

political affairs

JULY 1955 • 25 CENTS

HX

1
C8

v. 34

no. 7

MARTHA STONE

- [1] A New Stage in the Fight
for Peace

WILLIAM Z. FOSTER

- [12] The General Law of Trade
Union Progress

HERBERT APTHEKER

- [22] Patriotism and the Nation

JOHN WILLIAMSON

- [34] To My Comrades

WILLIAM SENNETT

- [41] The Chicago Elections and 1956

MAURICE THOREZ

- [54] Mystification and Reality: The
Economic Situation in France

- [65] Letter from A Reader

NEW AND RECENT PAMPHLETS

"NOT GUILTY!" <i>by Claude Lightfoot</i>	\$.05
WHAT'S BEHIND JUVENILE DELINQUENCY? <i>by Aaron Weissman</i>	.05
SOVIET FOREIGN POLICY <i>by V. M. Molotov</i>	.25
"WE STAND FOR PEACEFUL COEXISTENCE" Interviews with N. S. Khrushchev, N. A. Bulganin, and G. K. Zhukov, <i>by William Randolph Hearst, Kingsbury Smith and Frank Conniff.</i>	.15
THE FARM CRISIS, <i>prepared by the National Farm Commission of the Communist Party</i>	.10
THE BEST YEARS OF THEIR LIVES <i>by Aaron Weissman</i>	.05
THE PEOPLE VERSUS SEGREGATED SCHOOLS <i>by Doxey A. Wilkerson</i>	.05
LABOR UNITY <i>by George Morris</i>	.05
THE NELSON CASE <i>prepared by Civil Rights Congress</i>	.05
NEW MOVES TOWARD PEACE: SOVIET PROPOSALS TO THE U.N.	.05
TOWARDS A MARXIST LIBRARY, <i>prepared by the Jefferson School of Social Science</i>	.10
COEXISTENCE OR NO EXISTENCE <i>by Adam Lapin</i>	.05
HOW THE CRADLE OF LIBERTY WAS ROBBED <i>by Joseph Morton</i>	.05
HOW TO KEEP YOUR JOB <i>by Bernard Burton</i>	.05



NEW CENTURY PUBLISHERS • 832 Broadway, New York 3

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

PRINTED IN U.S.A.

A Theoretical and Political Magazine of Scientific Socialism

Editor: V. J. Jerome

A New Stage in the Fight for Peace

By Martha Stone

FOR THE FIRST TIME in ten years following the anti-Hitler war a meeting of the chiefs of state of the Big Four will be convened. The convening of this meeting is a most significant victory for the world peace forces who have been pressing for such talks and negotiations. This long awaited development is not just one of the many "ups" and "downs" in the peace fight. It opens *new* opportunities for drastically changing the entire international situation through the peaceful settlement of differences. It holds forth the possibility of a qualitative change in the whole character and context of this struggle. Progress in overcoming past differences and a prolonged period of negotiations can enhance the real chances of ending the cold-war program and spending billions for the health and welfare needs of Americans who are now paying so heavily for that program.

* * *

What are the factors that finally induced a reluctant Eisenhower Administration to agree to a conference

of the heads of government of the United States, the Soviet Union, Britain and France?

In the first place is the mounting unity of the peoples of all countries in pressing for an end to the threat of atomic warfare. As Walter Lippmann pointed out (May 12): "If East and West are agreed on nothing else, they are agreed that there is now in the world an insistent popular demand that war must be avoided. . . . The popular demand . . . for a meeting at the summit is an expression of the feeling that nuclear warfare is intolerable."

Second is the striking peace initiative of the Soviet Union and the Chinese People's Republic. Outstanding issues that have caused international tensions dividing the East and West are being met by constructive peace proposals of the Soviet Union. The ability of the USSR to compromise and settle differences forced even a John Foster Dulles to admit that the Austrian agreement represented an act of peace by the Soviet Union. A dramatic example

of the sweeping moves for peace that emanate from the Soviet Union is the Soviet-Yugoslav declaration. The Belgrade Resolution binds two countries, formerly divided, on a common course with the objective of ending the cold war and bringing about real negotiations. Past differences on disarmament proposals are now narrowing down. The door has opened to a reconsideration of the issue of Germany. Much credit for easing international tensions goes to the Chinese People's Republic for its fight for world peace at Bandung and the initiative it has taken to negotiate directly with the United States for relaxation of tensions in the Formosa area.

Thirdly, the British elections exerted much pressure on Eisenhower to commit the United States to the Four Power talks. The Conservatives, campaigning to win against the Labor Party, needed such an agreement for a top level meeting in order to win. Is this not an indirect tribute to the broad peace movement in Great Britain? To win an election there, candidates have to perform *concrete deeds* in the interests of peace. Giving lip service to the peace issue will not suffice. In this respect the Conservatives got help from Eisenhower who agreed to the summit meeting as their election campaign came to a close.

Fourth, heightened pressure for the Big Four meeting was brought to bear as a result of the massive struggle of the European peoples against West German rearmament.

The formal ratification of the Paris Pact has by no means settled the issue. The fight goes on against the implementation of the Paris accord, an implementation which would greatly increase the war danger. The negotiation of the Austrian Treaty on the basis of neutralization has given a new impetus to the widespread demand which is growing in our country, too, for agreement on a neutralized, de-militarized, united, democratic Germany.

Fifth among these factors is the set-back suffered by the Eisenhower-Dulles Administration in its provocations around Quemoy and Matsu. This tactic was the culmination of a series of efforts to heighten tensions following the Indo-China truce. The strong protests from all parts of our country as well as abroad, and the clear indications given by the British, Canadian and other governments that they would not support a Quemoy-Matsu war have in recent weeks compelled the Administration to retreat, though the situation in the Formosa Straits remains highly dangerous.

Sixth is the great role played by the Bandung conference. At Bandung, Indonesia, the governments of 29 countries, representing varying stages of economic and political development, with important differences in their internal systems and in their relationships to the great powers and their degree of independence, were able to reach agreement on proposals for disarmament, for the banning of nuclear weapons and

ests, for
internati
issues as
to self-d
gle agai
discrimi
raised a
peace be
the wor
co-existe
Seven
The pr
played
country
the figh
was a
armistic
around
The rol
their co
world p
by the
hand, t
are not
Socialis
hand, t
eign oo
the U.S
peace a
econom
the nee
Soviet
have g
with th
Eigh
Americ
class fo
themse
of war
swiftly
people
role. T

tests, for the peaceful settlement of international disputes and on such issues as anti-colonialism, the right to self-determination, and the struggle against racial segregation and discrimination. This mighty voice raised against imperialism and for peace became a tremendous force in the worldwide struggle for peaceful co-existence.

