, so that it will not stand out so obnoxiously and be such an intolerable stench in the nostrils of the democratic forces of the world. Consideration of this foreign policy necessity is also the main reason why the government has sent so many pliable Negro leaders abroad to exaggerate the Negro reforms at home and try to convince the peoples of the world that things "aren't so bad" for American Negroes. It is a main reason why Ralph Bunche was given such prominence as a diplomat and why C. H. Mahony, a Negro, was appointed as a delegate to the United Nations. The idea is to make it appear to the peoples of the world that the U.S. government is fair to the Negro people.

American imperialism, as a part of its general program of international aggression, has thus been compelled to adopt an apologetic attitude for Jim Crow. Take, for example, the question of the desegregation of the armed forces, such as it is. It had become virtually impossible for the United States to maintain Jim-Crow armies in Asia or Europe in the face of the popular opposition to Negro segregation. Everywhere the segregated American army went it was a living refutation to Wall Street's pretenses of democracy.

Something therefore had to be and was done about it in the desegregation order. By the same token, at least a gesture towards desegregating the schools had become a necessity for American international policy. And if in recent years the Southern lynch mobs are not so much in evidence, a very considerable reason for this is that American imperialism is afraid of the deleterious effects abroad of lynchings in this country. Hence, the potential lynch gangs have acquired a fear that if they dare undertake a lynching, at long last the F.B.I. might possibly take some action against them.

Today, erstwhile rabid Jim Crowists in many parts of the country are yielding a bit under the ever-present contention that a partial mitigation of Jim Crow persecution is indispensable as a matter of American foreign policy. The whole foreign policy pressure thus constitutes a very powerful force in winning such limited concessions as the Negro people have secured in the past few years. It may be remarked in passing that this international democratic pressure has also helped not little the general fight of the American masses for peace and against McCarthyism in the United States. Such minor lessenings of Jim Crow sharpness as the imperialists are now conceding, while not destroying the Jim-Crow system, make very plausible arguments for American apologists in Asia and Europe, who are striving to make it appear that discrimination and persecution against

Negroes in this country have ended, or nearly so.

The above conclusions regarding the importance of the international factor in the fight against Jim Crow are borne out by the remarkable fact that the concessions have been made to the Negro people during a period of acute war hysteria and of rising fascist danger, one in which, through a whole spate of semi-fascist legislation, the democratic rights of the people as a whole—in the trade unions, in respect to the Communist Party and other Left bodies, in the school system, and elsewhere—have been seriously curtailed. In fact, the Negro people themselves have also been under a growing attack in various spheres. This seeming anomaly can be explained only upon the basis of the international democratic pressures above-mentioned, compelling American imperialism to make at least a pretense of abolishing the Jim-Crow system.

THE STRENGTHENING OF NEGRO REFORMISM

During several years past, especially in the war and post-war period, there has been a marked increase in the influence of bourgeois and social-reformist leaders among the Negro workers and other sections of the Negro people. Various factors have contributed to this—especially the illusions connected with the current false, war-made prosperity, which have also cultivated reformist influences in the trade union movement. But a powerful and special

elen
gro
not
that
tion
mak
the
thro
form
and
refo
enal
and
thus
whic
only
Se
nize
tion
issue
But
sary
this
dem
velo
worl
cent
sequ
is th
thus
deser
have
slanc
natio
have
tive
can
By th
acqu
the
being
cratic

element operating to strengthen Negro reformism, and one that must not be ignored, is precisely the fact that the government, for the international policy reasons above cited, in making some surface concessions to the Negro people, has done so through the instrumentality of the reformists. Consequently, the NAACP and other Negro organizations with reformists at their head have been enabled to profit hugely in prestige and leadership. These elements are thus getting credit for victories for which they are at best responsible only to a limited degree.

Several years ago our Party recognized that the American Negro question had become an international issue of considerable importance. But we have not drawn the necessary conclusions and policies from this patent fact as the international democratic pressure has gone on developing during the course of the world anti-Jim Crow struggle of recent years. One of the major consequences of this failure on our part is that the Negro reformists have thus been facilitated in reaping undeserved prestige. Many of them have even insolently attempted to slander and denounce the very international democratic forces which have been playing such a constructive role in the fight of the American Negro people for equal rights. By the same token, by our failure to acquaint the Negro people fully with the great importance of the fight being made for them by the democratic forces of the world, our

Party's prestige has suffered accordingly.

In this general situation the Communist Party in its Negro work faces a number of tasks which we, although belatedly, must take up energetically. For one thing, we must explain to the workers and other democratic forces in other countries the very limited character of the government's anti-Jim Crow actions, such as the desegregation of the armed forces, the Supreme Court's school desegregation order and the like. We must point out strongly the continuing reality of the Jim-Crow system. We must also stimulate these international forces to continue and intensify everywhere their pressure against American Jim Crowism. Even more important, we must make the American Negro masses fully aware of the great forces operating in their behalf on a world scale. The Negro people already are the most international-minded section of the working class and American democratic forces, and they are highly sympathetic to the democratic struggles of oppressed peoples throughout the world. With the realization of the fight these world forces are making against Jim Crow the Negro people can be all the more readily enlisted in all phases of the great struggle for peace and democracy, both in our country and abroad.

ON THE QUESTION OF "LEFT CENTERS"

Naturally, the changes that have

been taking place in the status of the Negro people, especially during the past decade or so—urbanization, industrialization, the building up of powerful Negro mass organizations, the penetration of the trade unions, as well as the effects of the general economic and political situation in our country and throughout the world—carry with them certain necessary policy changes for us. These affect not only individual planks in our program, but also our organizational forms and methods of work. Here we can deal with only one of these specific questions, namely, the problem of the “Left centers,” now being so actively discussed in our Party.

Twenty years ago, with the Negro people in the North, although rapidly stirring, still largely isolated from the general mass white organizations, especially the trade unions, our Party had to concentrate its work upon helping create such independent organizations as the National Negro Congress. A number of years before that we also even had to give consideration to the question of forming Negro trade unions where Negro workers were barred from the conservative unions.

Now, however, we face a quite different situation, with the Northern Negro workers members en masse of the trade unions—both A. F. of L. and C.I.O.—with their building of the N.A.A.C.P. into a mass body, with their playing an increasingly important role in the Democratic Party, and with their

entering into many other types of mass organizations from which they had hitherto been barred. Obviously, in such a situation it is our task to base our Negro work upon these mass organizations. A further special consideration to this end is the fact that with the heavy government persecution of the Communist Party and all other Left and progressive organizations, the need is all the greater to ally ourselves closely with the masses in their organizations. Of course, in the South, where the Negro masses in the industries and on the farms are largely unorganized, the problem is more complex.

Those comrades who are placing all the stress upon building “Left centers” are not abreast of the actual situation prevailing among the Negro people, especially in the North, and among the broad American masses. “Left centers,” correct 25 years ago, may now be highly sectarian. On the other hand, we must not take a dogmatic, one-sided stand in this matter and make a fetish of opposition to “Left centers.” This could lead us into damaging opportunist practices. In certain cases—which have to be individually considered—“Left center” organizations and activities have to be created in order to carry on work otherwise impossible. In this respect, a very important need is to build a powerful independent Left-progressive press—and the same need exists in other branches of our mass work. The main thing to realize is that we must work within the mass organ-

ization
separ
quest
cusse
tivati
ganiz
amon
in th
SOM
CC
Th
port
progr
gro
stress
largel
have
and a
we ne
If the
our P
groun
Some
among
caused
experie
are de
gence.
First
sharpe
of the
we m
to its n
Americ
this, as
who u
Negro
the cur
gro pes
ited so
We
a persp

izations and not isolate ourselves in separate movements. This whole question should be concretely discussed within the framework of cultivating work among the broad organized workers in the North and among the broad unorganized masses in the South.

SOME GENERAL CONCLUSIONS

The foregoing Notes do not purport to present a fully rounded-out program or detailed tasks on the Negro question. They do, however, stress a number of key matters—largely new problems—to which we have not given full consideration, and also some old ones, on which we need to do some new thinking. If these lessons are taken to heart our Party can go far to recover lost ground among the Negro people. Some of these losses, like those among white workers, are directly caused by the persecution now being experienced by our Party, but others are definitely due to our own negligence.