Seventh is the role of neutralism. The pro-peace, pro-democratic role played by India and other neutral countries is a new contribution in the fight for world peace. Theirs was a special role in the Korean armistice, in the settling of issues around Indo-China and at Bandung. The role of the neutral countries and their contributions in the cause of world peace have been strengthened by the Austrian treaty. On the one hand, these nations want peace, but are not ready to join the camp of Socialist nations; and on the other hand, they want to be free of foreign occupation and domination by the U.S. military bloc. They require peace and trade to develop their own economies. In giving expression to the needs of the smaller nations, the Soviet Union and People's China have greatly improved relationships with them.

Eighth is the contribution of the American people and the working class for peace, especially where they themselves saw immediate danger of war-involvement. In all of these swiftly moving events the American people have played a most positive role. The demands of the American

people to end the Korean war contributed to bringing about peace. It helped to keep us out of and settle the Indo-China war and influenced the easing of tensions around the issue of Formosa. Though the level of struggle of the American people does not measure up to that in Europe, for understandable reasons, nonetheless progressives and Communists must appreciate the advances made in recent years. This very level of peace struggle and understanding among the people represents a serious obstacle to the Eisenhower Administration, whose aim is to maintain world tensions and continue the cold war.

On the issue of keeping out of Quemoy and Matsu and the banning of the H-bomb there have been the widest expressions from people's organizations, churches, trade unions, the press. These activities were increased as the anniversary session at the UN opened at San Francisco.

Among the Negro people, the Bandung conference had a great impact. Negro Americans expressed the fullest unity with the objectives of Bandung as they felt a close bond with the conference and its decisions on the question of freedom, peace, equality and independence of all peoples. For example, in the May issue of the *Crisis*, official organ of the N.A.A.C.P., the editorial declares that it will no longer "be possible for Europe to decide Africa's and Asia's fate around Western council tables without the presence of a single African or Asian."

Another illustration of the deep stirrings among Negro people for peace is the statement of Horace R. Cayton, in the *Pittsburgh Courier* of June 4. Mr. Cayton was discussing the forthcoming Helsinki Peace Conference, the extraordinary breadth of whose delegations from throughout the world is itself a further important indication of the heightened demand for peace. He wrote:

I'm sick and tired of a world where the stock markets do a nose dive when a "peace scare" breaks out. I'm weary of walking down the canyoned streets of a great city and wondering to myself if all that magnificent towering structure, all those millions of well-meaning people around me won't be fused into meaningless dust by tomorrow.

So, as you gather, I'm for peace; I'm for people who have the guts to talk about it and meet to try to do something about it. Frankly, I'm not too hopeful about the possibilities, but I do wish this Helsinki business will be just as concerned about the future of Horace Cayton as it might be about Ivan Ruskyy.

Likewise among America's youth, there have been the broadest expressions for peace and a higher level of peace activity and organization. The sweeping movement for international student exchange, developed on the campuses, resulted in winning from the State Department the invitation to Soviet students and youth editors. Over a hundred councils and papers joined

in this invitation. In Chicago, one thousand people signed welcoming petitions. Thirty organizations formed a committee to plan for the visit of the Soviet editors. At Oberlin, a conference for all Ohio and Michigan was planned so that students could meet the editors. In Michigan the head of the International Students Union called not only for more exchanges but a regular Fulbright program between the Soviet Union and the United States. In all these activities, the idea of these two nations living side by side peacefully was constantly expressed.

On the issue of UMT, the United Christian Youth movement sent a delegation of forty members to lobby at the last National Convention of the CIO. The recent convention of the Y.W.C.A., that was attended by 4,000 women coming from all walks of life, expressed themselves on the need for world peace. These and many other illustrations point to the clear and unmistakable proof that the youth of America respond most favorably to the powerful issues of Peace and opposition to UMT, and for a policy of negotiations to end the threat of war.

GROWING DIFFERENCES AS CRISIS IN FOREIGN POLICY CONTINUES

The international situation has produced important changes within our own country. Under the impact of these world-wide developments and the marked increase of peace activity in the U.S., the foreign pol-

icy of
deeper i
cannot
different
selves a
and wi
These ri
basis for
determine
peace ca
The
reflectin
oly cap
world r
of the
headed
suffered
foreign
after an
its influ
came w
fered a
Indo-Ch
peoples
and rej
icies in
Eisenho
tended
in We
policy
Canadi
war pr
and M
istration
the ha
movem
Formos
the Ad
lands a
These
forced
tion to

icy of our Government gets ever deeper into a crisis from which it cannot extricate itself. Growing differentiations are expressing themselves among monopolist groupings and within *both* political parties. These rifts will become wider as the basis for the cold-war program is undermined by the advances of the peace camp.

The Eisenhower-Dulles policies, reflecting the main drive of monopoly capital, have sought to shift world relationship of forces in favor of the camp of war and aggression headed by the U.S. But these policies suffered some very major blows. U.S. foreign policy ran into one crisis after another, and with each defeat its influence in the world arena became weaker. The Dulles line suffered a setback in China, Korea, Indo-China. At Bandung the colonial peoples defended their independence and rejected the U.S. cold-war policies in Asia. The defeats of the Eisenhower-Dulles policies have tended to isolate it from its "allies" in Western Europe. U.S. foreign policy was criticized by British and Canadian governments as it created war provocations against Quemoy and Matsu. The Eisenhower Administration was forced to recoil under the hammer blows of the peace movement after it introduced the Formosa Resolution which joined the Administration with the Knowlands and McCarthys on this issue. These setbacks to U.S. prestige forced the Eisenhower Administration to make tactical shifts, to ma-

neuver demagogically on the issue of peaceful co-existence, on Big Four negotiations.

The meeting at the summit was imposed on the Eisenhower Administration. Now that it is confronted with this coming meeting it is approaching the meeting with so many "ifs" and "buts" and throwing so much cold water on it that the suspicion grows that Washington will not play and does not want to play a constructive role. What is more: clinging to their discredited "positions of strength" policy—which has weakened our country politically and morally throughout the world—Eisenhower and Dulles are seeking to use the meeting as an instrument in the cold war by suggesting that the conference interfere in the internal affairs of the people's democracies and discuss such matters as "international communism." At the same time, they are rejecting in advance proposals on the real issues to be discussed and Dulles has even rejected the idea that the purpose of the conference is to relax international tensions. *The only guarantee that the U.S. will play a constructive role in the conference and help resolve all differences is the direct intervention of the American people.* Eisenhower, once more parading about in his "peace role" now that his policies have been rebuffed all over the world, cannot be relied upon to ease and resolve problems that stand in the way of world peace.

All is not well within the extreme Right-wing circles of the G.O.P. nor

among the most rabid warmongers in monopoly circles. Tactical rifts and differences are developing there, too, as the crisis grows. This is highlighted by the views of Hearst who, upon his return from the Soviet Union, denied that America's security was threatened by the Soviet Union. He emphasized the need for a policy of "competitive co-existence." These differentiations are expressed in the speech of General MacArthur who on January 26 said:

We are in a new era. The old methods and solutions no longer suffice. We must have new thoughts, new ideas, new concepts, just as did our venerated forefathers when they faced a new world. We must break out of the straitjacket of the past. There must always be one to lead and we should be that one. We should now proclaim our readiness to abolish war in concert with the great powers of the world. The result would be magical.

Within the most aggressive pro-war Right-wing group of the G.O.P. there are differences that have for the moment separated Knowland and McCarthy in their approach to the Big Four negotiations. Knowland found it publicly expedient to retreat temporarily from his past opposition to negotiations. McCarthy on the other hand called for torpedoing the Big Four conference by demanding that "the U.S. should talk only about the liberation of the countries now held captive by the Communists—and nothing else."

The most open and aggressive opponents of a Big Four conference

have been the ultra reactionary Knowlands, McCarthys, Radford and their fellow advocates of "preventive war." They have worked day and night to precipitate armed conflict with China and far from agreeing to sit down at the same table with the Soviet Union, have demanded the rupture of diplomatic relations with our great war-time ally. The calling of the Big Four meeting is therefore in the first place a defeat for these aggressors.

Likewise, in the ranks of the Democratic Party there are some significant changes on the peace issue. The most articulate group expressing a pro-peace viewpoint consists of Senators Lehman, Morse, and Kefauver. They expressed themselves most critically in regard to Eisenhower's policies around the issue of Quemoy and Matsu and on the question of negotiations. They form the strongest of a group of liberal and pro-labor Senators who opposed or tried to restrict the Eisenhower Formosa resolution. A high point in sharpening the differences between the Democrats and their Republican opponents was the speech of Adlai Stevenson on June 13 when he said:

On the Big Four conference, our task is to keep our hopes high but our heads clear, to consider every suggestion honestly and dispassionately, to look for the basis of agreement and, not least, to be willing to take some reasonable chance. To want peace is to want compromise. It is not to demand perfection, but to be willing to

accept
less th
the al
and
tension
compro
tions
war is
Soviet
if we
for on
ous fo
will h
This
in the
ful al
G.O.P.
find
didate
native
progr
reacti
on th
use o
it eve
tarist
John
from
Party
have
Steve
gotia
cratic
tiona
Cong
John
feate
the
icy.
iebra
vens
can
of p

accept something less, perhaps much less than perfection—but better than the alternative which is a sharpening and prolonging of ugly, dangerous tensions. If we, the people, are uncompromising, if we equate negotiations with appeasement, if we think war is inevitable, if we regard every Soviet proposal as a trick and a trap, if we think that what is advantageous for one is automatically disadvantageous for the other, then we the people will have ruled out bargaining.

This is a most positive beginning in the direction of presenting peaceful alternatives to the policies of the G.O.P. Unless the American people find in the Democratic Party candidates and their program an alternative to the Eisenhower cold-war program, the danger exists that this reactionary Administration will win on the basis of the most demagogic use of the peace issue. This makes it even more necessary that the militarist forces grouped around Lyndon Johnson and Sam Rayburn (both from Texas) within the Democratic Party be defeated. Pro-peace forces have yet to wage the struggle to make Stevenson's views on peaceful negotiations the policy of the Democratic Party organization. The reactionary forces in the Democratic Congressional leadership, headed by Johnson and Rayburn, must be defeated in their persistent support to the Eisenhower-Dulles foreign policy. Continuing to appease the Dixiecrats for the sake of what the Stevenson forces consider "party unity" can only result in alienating millions of people who will rally around can-

didates taking a strong peace stand.

All these differences and tactical rifts within monopoly capital as expressed in both parties are the direct results of the world peace fight and the resistance of the American people to the McCarthyite line. Given a well organized peace movement with labor playing a leading role, the struggle for peaceful co-existence and world peace can be won and the cold war brought to an end. It would be a mistake to assume, however, that the preventive-war advocates will take their defeat lying down. Through their positions in the Administration, in Congress, in the Republican Party and in the armed forces, as well as through the activities of their "friend at court," Secretary of State Dulles, they are trying to pressure the Eisenhower Administration into merely going through the motions of negotiations while sabotaging them in fact.

THE ROLE OF THE LABOR MOVEMENT

Millions of working men and women have a new feeling of confidence in the ability to avert war. After years during which masses urged a meeting of the four big powers at the summit, this meeting is finally coming to pass. This lifts the hope of all and unfolds a new perspective of world peace. Should these negotiations result in a settlement of many past differences between the East and West, the very basis for continuing the cold war is undermined.

The basis for further confidence in labor's own ability to directly influence the peace struggle is further enhanced by the increased strength of labor growing out of the A.F.L.-C.I.O. merger. This merger, bringing millions into one organized labor federation, can strengthen labor's political role around all the vital issues in the '56 elections, in which peace will play such an important role.

Operating to the detriment of the peace interests of the membership of the trade-union movement is the continued and stubborn defense of the bi-partisan foreign policy by the top labor officialdom in this country. They continue this course, despite the rejection by the labor movement in Europe and Asia of the cold war program, and despite its declining base for support in our own country. Especially is this true of the role of George Meany, whose foreign policy position is even to the Right of Dulles.

The growing disparity between the peace sentiments of the workers and the continued support to the reactionary war policies of the top leadership is forcing a change in the views of some top labor leaders. This even brought about a modification in the position of the A.F.L. Executive Council on the question of our involvement in Quemoy and Matsu. This is what led Walter Reuther to pose the peace issue before the last Auto Union Convention as a central question closely related to the economic problems of the workers.

Contrary to his past position of support to the "guns-and-butter" program, Reuther advanced at this convention the outlook that American labor can have jobs in a peacetime economy.