First of all, we have got to greatly sharpen up our theoretical analysis of the Negro question. As Marxists, we must also pay special attention to its newer aspects and to its specific American features. Neglecting to do this, as with many of our comrades who undertake to speak upon our Negro work, means to deal not with the current situation among the Negro people, but with that which existed some years back.

We must orient definitely upon a perspective of increasing struggles

in the future by the Negro people, in alliance with ever greater numbers of white workers. Especially must we be aware of this regarding the 1956 national election. The Negro people's struggle will generally be provoked by sharpening economic and political reaction. Those who, in view of present reforms won by the Negro people, draw the conclusion that the anti-Jim-Crow fight is virtually won, are living in an illusion. The decisive struggle on this whole question still lies ahead.

A major point in our program, too, must be to work constantly and skillfully to strengthen the leading role of the working class in the national struggles of the Negro people. To this end, in addition to the measures mentioned above, our Party should take care to develop as Negro cadres those workers who have had actual experience in basic industry and in the trade unions.

Let us remember, too, that although the Negro masses in the North are playing a greatly increased role in the battle for Negro rights, the main center of struggle still lies in the South. Two-thirds of the Negro people live there, and it is there that even the most elementary Negro rights have to be won. That is where the big and bitter battles still have to be fought—the winning of the land for the landless, the securing of jobs in industry for the workers, Negro penetration of the trade unions, the union organization of the workers in industry, the desegregation of the schools, the establish-

ment of civil rights generally, and ultimately the winning of the right of self-determination. The South remains the main home of the Jim-Crow system and also of the struggle against it.

In the fight against white chauvinism too, we particularly must bear in mind that this struggle cannot be separated from the general fight for Negro rights, but must be an organic part of that struggle. Our Party suffered grave damages in loss of prestige and leadership because of the "Leftist" sectarian way we conducted this fight during the past several years, by our trying in practice to single out white chauvinism to be combatted by itself.

In building the national solidarity of the Negro people we must also keep in mind and always work on two fronts. That is, we must fight against the Rightist danger of tailing after the Negro bourgeoisie, and also against the sectarian danger of isolating ourselves from the masses through ill-advised "Left centers" and other "Leftist" practices, some of which have been mentioned in passing.

In our Party's fight against social reformism, which is increasingly a peril to the Negro workers and to other masses, we must, among other measures, particularly pay attention to popularizing among Negroes the important and badly neglected fact of the vital role of the world's workers and other democratic forces in the fight against American Jim Crowism.

The main thing, however, that we must remember is that improvements in theoretical analysis and tactical measures will avail us but little if we do not at the same time build the Communist Party and greatly increase its activities on all fronts in the fight for Negro rights. Our slackening in this respect during the recent past has been the most elementary reason for such losses as we have had among the Negro masses. Over the decades our Party has won for itself very much prestige among the Negro people as the tireless, pioneering and indomitable fighter for their rights. But we cannot live on our past reputation alone; we must renew and strengthen this prestige every day in the constant fight for Negro equality.

At this time, when the Communist Party is setting out to improve drastically its Negro work, we could do no better than to pattern after the splendid example recently set by Comrade Ben Davis. Although locked up in prison, Ben was able to launch a real pioneering fight against Jim Crow by his battle to abolish Negro segregation in the Federal penitentiaries. This fight is of historic importance; its great significance being that it expresses the true fighting spirit of the Communist Party, not to mention of Ben himself. Give us more of such battling and the Communist Party will soon vastly strengthen its leading, fighting position among the Negro people.

By A

IN THE
tant c
in our
This
phase
tion—
nism.
follow

1) "

s

t

c

2) P

v

3) T

p

ch

4) V

fi

I. Th

Str

the

vin

Very

the foll

the fig

question

chauvin

tion. D

opinion

total m

The Fight Against White Chauvinism

By Andrew Stevens

IN THE recent period, a most important discussion has been developing in our Party on the Negro question. This article deals with only one phase of this highly complex question—the fight against white chauvinism. It concerns itself with the following:

- 1) The relationship between the struggle for Negro rights and the mass fight against white chauvinism.
- 2) Has the danger of white chauvinism increased or decreased?
- 3) The relationship of the inner-Party struggle against white chauvinism to the mass struggle.
- 4) What is the main danger in the fight for Negro rights?

I. *The Relationship Between the Struggle for Negro Rights and the Fight Against White Chauvinism Among the Masses*

Very frequently we run up against the following opinion in the Party: the fight for Negro rights is a mass question, but the fight against white chauvinism is an inner-Party question. Despite its wide currency, this opinion is wrong and is based on a total misunderstanding of the con-

tent of the struggle against white chauvinism.

What is often implied here is that the struggle against white chauvinism can be conducted only within a Marxist framework, that acceptance of a Marxist position on the Negro question is a precondition for fighting white chauvinism.

What is the fallacy? It is a failure to understand that the struggle for Negro rights—and consequently the fight against the ideology of white chauvinism—is essentially a struggle for elementary bourgeois-democratic rights and against an ideology which justifies the denial of bourgeois-democratic rights to the Negro people. It is not a struggle for socialist demands or socialist ideology—although, obviously such a struggle can be most effectively and consistently conducted only from a socialist standpoint.

As a result of this separation between the inner-Party struggle against white chauvinism and the mass fight for Negro rights, those holding such opinions tend to become isolated from the broad movements of struggle against white chauvinism which are actually de-

veloping among the non-Party masses—most often under the political leadership of Social-Democrats, reformists and liberals. At the same time, those who take this position tend to turn the entire struggle against white chauvinism inwardly as though the source of white chauvinist ideology were to be found within the Communist Party and the Left generally. Since the fight against white chauvinism is developed exclusively as an inner-Party struggle, no thought is given to the tactical questions involved in such a struggle, to the forms and methods of united front struggle against white chauvinism. When life itself catapults these Party members, willy-nilly, into a mass struggle against white chauvinism, they tend to commit grievous sectarian mistakes because they mechanically transplant the methods, forms and issues of inner-Party struggle to the non-Party mass movements and organizations. To the extent that such an inner-Party struggle against white chauvinism is developed, it is usually divorced from the issues and problems of the mass struggle for Negro rights.

A MASS STRUGGLE

The struggle against white chauvinism must be seen *in the first place* as a mass struggle. It is the ideological accompaniment and counterpart of the struggle for Negro rights. Every struggle for Negro rights inevitably precipitates major ideological questions among the masses. This

is because the ideology of white chauvinism is intended to "justify" oppression of the Negro people and to prevent Negro-white unity. It is impossible, in fact, to conduct a successful struggle for Negro rights separate and apart from the struggle against white chauvinism. What kind of a struggle, for example, can be carried on to enforce the Supreme Court ruling on desegregation which does not challenge the racist ideology on which segregation in the schools is based? The converse is also true. It is impossible to develop a struggle against white chauvinism among the masses unless this is done in connection with a concrete practical struggle for Negro rights. Any struggle against white chauvinism among the masses which is not so carried on is doomed to failure because it is academic, abstract and idealist in approach. It has nothing in common with serious mass work.

The mass struggle against white chauvinism must also be connected with concrete struggle for Negro rights because that is how masses (in contrast to schools, classes and study groups) learn, i.e., from the experience of participation in mass struggles and not from lectures or pedantic exhortations.

The starting point of the struggle against white chauvinism must always be the mass struggle for Negro rights and not vice versa. For under present conditions, the white masses enter the fight for Negro rights not out of altruistic considerations but because such struggles are

in the
(as w
Hence
for N
have a
chauvi
but be
for the
social
so. Th
been f
of Mar
pressin
son th
sition
the Br
they fi
Ireland
again a
ers mu
cause i
do so-
never
black
Any
zation
ers and
Marxis
ist, ab
approa
proach
apart
the m
fighters
man's
stantial
ciple
day pa
Negro
ligious
the de
directio

in their own direct and immediate (as well as long-range) interest. Hence, they participate in the fight for Negro rights, not because they have already rid themselves of white chauvinist attitudes and prejudices, but because the logic of the struggle for their own economic, political and social interests compels them to do so. This understanding has always been fundamental in the approach of Marxists to the workers of an oppressing nation. It was for this reason that Marx insisted on the proposition that it was in the interests of the British workers themselves that they fight for the independence of Ireland. Similarly, Marx stressed again and again that the white workers must fight to abolish slavery because it was in their own interest to do so—"Labor in a white skin can never be free so long as labor in a black skin is branded."