The *CIO News* published a comment by Willard Shelton criticizing the negative Eisenhower-Dulles approach to the Big Four conference. Then there is the editorial of the organ of the Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen which said:

One year ago, the editors of the *Butcher Workman* were severely criticized by many in the trade union movement for expressing the thought that co-existence in this world among all nations, including Russia and her satellites, is possible. After all, how can anyone with Christian ideals think otherwise? We say again there must be co-existence or no-existence in the conflict of ideologies that has so divided the opinions of the people of the world.

The CIO last December expressed opposition to the Knowland line that called for our involvement in a war with China. The April issue of *Textile Labor* in an editorial declares:

For the first time in history, man now has the power to destroy mankind. A simple accident, a mistaken signal, a fit of temper, a broken compass could wreak atomic horror on us all. Why then should anyone in power, be he Eisenhower or Bulganin, stand on his dignity or maneuver for position? Talk, men, talk! Talk *to* each other, not *about* each other; talk now, lest the

shattered
erations
apes.

Then
more
trade-u
itive p
lated i
and t
place
mum
Govern
and o
tip th
reality
to the
There
conver
on the
ment
and c
resolu
union
of lab
full
peace
from
In t
opera
stand
regist
co-exi

Th
advan
move
organ
great
those
ing o
of th
the S

shattered remains of some future generations be reduced to the language of apes.

These views open the way to a more active political role for the trade-union movement. These positive peace expressions will be translated into life only if the peace forces and the Communists in the first place help labor to exert its maximum influence on the policies of our Government. The Walter Reuthers and other top labor leaders at best tip their hats to the peace issue. In reality they do not take these issues to the membership of their unions. There is a great gap between UAW convention speeches and resolutions on the peace issue, and the involvement of every local union member and officer in implementing these resolutions. Social-Democratic trade-union leaders fear the full impact of labor's intervention. They know full well that mass activity for peace will only break masses away from the Eisenhower-Dulles line. In this regard Social-Democracy operates as a brake on labor and stands in the way of the workers registering their desires for peaceful co-existence.

This makes it incumbent on the advanced peace forces in the labor movement to help the workers to organize for peace, to exert their greatest influence in connection with those issues coming before the meeting of the heads of the Governments of the U.S., France, England and the Soviet Union.

This activity at the grass roots level can produce a new, qualitative change in the situation in our country which will strengthen labor's role in the fight for peace as well as the peace forces in the country, bringing about a victory for the pro-peace, pro-labor forces in the '56 elections.

Spurred on by the coming A.F. of L.-C.I.O. merger, the workers are generally in a more militant mood. They are meeting employer attacks with greater resistance. Witness the long strike of textile workers in New England against a wage cut; the strikes and dissatisfaction of auto workers in G.M. and Ford because of the limited gains in the new contract; the strikes in maritime; the militancy of the southern workers and the united legislative campaign of the A.F. of L. and C.I.O. for the \$1.25 minimum wage law. There is new spirit in labor's ranks.

Labor's advances on the economic front are inevitably bound up with the character of our foreign policy. Every advance in the fight for peace and for improved conditions of labor undermines the basis for the cold war. After the Second World War, Big Business demanded huge sums from the Government to keep up the high level of arms production. They did this to continue their maximum profits and in pursuit of their whole outlook for world domination and war. These plotters against the peace covered up this scheme by trying to frighten the American people with fantastic stories about

the great "danger of Communist aggression." But in reality what is shaping up in the world is just the opposite. Tensions are lessening, because of the growing strength of the world peace camp, and the idea that peoples of varying social systems can live side-by-side peacefully is beginning to catch hold.

Have not recent developments on an international scale proven beyond a doubt that if our government is willing, it can negotiate and solve differences with the Soviet Union? Have not the modifications in the Soviet Union's position on disarmament shown that differences between the East and West are narrowing down and can be overcome? For labor this has a very special meaning. Why go on spending billions for arms which the workers pay through high taxes when we can reach an agreement to cut down armaments and lessen the war danger?

Certainly the time is ripe to raise the demand for ending the cold war, and for shifting our economy from that of war to peacetime production. Many of the big industries in our nation, if compelled to return to a peacetime economy, to grant wage increases, and to break down completely the trade barriers now existing between East and West, would find new markets for American industry and new jobs would be secured for the American workers. This whole economic outlook needs to be advanced by labor as it presses for a policy of continued negotiations, and the settlement of all differ-

ences standing in the way of world peace.

Spending less and less for war preparations and more and more for housing, health, and education must begin now. The American working class, the Negro people, and the farm population have suffered greatly in an economic as well as political sense from the damaging effects of the cold-war program. Every parent—in fact, every decent human being—should be revolted at the refusal of our government (in contrast to even other capitalist states) to immunize children from polio simply because such an immunity program would cost money now going into battle-ships and tanks.

GENERAL SLOGANS IN THE PEACE MOVEMENT

A number of slogans around which all sectors of the population can unite, arising from the concrete situation as the Big Four talks open up, are: *Negotiate in a spirit of mutual concessions. Insist that Dulles and Eisenhower continue negotiations until settlements are reached. Oppose all appeasement of the Knowlands and McCarthys. Don't re-arm Germany when the whole world can begin to disarm. Ban the H-Bomb. Seat China in the U.N. Eliminate all international barriers and expand East-West trade. Allocate government expenditures for peace, not war. End the cold war.*

Never before have the American people had such favorable opportunity to leap forward in the direc-

tion of peace. The opening of the summit conference must usher in the beginning of a long period of negotiations and settlements of those differences that create a threat of war. This will largely depend on the full unity and strength of the people in our own country and their concerted action with millions in Asia, Africa, and Europe whose hopes are high for world peace. The wise words of Stalin in this regard need to be recalled—he urged upon the millions of people to take the matter of peace into their own hands. The millions are strong. The enemy is fighting ferociously to hold on to its badly battered policies known as the cold war. The biggest defeat yet administered to the cold-war program is the convening of the meeting at the summit. When the cold war program with bi-partisan support was first put forward in our country, it was predicated on the idea that there can be no meetings, negotiations, conferences and talks between the heads of the Soviet Union and those of the imperialist powers like Britain, France, and the U.S. Now this is being changed, and the change is being imposed on the Eisenhower Administration and will of the peoples the world over. This brings about a new stage in the fight for peaceful co-existence, for the ending of the cold war.