Any other approach to the mobilization of the masses of white workers and farmers is incorrect and non-Marxist. It would substitute an idealist, abstract, humanitarian, ethical approach for a class struggle approach. It is certainly true (even apart from Communists, who are the most profound humanists and fighters for the enhancement of man's dignity) that there is a substantial and growing number of principled white individuals who are today participating in the struggle for Negro rights because of moral, religious or ethical principles. In fact, the developments of trends in this direction is most marked. Witness

the popularity of moral arguments against discrimination and segregation. Witness the growing trend among many Protestant churches and, in certain local areas, within the Catholic church to condemn discrimination and segregation as sinful, etc. Naturally, such developments are positive and encouraging. Wherever appeals based on these considerations are made to white workers they are extremely helpful. But they do not alter the fundamental fact that the struggle for Negro rights is doomed to failure if it depends solely on such appeals to move white masses into action, as distinct from individuals or small groups.

The idealist concept of how white masses can be moved into the struggle for Negro rights is based, despite its good intentions, on the big lie of white chauvinism, namely, that the white masses actually benefit from anti-Negro discrimination, oppression and segregation; that there actually is a conflict of economic, political and social interests between Negro and white; that the white masses must be asked, therefore, to rise above their material economic, political, and social interests; to sacrifice their own interests in order to advance the interests of the Negro people.

But this white chauvinist proposition covers up the fact that there is only a narrow stratum among the white masses which derives any material benefit from discrimination and segregation. This narrow stratum of the white working class is

the highly paid aristocracy of labor. As far as the millions of white workers and farmers are concerned, they pay a heavy price for the oppression and super-exploitation of the Negro people—as witness the voteless southern white masses, the Dixiecrat-cursed white masses of the north, the poverty-stricken, disease-ravaged workers in the lily-white textile industry of the South, etc.

Whoever, consciously or unconsciously, adopts an abstract, idealist approach as a starting point will inevitably lose faith in the readiness of the white masses to participate in the struggle for Negro rights. For if there is no material interest which tends to propel the white masses into the struggle for Negro rights, then the only other factor capable of energizing them in such a struggle is their liberation from the crippling mental bondage of white chauvinist ideology. But when we stop to consider the Augean stables of white chauvinist filth which would have to be cleaned before that happy day could come to pass, it is clear that we would in effect postpone the mobilization of the white masses indefinitely.

STRUGGLE AROUND CONCRETE ISSUES

If we wish to mobilize the white masses *now* to participate in the struggle for Negro rights we should not expect to win a prior victory in the fight against the chauvinist prejudices which helped in the past to sustain or tolerate one or another

form of discrimination against the Negro people. We should rather make an estimate as to which issue—among many of more or less burning urgency—embodies in itself, so to speak, the most self-evident and visible elements of common interest to both Negro and white. Other things being equal, that issue is usually the link which should be grasped to pull the whole chain forward. Such issues (e.g.—abolition of the poll tax; equal pay for equal work; organization of Negro workers in basic industry, etc.) then become in the course of the struggle the school of life in which the white masses learn the A B C's of the struggle against white chauvinism.

But unless the conscious and advanced forces systematically organize and conduct this struggle against white chauvinism and, for the most part, win it in the course of the fight around the given issue, it is doubtful whether the issue itself can be resolved. This is most strikingly illustrated in the disgraceful failure of Operation Dixie in which the C.I.O. suffered one of its greatest defeats. The organization of the unorganized in the South—what issue could be of greater significance to the whole fight for Negro rights? But this drive was turned into a fiasco because, among other things, the C.I.O. leadership refused to tackle the struggle against white chauvinism and instead, attempted to organize the Southern masses without coming to grips with what was quaintly called "local habits and patterns."

One
Comm
in the
the ver
for F.J
ern suf
of the r
vinism.
ticipati
siderabl
for the
ing tha
vanced
or all
This el
then be
ing poi
or more
of unde
tion. T
struggle
their pr
be to cl
ticipati
ly and
addition
have s/
support
fight w
derstan
Some
Negro
struggle
cause t
mass fi
mass st
nism a
the den
egro peo
white c
equal r
This "

One of the main tasks which the Communist Party has to carry out in the process of its participation in the very important current struggles for F.E.P.C., desegregation, Southern suffrage, etc., is the organization of the mass fight against white chauvinism. The white masses are participating in these struggles to a considerable extent. They are doing so for the most part on the basis of seeing that their own self-interest is advanced by winning one or another or all of the foregoing demands. This elementary understanding must then be taken by the Party as a starting point to move these masses one or more stages higher in the scale of understanding of the Negro question. These white masses enter the struggle for Negro rights *despite* their prejudices. Our objective must be to change the nature of their participation in the struggle qualitatively and thus facilitate their entry into additional struggles because they have *shed* their prejudices and now support the Negro people's freedom fight with deep conviction and understanding.

Some contrast the mass fight for Negro rights to the inner-Party struggle against white chauvinism because they tacitly assume that the mass fight for Negro rights and the mass struggle against white chauvinism are one and the same thing: the denial of equal rights to the Negro people is white chauvinism and white chauvinism is the denial of equal rights to the Negro people. This "tacit assumption," however,

oversimplifies and distorts the relationship between the two.

It overlooks a very important distinction between the national oppression of the Negro people and white chauvinism. The Negro people are forcibly denied their democratic rights through the operation of a whole system of well known *practices*: Jim Crowism, segregation, discrimination, etc. These practices are enforced by legal and extra-legal sanctions ranging from "social pressures," "tradition" through vicious "law enforcement" up to and including the organization of the most barbaric mob violence and lynching.

White chauvinism, however, is an *ideology* which attempts to justify and rationalize these *practices* by virtue of the theory that white-skinned people are inherently superior beings entitled to special privileges and rights, while Negroes constitute an inherently inferior race not entitled to the same rights and privileges as whites.

The practice of discrimination and segregation penetrates into every nook and cranny of our economic, political, cultural and social structure. Correspondingly, the ideology of white chauvinism is a vast system of theories, ideas, judgments, irrational prejudices, superstitions, attitudes and rationalizations which permeate the total ideological superstructure in the United States—law, philosophy, science, literature, aesthetics, language, etc.

The *practice* of discrimination and the *ideology* of white chauvinism are

organically intertwined, but they are not identical. Much confusion results when the indissoluble unity of the two is disrupted; or conversely, when the necessary distinctions between them are not grasped. This is particularly the case in developing our mass activities in the fight for Negro rights and in the struggle against white chauvinism.

The fight for Negro rights does not automatically guarantee the struggle against white chauvinism because, as we have seen, they are not one and the same. And even though it is correct to assert that white chauvinist ideology arose as a *consequence and after the practice of discrimination* (in the beginning was the deed!), it is a mistake to think that the abolition of Jim-Crow practices will automatically wipe out white chauvinism without a corresponding ideological struggle among the masses. Such an understanding of the relationship of ideology to material base is mechanistic and sterile. Such a statement of our tactical approach in the struggle for Negro rights is an opportunist evasion of the mass struggle against white chauvinism.

II. *Has the Danger of White Chauvinism Increased or Decreased?*

How should we estimate the danger of white chauvinism among the masses at the present time? Has this danger increased or decreased?

The answer to this question is often confused and one-sided. Some comrades maintain that the danger

of white chauvinism has increased. Others insist just as vehemently that it has decreased. Where does the truth lie?

Actually there is a great ambiguity in this debate. There are really two different questions involved here: first: has the ideological influence of white chauvinism among the masses increased or decreased? second: have the chauvinist attacks of the monopolists, racists and Dixiecrats increased or decreased?

The effect of a one-sided or unclear answer to the question can be and in actual fact is quite serious. For, if it is maintained that the danger of white chauvinism among the masses has increased, and by this it is understood that the ideology of white chauvinism has a stronger hold on the masses today than in the past, serious Left sectarian errors will be made. On the other hand, if it is maintained that the danger of white chauvinism among the masses has decreased, and by this it is understood that the chauvinist attack of the monopolists, racists and Dixiecrats constitutes less of a menace, then serious Right opportunist errors will be made.

That is why we must be quite clear in our estimate of what is happening. It is this: the ideological influence of white chauvinism among the masses has clearly decreased in the recent period; but the attack of the monopolists and racists upon the Negro people has been stepped up, as has been their attempt to spread

chau
masse
Let
of thi

WHI
TH

The
in the
among
in the
this fa

histori
place
two c

either
have b
gro r
these
white
In eith
violenc

Let
import
ence o
been r

ment.
the m
the C
ment
unions
influen

lily-wh
united
Negro
out ba

labor
unions
erhood
a whit
very n
struggl

chauvinist poison among the white masses.

Let us now examine each element of this problem more in detail.

WHITE CHAUVINISM AND THE LABOR MOVEMENT

There has been an overall decrease in the influence of white chauvinism among the white masses, especially in the labor movement. Not to grasp this fact is to be blind to the massive historic changes that have taken place among the people in the last two or three decades. One must either deny that substantial advances have been made in the fight for Negro rights; or assert that despite these advances, the mentality of the white masses has remained the same. In either case, one would have to do violence to the facts of life.

Let us examine briefly some of the important areas in which the influence of white chauvinist ideology has been rolled back in the labor movement. Prior to the organization of the mass production industries by the C.I.O., the trade union movement in the U.S. (except for the unions organized by, or under the influence of, the Left) was practically lily-white. Today the principle of a united trade union organization of Negro and white is accepted without basic or open challenge in the labor movement—except for a few unions in the A.F.L. and R.R. Brotherhoods, which still *openly* espouse a white supremacist policy. At this very moment, we witness a major struggle to establish guarantees

against racial discrimination in all unions as a pre-condition for the organic unity of A.F.L.-C.I.O. The sharpest criticism has been launched against the C.I.O. negotiating committee because it failed to insist upon and win such guarantees in the preliminary negotiations. This criticism comes not from the Left alone, but from such unions as the Transport Workers Union, the Packinghouse Workers Union, etc.

Prior to the struggles of the past two decades, the trade unions accepted the white chauvinist principle of economic inequality for Negroes in wages, hours, working conditions. The infamous differential based on race was an accepted part of trade union wage policy, as was the North-South differential, which was rooted essentially in the same premise. Today there is not a single important trade union that would dare accept a wage differential based on race. The slogan of the labor movement is equal pay for equal work. The Steel Union fought for and won abolition of the North-South differential. The entire labor movement is committed to the fight to enact Fair Employment Practice legislation—federally, in the states and municipalities. An increasing number of important trade unions, e.g. Auto and Packing, have established as part of their contract demands the inclusion of a model anti-discrimination clause.

Two decades ago the trade unions—except for a gesture now and then—virtually ignored the struggle of the Negro people for civil rights—

if they did not actually conspire to deprive them of certain of these rights in some cases. By contrast, the labor movement today is committed to support of a civil rights program in the comprehensive and omnibus form in which this was first projected in 1948 by Truman or in which it has since been introduced in Congress on various occasions.

In addition, the trade unions, including some led by conservative forces, are increasingly beginning to set up special trade union machinery to facilitate an effective fight for equal rights. Thus there has been a veritable flowering of F.E.P.C. Committees, Anti-Discrimination Committees, Civil Rights Committees, Human Rights Committees, F.E.P.C. Conferences, Anti-Discrimination Conferences, etc. True enough, this development is more marked in the C.I.O. than in the A.F.L., but the fact is that it is a trend which was non-existent in any section of the labor movement two decades ago.

Finally, we call attention to the continuing development of an alliance between the labor movement and the Negro people's movement, an alliance which is something more than a united struggle along parallel lines. It is an alliance which expresses itself in organizational form—e.g., the permanent committee of 200 organizations in support of Federal F.E.P.C. legislation involving A.F.L., C.I.O., N.A.A.C.P. and others; the formal relations which exist between N.A.A.C.P. and C.I.O., etc. It is wrong to think that the

labor-Negro people's alliance was smashed as a result of the break-up of Left-center unity in the C.I.O. and the subsequent expulsion of the Left internationals. What took place was a transformation in the political content of this alliance so that it began to operate under exclusively Social-Democratic and reformist leadership; but it was not broken up as some mistakenly assert.

There cannot be the slightest doubt that the influence of white chauvinism among the masses is far weaker today than it was a decade ago or two decades ago.

But if this were all we were to say, we would be guilty of a gross oversimplification of the problem. To the foregoing, and as an integral part of our estimate, the following must be added:

(1) There is still a tragically large mass of white people among whom the influence of crass and open white chauvinism still prevails. This is true in the South, for example. Despite all the positive developments among the Southern white masses in the past period, despite the great significance of the anti-racist movements among the Southern white liberals, it is still a fact that open and crass white chauvinist ideology still dominates the thinking of the bulk of the Southern white workers and farmers.

Likewise within the labor movement there are still whole areas which are under the domination of open racist leaderships and which are guided by undisguised white

suprem
the rail
the M
all far
spectac
racist
in oper
ple in
troit, C
(2)
been r
ence of
masses
anted
Germa
cialist
ferocio
assault
ist out
class d
by char
to a so
what g
perman
have be
fluence
the ma
Actu
ences c
tion. T
for exa
in resp
rights,
integrat
all leve
in a si
ment, t
ran, th
struggle
Negro
a resul
driven

supremacist doctrines, e.g., some of the railroad brotherhoods, sections of the Machinists, etc. Finally, we are all familiar with the disgraceful spectacle of white mobs, incited by racist realty interests, participating in open violence against Negro people in such northern cities as Detroit, Chicago, Peekskill, etc.

(2) Those advances which have been made in curtailing the influence of white chauvinism among the masses are by no means fully guaranteed or irreversible. In pre-Hitler Germany the working class was socialist in its outlook. But under the ferocious physical and ideological assault of Hitler fascism, the socialist outlook of the German working class disintegrated and was replaced by chauvinism. If this could happen to a socialist-minded working class, what guarantees can be given for the permanence of the advances that have been made in curtailing the influence of white chauvinism among the masses in our country?

Actually, certain retrograde influences can already be seen in operation. The National Maritime Union, for example, was at one time a model in respect to its fight for Negro rights, for Negro-white unity, for integration of its Negro members in all levels of union leadership. Today, in a situation of declining employment, under the leadership of Curran, the union has abandoned the struggle to defend the interests of Negro and Puerto Rican seamen. As a result, they are being practically driven out of the industry by the

shipping interests. And for the first time in its history, the N.M.U. has a lily-white leadership!

The C.I.O., for example, made great advances in building unions based on the principle of fighting against racial discrimination. So firmly entrenched was this principle that it became one of the three objectives originally set by the C.I.O. leadership as a condition for organic unity with the A.F.L. But the preliminary statement of agreement signed by the C.I.O. and A.F.L. negotiating committees shows that the C.I.O. leadership has made serious and basic concessions to the chauvinist and racist elements in the A.F.L. Can there be any guarantees that the Reuther leadership will not completely surrender all the ground won by the C.I.O. in this field? Can there be any guarantee that the more backward position of the A.F.L. on the Negro question may not begin to dominate the American labor movement?

Hence, any tendency to minimize the continuing serious danger of white chauvinism simply because its influence has been curtailed among the masses is the most dangerous opportunism.

(3) The roll-back of crass and open white chauvinist influence among the masses must not be interpreted to mean that there has been a corresponding increase in the influence of a militant class struggle approach to the Negro question.

It is true, of course, that such a class struggle approach to the Negro

question does influence an increasing section of white workers and the white masses generally. This is a tribute to and a consequence of the valiant and unceasing fight for Negro rights and against white chauvinism waged by the Communist Party and the Left in general. But it would be quite unrealistic to assume that this is the dominant trend at the moment. At the present stage of development the decrease in the influence of white chauvinism among the masses is accompanied by an increased influence of Social-Democratic ideology on the Negro question.

Hence, we do not answer all questions about the struggle against white chauvinism simply by making an estimate that there has been a decrease in the influence of crass and open white chauvinism among the masses. For, we then come face to face with the struggle against the influence of Social-Democracy among the white masses in respect to the Negro question.