Our Party must throw its full energy and forces into this ever expanding peace movement. Left peace forces need to become an integral part of the peace activities in churches, trade unions and other mass organizations. Recently, the new initiative of various peace centers with Left-leadership have activated many at the grass-roots level, stimulated parallel actions on the peace front, and cemented ties and relationships between the Left and broader peace forces. This is particularly demonstrated in the peace movement at the West Coast and in the mass signature campaign on the H-bomb conducted by the San Francisco peace crusade on the occasion of the celebration of the Tenth Anniversary of the UN.

We need to have a heightened appreciation of the contributions of the American people to these international peace developments. Victories on the peace front will have far-reaching consequences for our own people. It will deliver a major blow to the McCarthys and other fascist forces who plot the destruction of democratic rights. Winning the fight for peaceful co-existence will be the greatest barrier to these reactionary un-American forces who would impose fascism upon us, and will open up new horizons for a people's victory.

The General Law of Trade Union Progress*

By William Z. Foster

SOCIETY HAS its principles or laws of growth, function, and decline. Among them, particularly with regard to the capitalist system under which we live, may be mentioned those laws relating to the economic factor in determining the course of history, to the extraction of surplus value, to cyclical economic crises, to the class struggle, to monopoly capitalism, to the general crisis of world capitalism, to proletarian revolution, and many others. The basic theoretical achievement of Marxists is to have been able to analyze these social laws and to draw from them the necessary conclusions. Bourgeois economists are characterized by a general failure to recognize or understand social laws. At the burial of Karl Marx on March 18, 1883, his brilliant co-worker, Frederick Engels, said of the great thinker and fighter: "Just as Darwin discovered the law of evolution in organic nature, so Marx discovered the law of evolution in human history."

As part of society the trade union movement—here we speak primarily of the one in the capitalist countries—is subject to society's basic laws of growth and development. Trade unionism grew with the capitalist system, and as part of that system it is conditioned by such laws as those

of the class struggle, of the uneven development of capitalism, and others. For example—capitalist cyclical economic crises historically have had far-reaching effects upon trade unions, mostly in a disruptive sense; colonial regimes have placed their indelible stamp upon the worker composition of the unions; the expansion of trade unionism on a world scale relates to the growth of international capitalism, and so on.

The trade union movement also has specific laws of its own. With some 140,000,000 members throughout the world and over two centuries of history behind it, the movement has not grown and does not function haphazardly. Trade unions are born, advance, and decline according to ascertainable principles or laws. It is a weakness of trade union writings that more attention has not been paid to this basic aspect of the movement's life.

THE MANNER OF TRADE UNION DEVELOPMENT

Historically speaking the trade unions have grown numerically, spread from country to country, and developed new structures, new programs, new tactics, and new ideologies to fit themselves for new situations and tasks. This whole development, considered in its broadest outlines, constitutes an evolution; in the

* Chapter 56 of my forthcoming book, *Outline History of the World Trade Union Movement*.

same sense that the history of society represents a general social evolution.

The growth of trade unionism, however, while evolutionary in an historical sense, has not been a steady evolutionary advance in an immediate sense. The growth graph made by it is not a smooth incline, but a series of plains and peaks, with a general upward tendency. The trade union movement has advanced with alternating periods of slow evolutionary expansion and of swift and stormy growth. Sometimes the trade unions have expanded at a snail's pace, or even retrogressed, and at other times they have raced ahead at tremendous speed, making progress in all directions. This alternation of periods of faster and slower development is the general law of the progress of the trade union movement. Its reality is attested to by the history of organized labor in every capitalist country.

The periods of faster and slower development of the unions relates directly to the rise or decline in the fighting spirit of the working class. Generally the periodic bursts of militancy by the workers are the results of long accumulated or suddenly precipitated grievances. They may be caused by wars, sweeping wage cuts, sudden drops in real wages, economic crises, open-shop drives, the threat of fascism, and the like. Industrial boom periods may also generate lesser offensives by the workers, with extensive union-building by the workers, as labor history

amply indicates. The periods of intense working class struggle may be short, or they may cover a decade or more; they may be local, national, or international in scope. When the economic and political situation is mature and the workers have a strong Communist Party, working class offensives may, of course, become proletarian revolutions, but this is not our concern here.

The question of mass spontaneity enters into the calculation. When the workers are in a militant mood and the political situation is matured, often a small incident may trigger a broad fighting movement. Both the Russian Revolution of 1917 and the German Revolution of 1918, although based on deep and fundamental class contradictions, got started in relatively small local revolts, which spread like prairie fires. All capitalist countries have had similar experiences on lesser scales. The Flint sit-down strike of January 1937, for example, was the spark that touched off the big series of strikes and organizing campaigns that built the C.I.O. in the late 1930's. The workers throughout the country, burdened with long years of hard times, exploitation, and general oppression, were ripe for struggle and the small but dramatic strike in Flint was sufficient to set them actively into motion. As workers become better organized economically and politically, however, they are less dependent upon these moods of spontaneity, vital though they are. With their

present-day strong organization and accumulated power, they are able to precipitate big offensives themselves, without waiting until the dam bursts of itself from the irresistible mass pressure behind it.

The history of the labor movement everywhere under capitalism shows that the workers, where bourgeois democratic conditions prevail, have made considerable progress during the less active periods of class struggle. The Second International, during its best period of 1889-1914, lived in a relative calm in the class struggle, save in Russia and to a lesser extent in the United States; but the workers nevertheless succeeded, despite an increasingly Right-wing Socialist leadership, in building up powerful mass trade unions, parties, and co-operatives on an international scale. This growth both Lenin and Stalin stressed strongly in their estimates of the historical role of the Second International.

Trade unions may also retrogress organizationally and ideologically during periods of lessened class struggle. This was notably the case with the A. F. of L. unions during 1923-29. These were years of high industrial activity when normally the trade unions should have grown considerably. Instead, they fell off in membership and their fighting morale sank to the lowest levels in American labor history. This decline occurred because during this period the unions became enmeshed by their reactionary leaders in the current class

collaborationist, no-strike, no-fight theories, to the general effect that if they speeded up production they automatically would reap higher real wages. This was the era of the B. & O. plan, the higher strategy of labor, the new wage policy, and other opportunist illusions.

But the two phases of organized labor's mode of progress—the slow evolutionary growth and the strong revolutionary advance—are not to be equated as of the same significance. The second phase—that of the strong fighting offensive—is much the more potent. During such periods of active struggle the trade unions, in all capitalist countries, have always made their greatest advances. The trade union movement, like the working class in general, makes its main progress, not by slow evolutionary steps, but by militant leaps forward. This principle has applied both in the development of strike movements and of direct attacks upon the capitalist system.