HOW SOCIAL-DEMOCRATIC IDEOLOGY OPERATES

The function of Social-Democratic ideology on the Negro question is to divert the masses from basic struggle against the class and social roots of Negro oppression. To the extent that it prevails, it helps maintain the essence of the Negro people's unequal status while eliminating the most barbaric expressions and manifestations of that inequality. While there are, of course, great differences between the Negro question in the U.S.

and the colonial question in Britain, an instructive example may be found in the "anti-colonialism" of the right-wing Labor Party officialdom as contrasted with the open Tory imperialism of the Conservative Party of Churchill and Eden. Of course, the two are not the same but in their own way the "anti-colonial" Labor Party officialdom does what the Tories cannot do among the masses to preserve Britain's colonial empire. They do this by declaring themselves against colonialism; but, of course, it takes time to prepare colonial people for freedom! Of course, the liberation of the colonies overnight is utopian! There must be a gradual process; there must be a transition; there must be trusteeship, etc., etc., ad nauseam.

According to the white Social-Democrats, like Reuther, Humphrey, et alia, the racist oppression of the Negro people is merely a "blemish," an "imperfection," in the fabric of American democracy. This "weakness" of American democracy has its roots, according to these white Social-Democrats, not in the rule of the monopolists and their Dixiecrat agents, but in the prejudices, the backwardness, the stupidities of the white masses. Therefore, we must aim at a "gradual" process of ending discrimination because a "long educational" process among the masses is necessary.

Hence the white Social-Democrats are for equal rights for the Negro people—but this can only come about after a long process of educational

work
mass
niti
ions,
their
majo
ties
lead
pres
sent
verse
tice
and
for r
to st
ers—
ciple
right
polit
equa
far?
but a
crats
so it
Ob
ideol
with
racis
tion
scope
Negr
with
vent
class
sion.
ment
chau
decre
there
crease
of So
Negr

work among the prejudiced white masses. They are for equal opportunities for Negroes in the trade unions, of course, but they must wait their turn, you see, until the white majorities fully appreciate the abilities of Negro unionists aspiring to leadership. Creation of a special vice-presidency to guarantee Negro representation—that's "Jim Crow in reverse"! They are opposed to the practice of Negroes being the last hired and the first fired; but as to fighting for modification of seniority systems to stop mass firings of Negro workers—that would violate a sacred principle of trade unionism! Equal rights in the field of economics and politics—of course; but full social equality—why, isn't that going too far? Fight against fascists, of course—but after all, we do need the Dixiecrats to win in 1956, don't we? And so it goes.

Obviously such Social-Democratic ideology cannot be lumped together with the open chauvinism and crass racism of the Dixiecrats. But its function is, nevertheless, to restrict the scope of the developing struggle for Negro rights; to keep that struggle within its "proper bounds"; to prevent it from being directed at the class and social roots of Negro oppression. When we say, at the present moment, that the influence of white chauvinism among the masses has decreased, what this means is that there has been a corresponding increase in the influence among them of Social-Democratic ideology on the Negro question. This changes the

form of chauvinist influence among the masses and consequently the tactics of struggle against it—but it does not diminish the urgency or the magnitude of this struggle.

It is important to emphasize this point lest misconceptions arise which might lead to a lessening of the struggle. We make the necessary distinction between crass, open white chauvinism and the Social-Democratic approach to the Negro question in order to spotlight the target, not to curtail the fire against it.

Together with a decrease in the overall influence of open white chauvinism among the masses, there has been an increase in the attack of the racist forces in American life. It would be strange if this were not so—for the action of the masses always induces a counter-action by the enemy. And in this case, the victories won in the fight for Negro rights and the areas in which white chauvinist and racist ideology have been rolled back have stimulated the racist, anti-Negro, white supremacist forces to furious counter-attack against gains of the Negro people and growing white-Negro unity.

This stepped-up attack of the racist forces is facilitated by the poisonous miasma of chauvinist gases loosed by Wall Street's drive to war and fascism. Wall Street is striving for world domination. It is preparing for a new world war to achieve this aim under the banner of defending "Western Civilization," that is, the civilization of the "Anglo-Saxon white man."

Domestically the fascist orientation

of the monopolists and their McCarthyite spearhead has provided the political atmosphere in which the most depraved racist forces in American life can operate freely and openly. It is a fact that the Dixiecrats are today playing a more decisive role in the political life of our country than at any time within the last two decades. During all the periods of the New Deal, the Dixiecrats were on the defensive within the Democratic Party, constantly forced to backtrack before the onslaught of the labor-New Deal coalition. Even during the so-called "Fair Deal" Administration of Harry Truman, the Dixiecrats were on the defensive. As a matter of fact, they were driven out of the Democratic Party temporarily as a result of the civil rights program adopted by the 1948 Convention of the Democratic Party.

But what is the situation today? The exact reverse! The Congressional leadership of the Democratic Party is in the hands of Dixiecrats like Senator George or the handmaidens of the Dixiecrats like Lyndon Johnson. Instead of a policy of head-on struggle against the Dixiecrat menace there is a marriage of convenience between the northern liberals headed by Stevenson-Humphrey and the Southern Dixiecrats. The Dixiecrats are mounting a ferocious struggle against all efforts to implement the Supreme Court decision on desegregation.

Open violence against the Negro people on the housing question ranges from bombings of Negro

homes, through mob sieges lasting for weeks as in Chicago, and going to the extreme of arrests for "sedition" as in Louisville, Kentucky. New openly anti-Negro organizations spring up all over the country like the National Association for the Advancement of White People or the anti-Negro Civic Councils in the South.

In the North police violence against the Negro people takes on unprecedented proportions. Harlem is an occupied city saturated with police; other Negro communities throughout the land are similarly swarming with foot police and squad cars so that they more and more resemble Negro communities in the deep South.

In face of these developments, it is rank opportunism to minimize the danger of chauvinism among the masses or the necessity to fight against it simply because the influence of crass, open forms of white chauvinism has declined.

III. The Relationship of the Inner-Party Struggle Against White Chauvinism to the Mass Struggle

First of all, should there be an inner-Party struggle against white chauvinism?

Of course! There should and there must!

Why? Should there be this struggle because white chauvinism is rampant in our Party, because our Party is rife with white chauvinism? Decidedly not! Such an estimate would be false and slanderous.

The
most
white
The
Party
strug
this
fights
ist co
white
nurtu
the r
pres
vinist
ruling
crease
cause
domin
its fa
States
mosp
white
count
Un
scious
they
ranks
ing o
Party
of N
and i
ties o
Wh
such
white
strug
white
masse
chauv
Party
alrea
in its

The Communist Party is the foremost fighter against the influence of white chauvinism among the masses. The program of the Communist Party and the actual record of its struggles are sufficient testimony to this fact. But our Party lives and fights in the most powerful imperialist country in the world, in which white chauvinist ideology has been nurtured, refined and propagated by the ruling class for centuries. In the present period, moreover, the chauvinist pressures emanating from the ruling class have considerably increased in intensity. This is so because of monopoly's drive to world domination and war and because of its fascist orientation in the United States itself. In such a political atmosphere the organized racist and white supremacist groupings in our country have become emboldened.

Unless these pressures are consciously and continuously combated, they will inevitably penetrate the ranks of our Party, affect the thinking of the white members of our Party, undermine the fighting unity of Negro and white Communists, and influence the policies and activities of the Party.

What is the difference between such an inner-Party struggle against white chauvinism and the Party's struggle among the masses against white chauvinism? Among the masses the main battle against white chauvinism must still be won. In the Party, however, the main battle has already been won. This is to be seen in its theory, ideology, program, pol-

icies, tactics and principles of organization. The members of the Communist Party are committed to the proposition of fighting for equal rights; they *want* to fight for equal rights and against white chauvinism. Hence, the struggle is against the impact of outside white chauvinist pressures upon the Party, against the penetration of *concealed* forms of white chauvinism, against the *remnants* of white chauvinism in the ideology of Party members.

Furthermore, among the masses the ideological framework of the struggle is fixed by the consideration that the fight for equal rights is essentially a fight for bourgeois-democratic rights. Neither acceptance of Marxism in general nor acceptance of a Marxist approach to the Negro question as a national question is prerequisite for the mass fight for equal rights. Hence, the struggle against white chauvinism among the masses must be conducted on the basis of a united front with proponents and adherents of a bourgeois-democratic and reformist approach to the Negro question.

In the main the starting point of the mass struggle is the self-interest of the white workers. By self-interest we do not have in mind the immediate and direct self-interest of a small group of white workers. What we mean essentially is the interest of *the class as a whole*. This class interest corresponds also to the immediate interests of an overwhelming majority of the working class. But it may also happen that the interests

of the working class as a whole conflict with the immediate "interests," narrowly conceived, of a small section of workers. This would be the case, for example, with certain elements of the labor aristocracy which actually benefit in a material way from Negro oppression. In such cases, of course, our policies are determined by the interests of the class as a whole even though it necessitates a collision with such elements of the labor aristocracy.

Given the starting point of self-interest, it not infrequently happens that white workers will participate in the fight for Negro rights but continue to maintain and espouse white chauvinist viewpoints. In the most common cases in which this occurs, white workers will participate militantly in a struggle for equal economic and political rights but declare themselves opposed to social equality. Hence the mass struggle against white chauvinism always involves complicated tactical questions, questions of the united front. Since the fight against white chauvinism must always serve the interests of the fight for Negro rights, considerable skill is required, united front tactics, maneuvering, etc.

In contrast to all this, the inner-Party struggle against white chauvinism, while primarily related to the needs of the mass struggle, takes place on the basis of a Marxist-Leninist fight for a socialist ideology among our members, for a Marxist-Leninist approach to all questions of program, policy, tactics in the mass

struggle. The inner-Party fight against white chauvinism proceeds from our concept of the Negro question as a national question. Within the Party there cannot be that separation between the fight for Negro rights and the ideological struggle against white chauvinism which is usually the case among the masses. We do not within the Communist Party conduct the struggle against white chauvinism on a united front basis anymore than we would conduct any other inner-Party ideological fight on a united front basis. The only basis for an inner-Party ideological fight is a forthright acceptance of the standpoint of Marxism-Leninism. But it is not sufficiently recognized that even when the struggle against white chauvinism is rooted in a Marxist-Leninist approach, serious mistakes may also be made either in a Right opportunist or Left sectarian direction. Comrade Foster's profound analysis of Left sectarian mistakes which have been made by our Party in the fight against white chauvinism is an invaluable contribution to the Party's theoretical and political grasp of the essentials of this question.*

CONTENT OF THE INNER-PARTY STRUGGLE

The content of the inner-Party struggle against white chauvinism is more or less fixed by our estimate of

* See William Z. Foster: "Left Sectarianism in the Fight for Negro Rights and Against White Chauvinism," *Political Affairs*, July 1953.

the in-
sures
as dis-
of on-
mitted
vinist
not ro-
the di-
tices.
the ve-
theless
vigilar-
and
racist
For
white
sults i-
of w-
masses
itself i-
ness o-
for N-
interes-
erly e-
expres-
Negro-
tion."
slacker-
the st-
short.
effect
upon
in the
Is th-
Party
vinist
lating
vinism
There
In the
the Pa-
of cor-

the impact of white chauvinist pressures on the Party. In the main—as distinct from individual instances of one or another member or committee—the impact of white chauvinist pressures upon the Party does not result in swerving the Party in the direction of racist ideas or practices. This is definitely precluded by the very nature of our Party. Nevertheless, there must be the greatest vigilance to combat even the isolated and individual manifestations of racist influence within the Party.

For the most part, the impact of white chauvinism upon the Party results in capitulation to the influence of white chauvinism among the masses. Such capitulation expresses itself in a lack of faith in the readiness of the white workers to fight for Negro rights when their self-interest in such a struggle is properly elucidated. This is sometimes expressed in the remark that “the Negro question is a narrow question.” As a result the Party tends to slacken or let up in development of the struggle for Negro rights. *In short, the main and most important effect of white chauvinist pressures upon the Party is to induce passivity in the fight for Negro rights.*

Is there a difference between the Party being swerved in a white chauvinist direction and the Party capitulating to the influence of white chauvinism among the masses? Yes! There is a very important difference. In the one case it would mean that the Party is moving in the direction of condoning and participating in

white chauvinist justification of Negro oppression. Although this is never explicitly stated, it lies at the basis of many incorrect conceptions of the inner-Party struggle against white chauvinism. To judge from the nature of some approaches to the struggle against white chauvinism, it would appear that the fight against white chauvinism *within the Party* has exactly the same objectives as the struggle *among the masses*. The only difference being apparently that *within the Party* there is greater freedom to conduct this struggle than there is among the masses. One result of this misconception is to make it appear that the Party is the main arena for the struggle against white chauvinism, that white chauvinism is rampant in the Party, etc. Needless to repeat, this is dangerous nonsense.

Capitulation to the influence of white chauvinism may arise from a number of factors and express itself in different ways. For one thing, there is sometimes a tendency to assume that the influence of white chauvinism is so strong among a group of workers that they will not respond to the fight for Negro rights. Hence the struggle for Negro rights is not even projected. An advance judgment has been made that “it’s no use, these workers are hopeless,” etc. But whether the influence of white chauvinism really is so deep and ingrained cannot be determined by abstract speculations which tend, generally speaking, to underestimate the advance made by white workers

in their understanding of the Negro question. It can only be determined by serious efforts, broadly conceived, to project pertinent issues on a united front basis. Furthermore, what is often overlooked is the dynamic character of political consciousness, its capacity for swift change and transformation in the course of struggle—provided the issue is correctly presented and the tactics are broad and flexible.

The impact of white chauvinist pressures on the Party may also create passivity in the fight for Negro rights for reasons other than capitulation. For example, passivity may also be caused by illusions in the bourgeoisie. There can be no doubt that such illusions were greatly strengthened, on the one hand, by Truman's advocacy of a civil rights program and, on the other, by the role of the Republican Party in connection with the Supreme Court decision on segregation. A special reflection of such illusions is the tendency to exaggerate the magnitude and scope of victories which have been won in the fight for Negro rights. Together with this, there is a naive tendency to look upon the advances made as assured, guaranteed and permanent. This whole tendency leads to illusions in and reliance upon Social-Democracy and reformism to lead the fight for Negro rights. It results in a passive trailing after the Social-Democrats, a surrender of Communist and Left initiative.

Passivity resulting from such opportunist illusions and misconcep-

tions is particularly insidious at the present time. This is so because the monopolists are attempting to cancel out the negative influence abroad of Negro oppression in the United States. The stench of American Jim Crow and segregation has a most damaging effect upon Wall Street's ability to carry out its reactionary foreign policy. Fundamentally, this is a result of the struggle waged by the world camp of peace, democracy and socialism to expose and stigmatize the crime of Negro oppression in the United States.

To meet this problem Wall Street has made certain concessions to the Negro people (e.g., the Supreme Court decision on desegregation). These concessions are then loudly advertised as heralding the dawn of a new day. A torrent of literature flows from the presses portraying the "enormous advances" which have been made in granting Negro rights, in advancing the economic, social, political and cultural interests of the Negro people.

Now, we have already had occasion to make a brief estimate of the advances made in the fight for Negro rights and against white chauvinism. At this point we wish only to stress the need to guard against being sucked in by the artificially concocted propaganda campaign about "the revolution in the U.S. on the Negro question," about "the new enlightened attitude of the employers," etc. Such illusions induce passivity in the fight for Negro rights because they engender the "com-

fortabl
ing al
gro
result
It is
the in
chauv
needs
strugg
strugg
must
Party
the m
Hence
abstra
white
nected
strugg
against
a resul
a vast
a neces
giving
There
and ab
takes o
been a
article.
For
opinion
"first w
struggle
first we
white c
we will
for Ne
But t
we mea
fight a
What I
inner-P
chauvin

fortable" feeling that things are going along swimmingly, that the Negro question is being solved as a result of "new attitudes," etc.

It is clear from the foregoing that the inner-Party struggle against white chauvinism flows directly from the needs and problems of the mass struggle. Primarily this inner-Party struggle against white chauvinism must have as its aim to project the Party more fully and effectively into the mass struggle for Negro rights. Hence we must oppose resolutely any abstract ideological fight against white chauvinism which is not connected up with the needs of the mass struggle. We must especially guard against turning the Party inwards as a result of such a fight, for there is a vast difference between carrying on a necessary inner-Party struggle and giving the Party an inner orientation. There is the greatest need to study and absorb the lessons of past mistakes on this question as they have been analyzed in Comrade Foster's article.