Mere militancy of itself is, however, not enough to guarantee victory and trade union growth. The workers must be well-led or even the most powerful spontaneous movements will go onto the rocks of defeat. Particularly is the danger great when the workers are led by Right Social Democrats—the enemies of all aggressive struggle by the workers. This tragic reality has been made clear time and again in world labor history, including such ill-fated So-

cial-Dem
the Ger
revoluti
strike of
big strik
general

A tra
ous lea
union c
ing the
German
1933-
fight, b
bureau
these v
trade u
will to
that th
wiped
wester
the E
tral"
in pro
toriou
Europ

Non
riods
union
as th
move
riods
are th
stron
They
build
the g
ship
made
strug
D
strug

cial-Democratic-led movements as the German Revolution of 1918, the revolutionary Italian metal workers' strike of 1920, the ill-fated American big strikes of 1918-23, and the British general strike of 1926.

A tragic example of the treacherous leadership of Social Democratic union officialdom was exhibited during the rise of fascism in Italy and Germany during the period of 1920-1933. The workers were ready to fight, but the Social Democratic labor bureaucrats, with a firm control on these workers' political parties and trade unions, managed to defeat their will to struggle. The first result was that the trade union movement was wiped out by the fascists, from the western borders of the U.S.S.R. to the English Channel, save in "neutral" Sweden and Switzerland, and in pro-Hitler Finland. It took a victorious world war to re-establish the European labor movement.

Normally during the recurring periods of stormy struggle the trade unions make their greatest growth, as the history of the world labor movement eloquently proves. In periods of hard fighting the workers are the most conscious of a need of strong trade union organization. They are also most in the mood to build it. In every capitalist country the greatest gains in union membership and general strength have been made during the periods of bitter struggle.

During these periods of acute struggle the workers understand

most clearly the need for political organization and action. The J. R. Commons theory that the workers turn alternately from industrial to political action and vice versa is not borne out by labor history. Instead, in all countries the periods of intense industrial struggle are almost always also the periods of the greatest political activity on the part of the working class.

By the same token, the trade unions have always made their most significant advances ideologically during times of sharpest mass struggle. This, too, is one of the basic lessons of world labor experience. When they are in hard struggle with the employers and the state the workers are the most receptive to advanced Marxist concepts. It is easiest then for them to understand the basic causes of their conflict, to grasp the class role of the state, and to understand the treachery of the Right Social Democracy. In all capitalist countries periods of sharp struggle are also periods of the most rapid working class enlightenment and growth of class consciousness.

The struggle periods are when the workers are most inclined to get rid of their Right bureaucratic leaders, the products of times of lesser class struggles, and to replace these parasites with fighting workers. Traditionally, and all over the world, it is during great working class movements that the workers produce new and better leaders. Fear of the loss of their jobs is one of the basic rea-

sons why the chair-warming labor bureaucrats so acutely dread the rise of militancy and working class struggle.

The period of the fighting offensive is also the most advantageous for the trade unions in other respects. Then the workers inevitably throw their largest forces into action and they are best able to deliver solid blows against the capitalist exploiters. And then, too, with the masses alert and in a fighting mood, they can most readily break through the network of hindrances and crippling bureaucratic controls that the conservative Social Democratic leaders have been able to fasten upon them during calm periods of the class struggle. A trade union movement going into active struggle is like a Gulliver breaking the cords with which the Lilliputians have bound him during his sleep.

Marx, Lenin, and many other Communist leaders have repeatedly pointed out that at certain times and due to specific conditions, the tempo of the class struggle is greatly speeded up, and that then the workers perform "miracles" of courage and achievement. "In such great developments," says Marx, "twenty years are but as one day—and there may come days which are as the concentrated essence of twenty years."* The law of trade union progress, which signalizes the periods of acute class struggle as the times of greatest trade union development, dove-

tails with and is part of the basic principle thus outlined by Marx.

EXAMPLES FROM WORLD TRADE UNION EXPERIENCE

Trade union experience under capitalism in all countries goes to prove the validity of the general law of trade union progress, as stated above. The history of organized labor in Great Britain, the classical home of trade unionism, is typical. The British unions have always made their greatest progress during periods of the most active class struggle, when the fighting spirit of the proletariat was at the highest pitch. Among the most important of these periods of intense struggle were the years 1830-48, the time of the historic Owenite-Chartist movement; the big London dock strike of 1889, which opened the doors of the British craft unions to the unskilled masses; the militant mass strikes of 1908-14, which gave the British working class a new realization of its revolutionary power and led to the formation of the Triple Alliance of 1918-20; the big increase in membership and activity in the mass upsurge following World War I; the basic agitation and struggle connected with the general strike of 1926, and the increase in struggle and union growth in the immediate aftermath of World War II. These were the times when the basic increases in trade union membership were made, when real improvements were achieved in trade union structure and tactics, when

* Karl Marx, *Briefwechsel*, Vol. III, p. 127.

the most concessions were wrung from the employers, when the workers sensed most clearly the need for political action, when the rank and file most successfully broke through the bureaucratic controls of class collaboration, and when the working masses made the greatest progress in ridding themselves of bourgeois thinking.

German trade union history tells the same general story of a record of plains and peaks in trade union development. Three peaks were: the swift union growth after the workers' defeat of the anti-Socialist laws in 1893, the stormy expansion of the trade unions in the revolutionary situation after World War I—from 1,415,519 members in January 1917 to 7,338,132 in December 1918—followed by relative union stagnation during the 15 years of class collaboration under the Weimar Republic; and then, again, there was the swift re-creation of the trade unions, from nothing to about 10,000,000 members, during 1945-49, following fascism and World War II.

The Italian labor movement has had a like experience of big leaps ahead during periods of sharp class warfare, and so, also, have the French unions, with interim periods of relative calm in the class struggle, marked by little or no trade union progress. Both movements grew enormously in the struggle periods following the two world wars. A famous "peak," too, in French labor history was during the people's front

struggle of the years 1935-37, when the workers succeeded by militant mass action in halting French fascism, in skyrocketing the C.G.T. membership from 1,000,000 to 5,000,000, in winning great national sit-down strikes, and in bringing about organic unity between the C.G.T. and the C.G.T.U., despite the resistance of a reluctant Social Democratic leadership.