For example, we must reject the opinion sometimes expressed that "first we must win the inner-Party struggle against white chauvinism, first we must burn out all traces of white chauvinism in the Party, then we will be able to develop the fight for Negro rights."

But the whole point is: what do we mean by winning the inner-Party fight against white chauvinism? What kind of a conception of the inner-Party struggle against white chauvinism is this which entertains

the possibility of winning it without the Party being involved in mass struggle? This is the worst kind of sterile and academic fight, against which Comrade Foster has warned.

Likewise we must reject the other extreme which advocates: "First let us start the fight for Negro rights, and then we will deal with whatever questions of white chauvinism arise in the course of the struggle."

But the whole point is: what is necessary to start the struggle for Negro rights? Does not the ideological mobilization of the Party play a role in the ability to get the Party started in the fight for Negro rights? Such an approach tends to vulgarize the relationship between consciousness and activity. It implies that we will get the Party active in the fight for Negro rights by an act of sheer will power unrelated to the Party's understanding and consciousness. But the Party will never get started in the fight for Negro rights without an inner-Party struggle accompanying its mobilization at all stages.

In general we must avoid a sterile discussion of the relationship between the fight for Negro rights and the inner-Party struggle against white chauvinism. Such discussions have a which-comes-first-the-chicken-or-the-egg aspect to them. The relationship between the mass fight for Negro rights and the inner-Party struggle against white chauvinism is the same as the relationship between mass activity and inner-Party struggle in general. The two must proceed hand in hand.

We must also guard against a distortion of the very correct concept that the inner-Party fight against white chauvinism must be intimately connected with the issues arising from the mass struggle. This does not mean that it should be *limited* to those issues which arise from the mass struggle for Negro rights. The primary emphasis is on them. But *primary* does not mean *exclusive*. For example, in respect to most mass struggles for Negro rights the question of social relations between Negro and white does not play a major role as yet. But clearly this is a major question in the United States in relation to all aspects of daily life and work—the commingling of Negro and white in shops, schools, restaurants, theatres, beaches, parks, trains, unions, intermarriage, housing, etc. Questions arising from social relations between Negro and white, as distinct from questions arising from the mass issues of struggle (FEPC, franchise in South, Negro representation, etc.), must therefore play a role in our approach to the struggle against white chauvinism even though they do not as yet constitute a very important aspect of the mass struggle for Negro rights.

In this respect, among others, the social relations between white and Negro in the United States have a significance in the fight against white chauvinism which did not exist in the national question in other countries, e.g., as between Russians and Ukrainians who were, for the most part, physically separated; or,

as between the British workers and the Irish, who were in the main physically separated.

Not so the white and Negro masses in the U.S. Here again, the struggle for social equality in its mass aspects is primary (i.e., housing, transportation, schools, etc.). But this struggle for social equality reflects itself within the Communist Party itself in the relations between Negro and white, which are not only political relations but also social relations. Merely because such questions are not as yet mass issues does not mean that they can be neglected or bypassed. On the contrary, our Party must become a model from which the whole labor movement can learn about the correct personal relations of social equality between Negro and white.

Furthermore, it is incorrect to assert that the struggle against white chauvinism can, or should take place *only* in the course of the mass struggle for Negro rights. The struggle against white chauvinism can be conducted *best and most effectively* in the context of the mass struggle for equal rights; but not *only* in such a context. For, although the ideology of white chauvinism is designed primarily to justify Negro oppression, it is a weapon which is used by the ruling class to keep the working class divided, to set Negro against white in all kinds of struggles and on all kinds of issues. Hence, the struggle against white chauvinism is a permanent feature of our ideological mass work. It must be waged in

the co
the
cism,
strugg
In fac
pensal
strugg
ing c
chauv
fight
same
the w
class u
interes

IV. K
t

Som
is the
fight f
this an
ism is
bypass
listing
which
hande
to spe
Wha
Party
fundam
doing
withou
cularit
Party's
Chief
the tw
fight f
hand, t
Negro
tion m
munity

the course of the fight for peace, in the course of the fight against fascism, in the course of the economic struggles, in the electoral battles, etc. In fact, it is an essential and indispensable ingredient of our whole struggle to raise the level of the working class. The fight against white chauvinism is not only part of the fight for equal rights. It is at the same time part of the fight to unite the working class, to forge working class unity, and thus to advance the interests of the class as a whole.

IV. *What Is the Main Danger in the Fight for Negro Rights?*

Some assert that white chauvinism is the main danger in the Party's fight for Negro rights. Others deny this and maintain that Left sectarianism is the main danger. Still others bypass a direct answer by simply listing a series of weaknesses, all of which are presented in an even-handed way, without priorities, so to speak.

What is actually the case? The Party members are debating a very fundamental problem, but they are doing so in a one-sided way and without regard to certain special peculiarities which characterize the Party's fight for Negro rights.

Chief among these peculiarities is the twofold aspect of the Party's fight for Negro rights: on the one hand, there is its relationship to the Negro masses, to the Negro liberation movement, to the Negro community; and, on the other, there is

its role in mobilizing the white masses to participate in the fight for Negro rights. While these two fronts of the Party's struggle are organically interrelated, they are not identical.

The Party's fight for Negro rights involves the sum total of its activities on both fronts. But the problems, the difficulties, the weaknesses, the dangers which beset the Party are not always the same on each front. For the Negro question is not simply a class question; it is a national question. Hence, the main ideological tasks and political responsibilities of white Communists are not always identical with the main ideological tasks and political responsibilities of Negro Communists. The reason for this is that the main responsibility of white Communists is to work among the white masses, who belong to the oppressor nation. The main responsibility for working among the Negro masses, who belong to the oppressed nation, rests with the Negro Communists. It follows from this that at one or another moment of the struggle the main danger which confronts the Party in its work among the Negro masses may not at all be the same as that which confronts it in its work of mobilizing the white masses in the fight for Negro rights.

Therefore, before we can correctly answer the question of what the main danger is we must specify what we are discussing. Are we discussing the main danger confronting the Party in its work among the Negro masses, in the Negro communities, in the Negro liberation movement? Or are

we discussing the main danger confronting the Party in its work of mobilizing the white masses to participate in the fight for Negro rights—work which is carried on primarily in the white communities, in the shops and trade unions that contain a predominance of white workers?

Furthermore, we must guard against a tendency to oversimplify the fight against deviations on the Negro question. For example, some think that the Right deviation on the Negro question is white chauvinism, while the Left deviation is petit-bourgeois Negro nationalism. These Party members overlook the fact that in the struggle against white chauvinism we may make either Right opportunist or Left sectarian mistakes. Likewise, in the struggle against petit-bourgeois Negro nationalism, we may make either Right opportunist or Left sectarian mistakes. Further, some tend to characterize every weakness and defect of the Party's work in mobilizing the white masses to fight for Negro rights as white chauvinism. But this is incorrect. Such weaknesses may, in fact, be due to white chauvinist mistakes. But such weaknesses may be due also to Right opportunist mistakes or Left sectarian mistakes, or a combination of these. From the standpoint of our tactics among the masses as well as in the interests of self-correction it is extremely important to bear these distinctions in mind.

LEFT SECTARIANISM IN NEGRO WORK

As far as the Party's work among the Negro masses is concerned at the present moment the main danger which confronts us is Left sectarianism. This Left sectarianism has led to the isolation of the Party in the Negro communities from the mainstream of the Negro liberation movement, from the mass struggles of the Negro people for equal rights.

What is the basis of this Left sectarianism and how does it express itself?

First, it stems from an underestimation of the danger of fascism to the Negro people. This is articulated in the following way: "The Negro people have always lived under fascist conditions. Things can't get any worse for the Negro people than they are right now. Hence, fascism may be a danger to the white masses who have something to lose; but it means nothing essentially new for the Negro people."

As a result of this underestimation of the danger of fascism, there is a failure to conceive of the Negro people's liberation struggle in its relation to the fight against McCarthyism. There is a failure to join with the masses of Negro people in the fight against McCarthyism. Instead, everything is geared to a different task, to "the revolutionary, anti-imperialist struggle of the Negro people."