The Japanese trade union movement, which had functioned precariously for many years previously under semi-feudal conditions, took its first great leap forward after World War II. It soared from a position of no real unions at all under the militaristic-fascist regime to a movement of almost 7,000,000 members within two years after the end of the war. Almost like magic the awakened Japanese workers cast off old-time methods of thought, built powerful industrial unions, developed original forms of strike tactics, and acted like veteran trade unionists. The modern Japanese labor movement literally crashed into existence, almost overnight.

The history of the American trade unions also exhibits the working of the general law of trade union progress—with the characteristic alternating peaks of struggle with rapid union growth, and plains of lesser class struggle with relative organizational and ideological stagnation. Among the highest points of struggle and expansion of the trade union movement in the United States may

be listed: the historic trade union upswing of 1827-33, the stormy period of struggle and union-building immediately following the Civil War, the big burst of class struggle and organization during 1877-96, the considerable union expansion of 1918-20, and, above all, the sweeping trade union growth and struggle of 1933-48, a product of the great economic crisis of 1929-33 and the fight against world fascism.

During the latter tremendous surge forward the workers, breaking through the stifling controls of the Green labor bureaucracy, established the C.I.O., adopted industrial unionism, and launched a series of struggles and campaigns which organized the hitherto open-shop basic industries and raised the total number of trade unionists in the United States and Canada from 3,000,000 in 1933 to about 16,000,000 at the end of 1948. Moreover, characteristic of such periods of swift advance, the C.I.O., hearkening to its big Left-progressive wing, broke with many of the old reactionary Gompersian shibboleths and practices and adopted many new and progressive policies and tactics—with regard to Negro workers, women and youth workers, political action, mass picketing, international labor unity, etc. The C.I.O. swiftly became the vanguard of the American trade union movement.

The trade unions of the countries of socialism and people's democracy—the U.S.S.R., People's China, and the rest—all had similar experiences

during their earlier phases under the capitalist system. The trade unions of old Russia, hardly able to exist even in skeleton form under Tsarist tyranny, took their first great jump forward during the Revolution of 1905, when in a few months they became an organized movement of about 250,000 members. Suppressed in 1904-08 by tsarist reaction, they again made a rapid expansion during the Revolution of 1917. In March 1917 the Russian trade unions totaled only a handful, but by June 1917 they counted 1,475,429 affiliates, and by January 1918, 2,532,000—after which they went ahead still faster, until finally they have reached their present figure of 40,200,000.

The Chinese trade unions first burst upon the scene of labor history during the big revolutionary united front drive of the Kuomintang and Communist Party forces in 1925-27 against feudal reaction. Although prior to 1925 trade unions had hardly been known in China, by 1927 they already had jumped to 2,600,000 members. After the Chiang Kai-shek counter-revolution in 1927 the unions, suffering many terrifying hardships, were reduced to skeletons, or wiped out, except in the liberated areas. In 1948, with the victorious advance of the Chinese Revolution, the trade unions again grew swiftly, reporting 2,836,059 members, and by 1953 the membership had risen to 10,200,000. The European people's democracies, with their huge trade union movements, have all had

similar
organiza
growth
struggle.

The t
of Social
are now
tions. T
of grow
them to
treat the
countrie
militan
ical stre
was dr
the enor
of the
World
develop
been br
are dis
numeri
readily
them,
and flo
terferen
conditi
militan

THE G
SOM

The
of the
ing spi
underli
union
import
world
worker
to und
they h

similar experiences, with their labor organizations making their real growth during the periods of hard struggle.

The trade unions in the countries of Socialism and people's democracy are now matured labor organizations. The peaks-and-valleys method of growth no longer prevails among them to anywhere near the same extent that it does in the capitalist countries. That rises in working class militancy, under economic and political stress, still play a role with them, was dramatically demonstrated by the enormous industrial achievements of the Soviet trade unions during World War II. The barriers to the development of these unions have been broken down and their enemies are dispersed. They grow freely numerically, they adapt themselves readily to the new tasks confronting them, and their ideology expands and flourishes without capitalist interference. These unions live in a condition of more or less permanent militancy and rapid development.

THE GENERAL LAW AND SOME CONCLUSIONS

The reality of the varying tempos of the class struggle and of the fighting spirit of the working class, which underlies the general law of trade union progress, has played a very important role in the history of the world trade union movement. The workers and their leaders have tried to understand this phenomenon and they have responded to it interna-

tionally and tactically in various ways. Historically, the major currents in the modern labor movement, (without checking the older ones), which can be roughly grouped under the trends of Right Social Democracy, Anarchism, Syndicalism, and Communism, have taken different attitudes towards the recurring waves of struggle and the periods of relative working class calm.

The Right-wing Social Democrats have always based themselves upon a minimum of class struggle. They are the ardent proponents of *Kleinarbeit*; that is, of day-to-day work, of the slow, bit-by-bit advance. Their fundamental policy is class collaboration, and they are inveterate opponents of militant class struggle. Their great dread is of outbursts of aggressive fighting spirit on the part of the workers, whether these are powerful strike movements, or incomparably worse, attacks upon the capitalist system itself. They are advocates of evolution and enemies of revolution. They especially require the periods of calm for building their hard-and-fast bureaucracies, an enterprise at which they are very expert. As the history of all countries shows, when Right Social Democrats, during periods of working class upheaval, are compelled to lead big movements of struggle, "they head them only to behead them." The whole policy of the Social Democrats is tied in with the fact that at bottom they are only petty bourgeois reformists without any Socialist per-

spective.

The Anarchist trend in the labor movement has always gone to the other extreme from that of the Right Social Democrats. The early Anarchists practically ignored the current urgent tasks of day-to-day demands, struggle, and organization. Their basic reliance was the spontaneous action of the masses. This was a petty bourgeois tendency; for middle class elements are notoriously lacking in definite programs and fighting organizations. The Anarcho-Syndicalists have practically the same weakness in this respect; that is, an over-reliance upon the spontaneity of the working class and too little attention to the questions of organization and daily struggle. For them the general strike has always been the cure-all, and they have usually hoped to achieve their general strikes through arbitrary manifestoes, rather than by hard preliminary organization work and by striking the blow at the strategic moment. The usual result has been failure. This is the experience of Anarcho-Syndicalism in all countries.