Secondly, this Left sectarianism stems from an overestimation of the

radical
from
fluence
tancy
scious
exagger
Left co
the N
desert
awaite
militar
ly, the
to plac
within
Negro
church

Like
need fo
ing the
people
This d
to reco
in the
that th
a posit
rights.
correct
mony
liberat
ency to
stage
reached
though
already

Thir
stems f
that the
tain ser
period.
sions th
cies in t

radicalization of the Negro masses; from an underestimation of the influence of Negro reformism. Militancy is confused with political consciousness. As a result, there is an exaggerated concept of the role of Left committees or centers, as though the Negro masses were ready to desert their reformist leaders and awaited only the clarion call of a militant Left center. Correspondingly, there is opposition and resistance to placing chief emphasis upon work within the main organizations of the Negro people—N.A.A.C.P., Elks, churches, etc.

Likewise, there is a denial of the need for and the possibility of achieving the all-class unity of the Negro people in the fight for equal rights. This denial bases itself on a refusal to recognize one of the facts of life in the Negro liberation movement—that the Negro bourgeoisie can play a positive role in the fight for equal rights. Finally, in the necessary and correct fight to establish the hegemony of the Negro workers in the liberation movement, there is a tendency to skip stages, to exaggerate the stage which has actually been reached in this struggle, to act as though our ultimate objective were already an accomplished fact.

Thirdly, this Left sectarianism stems from a failure to recognize that the Negro people have won certain serious concessions in the past period. In relation to these concessions there are two sectarian tendencies in the Party: one, to ignore them

as being of no significance—which is certainly not what the mass of Negro people think; and second, to conclude that the only way the Communists can break the Negro masses from the influence of the reformists, who are being given credit for these concessions, is to project "more advanced" slogans, e.g., propaganda for socialism.

All of this does not in the least exclude the fact that in this same area of our Party's work among the Negro masses certain serious Right opportunist tendencies are emerging. These express themselves in a tendency to exaggerate the role of the Negro bourgeoisie in the liberation movement, to ascribe to the Negro bourgeoisie virtues of stability and dependability which should be attributed only to the working class.

This emerging Right opportunist tendency also denies or minimizes the need to carry on criticism of the Negro reformism at the same time that we seek to build a united front with it in the liberation struggle. It tends to glorify the role of the Negro reformists, forgetting altogether that the main sections of Negro reformism are supporters of American imperialism's war drive and bitter enemies of the Communists and the united front. This tendency minimizes a serious fight for enhancing the role of the Negro workers in the liberation struggle. It leads, in fact, to a subordination of the Negro workers to the Negro bourgeoisie, to the Left tailing behind the Negro reformists.

RIGHT DANGER IN WORK AMONG WHITE MASSES

However, the situation is quite different when we examine the second aspect of the Party's fight for Negro rights—its work in mobilizing the white masses to fight for Negro rights. This work must be carried on among the white workers in the shops, unions, communities and people's organizations, work for which white Communists are chiefly responsible.

In this area of our Party's work the main danger at the present moment is Right opportunism, which tends to develop under the impact upon the Party and the white Party members of white chauvinist pressures. This expresses itself in the following ways:

1) Underestimation of the readiness of white workers to fight for Negro rights as a result of overestimating the influence of white chauvinism among them. This wrong estimate is the exact opposite of the mistake in estimating the political level of the Negro masses.

Obviously, such an underestimation of the readiness of the white workers to fight for Negro rights leads to passivity on the part of the Party. It results in capitulation to those difficulties which do exist in mobilizing white workers to fight for Negro rights.

Generally this tendency has been enhanced by the repressive attacks on the Party combined with increasingly intense racist assaults on the

Negro people. Needless to say, such capitulation and passivity, carried to its conclusion, leads in effect to acceptance of and accommodation to the unequal status of the Negro people. It is a major manifestation of the Right opportunist tendency on the Negro question.

2) Illusions in the scope and magnitude of concessions already won by the Negro people; misconceptions about the permanence of the advances which have been made; concepts of an uninterrupted and automatic progression of the Negro people in the fight for equal rights. Generally, this is an outgrowth of the demagogic propaganda of Wall Street, which is attempting to counteract the struggle of the world democratic forces against Jim Crow in the United States. Such illusions reflect the penetration into our ranks of Social-Democratic and reformist opinions. They demobilize the Party's fighting capacity and readiness; minimize the urgency of the fight for Negro rights; lead to the Party's tailing behind the Social-Democrats and labor reformists on the Negro question.

3) A general weakening in the struggle against white chauvinism, both among the masses and within the Party itself. There is particularly a tendency to minimize the importance of the inner-Party struggle against white chauvinism. Attempts are made to justify this by reference to the gross sectarian mistakes which were made in the past on this score. In fact, some Party members incor-

rectly tend to see the weaknesses and distortions of the past struggles against white chauvinism as the main and dominant characteristic of that struggle. Thus the criticism of these sectarian distortions, instead of helping to strengthen the inner-Party fight against white chauvinism by putting it on a correct basis, becomes an excuse to abandon the struggle against white chauvinism.

Likewise, in analyzing the reasons for the Party's lag in the struggle for Negro rights there is a tendency by some to place the Party's weaknesses in the fight against white chauvinism on the same level with a whole host of other ideological weaknesses, thus still further de-emphasizing the fight against white chauvinism. The effect of all this is that, whereas in the past there were strong tendencies to explain all of the Party's weaknesses in the fight for Negro rights exclusively by white chauvinism, there is today developing a tendency to consider the impact of white chauvinism as playing only a minor role in the Party's weaknesses in the fight for Negro rights.

We say that the main danger in the Party's work of mobilizing the white masses to fight for Negro rights is Right opportunism, which stems basically from the impact of white chauvinist pressures upon the Party. Does this mean that it is the only danger? No!

There are also serious Left sectarian influences which hamper the Party's work in mobilizing white workers to fight for Negro rights. These take the form of disregarding

and standing aside from the widespread movement for Negro rights in the trade unions which is developing through a variety of forms — F.E.P.C. Committees, Fair Practice Committees, Anti-Discrimination Committees, etc. They take the form of projecting narrowly conceived struggles, for example, on the housing question, in which only the Left is mobilized to defend the right of Negroes to rent apartments or buy homes in lily-white communities. Then, of course, there is that whole host of Left sectarian mistakes in the struggle against white chauvinism which were so devastatingly analyzed by Comrade Foster in his article in *Political Affairs*.

The foregoing serves to emphasize anew that the struggle against deviations is always a concrete struggle. And in the field of our Party's fight for Negro rights, as in all other fields, this concrete struggle must always be conducted on two fronts. A one-sided struggle against deviations or an abstract struggle against deviations is harmful to the correct unfolding of the line of the Party in the fight for Negro rights.

Our Party has a proud heritage of struggle against white chauvinism. The current discussion of this question is designed to equip our Party to carry forward its vanguard role even more effectively. The clarity which this discussion is developing must be translated into an upsurge of mass activity that will bring every Communist into the forefront of the struggle for economic, political and social equality for the Negro people.

TWO GREAT NEW BOOKS—

**HISTORY OF THE THREE
INTERNATIONALS**

by WILLIAM Z. FOSTER

For the first time, advanced workers and students will be armed with a comprehensive, scientific Marxist analysis of the history of world Communism during the past century—a truly monumental study of the political struggles, movements and lessons of working-class political experience in all countries covering a span of more than one hundred years. Special pre-publication price to organizations for quantity orders.

International Publishers, \$6.00

•

THE 13TH JUROR

by STEVE NELSON

The heroic struggle of an American worker against a monstrous political frame-up which threatens him with twenty-five years imprisonment—and possibly, death—for his Communist views and convictions. This 256-page book is the gripping personal story of Steve Nelson's experiences in defense of his own and his country's freedom against the combination of Pittsburgh trusts, government and courts, and their stable of well-trained stoolpigeons and informers.

Masses & Mainstream. Popular \$1.50, cloth \$2.50

•

NEW CENTURY PUBLISHERS • 832 Broadway, New York 3

d
f
al
g-
re
a-

00

us
m-
nd
of
y's
nd
ers.
.50

t 3