The Communists and other Left trade unionists, on the other hand, know how to advance the cause of the workers in both phases of the general law of trade union progress. They are the best day-to-day builders and fighters during periods of relative calm in the class struggle. They are also the ones who understand best how to lead broad masses of workers in the periods of active class struggle

and to utilize these struggles to build strong trade unions, and, when it is timely, to march on to Socialism. The basic method of Communists is that of the revolutionary advance; but they also know how to make slow evolutionary progress when this is the only way. This puts them into harmony with the fighting methods of the workers; who, facing daily grievances in their work and life, constantly fight against them, and who also, confronting from time to time heavier attacks upon their living and working conditions, reply to them with sweeping offensives which, upon appropriate occasions may become revolutions.

The Communists fully appreciate the fundamental importance of the periodic expressions of high working class spontaneity or fighting spirit; but they also understand no less well that unless this militancy is skillfully educated, organized, and led, it must, especially under modern conditions, dissipate itself in defeat. It is precisely because, unlike the Right Social Democrats and Anarcho-Syndicalists, the Communists know the significance of both the active and the passive phases of the general law of trade union progress in building the trade unions and in leading them in active struggle, that trade union leadership on a world scale is gravitating towards the Left.

Trade union militants need to have a working knowledge of the general law of trade union progress. This will enable them to work more effec-

tively in
struggle;
when th
a slow
during i
it makes
Avoidin
the Soci
and un
active str
Syndical
militant
the Co
wingers
both th
With
of today
ers then

tively in both phases of the class struggle; during those calmer times when the working class makes only a slow evolutionary advance, and during its militant upheavals when it makes revolutionary leaps ahead. Avoiding the wrong tendencies of the Social Democrats to play down and underestimate the periods of active struggle and also the Anarcho-Syndicalists' distorted estimation of militant moods among the workers, the Communists and other Left wingers must understand and utilize both these periods to the full.

With the immense trade unions of today it is possible for the workers themselves to generate powerful

offensives, but the most successful and sweeping of such forward movements depend upon a stimulating correlation of economic and political conditions, during which the fighting spirit of the workers is assured. The big thing is that the workers' leaders should understand the significance of such great movements of advance and on the basis of them—to build the trade unions, to register solidly with their demands, to remove the bureaucrats from office and to get a better leadership, to strengthen the unions' economic and political action, and drastically to improve the ideology of the working class.

Patriotism and the Nation

By Herbert Aptheker

THIS FOURTH OF JULY, birthday of our Republic, patriotic affirmations will abound, but their volume will exceed their depth. What is patriotism? Committees weigh it, editorials laud it, jobs depend upon it—but what is it?

* * *

When Henry Ford died, Edgar Guest, laureate of inanity, read a poem fitting the occasion, over the Ford Radio Hour, coast-to-coast. This poem proclaimed Mr. Ford's excellence and his sterling patriotism; it seemed to say that Heaven itself was thrice blessed to be favored at last with Mr. Ford's presence:

*Not many came to earth so wise,
So tender and so true
To show what faith and enterprise
And willing hands could do.
Who proved how great a man can be,
And gave so much to us,
Now Lord, we give him back to Thee
A soul victorious.*

A worker in Ford's company also wrote a poem. Wanting to keep his job, he did not sign his name, but the poem appeared in the then underground paper, the *United Auto Worker*. And this is what the Ford worker said:

*Now the music dies in the distance,
They announce a lovely old hymn,
Giving all glory to God
And singing their praises to Him.*

*But I wonder if those up in heaven
Ever look down from above
And see guns, tear-gas and night-sticks
A symbol of Ford's brand of love.*

* * * * *

*So we'll stick to the union forever,
Yes, forever, and a day,
Till the power of Ford has vanished
And the workers have gained a new
day.*

There is a little difference between the two poems. And there is a little difference in the meanings of patriotism, too.

* * *

Some light may be thrown on this question of patriotism by going back to the beginnings of this "nation" idea, and this idea of love of nation that everyone knows to be patriotism, but that, after one has said that much, appears to be not so simple.

The beginnings of the idea of "nation" do not go very far back, so far as history is concerned, a fact that should not be difficult for an American to see, for his nation is very

young indeed, not one of the youngest, by far, but still, quite young.

The fact is that just as our nation was born in revolution, and just as the very development of an American nationality was part of the process which culminated in and helped produce the Revolution that gave specific form and content to our nation, so generally, the appearance of nations has been revolutionary.

In the days of slavery and of feudalism there were not nations. There were more or less petty principalities and more or less extensive domains and even empires, but not nations. There were greater or lesser rulers and they had more or fewer *subjects*, but the sovereignty lay in the ruler and the subjects *belonged* to him as did the territory and that is why they were called subjects—not citizens. (Exactly so, there are American citizens, but not American subjects; while the language of monarchy still persists so that there are British subjects.)

In the course of the breakdown of feudalism one finds in-between ideas, as the beginnings of nation come to the fore. Thus, at that time, the very word, "nation" was used in Germany or in France to designate the ruling classes as opposed to the *Volk* or *people*, which was the equivalent of the words, "populace" or "common people." Thus, too, Martin Luther spoke of a German nation, but he specifically stated that "the bishops and the princes" constituted that nation. Similarly, Louis XIV spoke of

nation (though he did not do so often for he did not like the word—as one setting up an entity distinct from himself)—but when he did he always insisted that the nation "resided wholly in the person of the King."

When, during the French Revolution, much of the nobility fled to Germany and established counter-revolutionary headquarters in Coblenz, Edmund Burke declared that the French nation was no longer in France, but rather was there in Coblenz, with the nobility. As late as the 19th century, Joseph de Maistre, ultra-reactionary French writer, insisted that the nation itself consisted only of "the ruler and the nobility."

Even bourgeois revolutionaries, as John Adams and Alexander Hamilton, thought of citizens, of those who should actually participate in the nation's control as "the rich, the able, the well-born," while Voltaire, in his *Philosophical Dictionary* wrote:

He only who has a share in the natal soil or other property under secure protection of the laws, and a share in political rights, forms a member of the community, and he only has a fatherland.

Notable here are Voltaire's *assumptions* that only the propertied would have any political rights, and that those with political rights made up the nation.

The fact is, as Stalin wrote:

A nation is not merely a historical category but a historical category be-

longing to a definite epoch, the epoch of rising capitalism. The process of elimination of feudalism and development of capitalism was at the same time a process of amalgamation of people into nations—*Marxism and the National Question*, International 1942, p. 17.

The concept of nation is one opposed to the concept of personal sovereignty in which the ruler is actually the owner, and in which the state boundaries have no necessary relationship at all with nationality. The ruler rules what he has been able to conquer and hold and what he rules is his property (including his subjects) and his power is full—he is indeed the Lord.

Opposed to this was the idea of the sovereignty of the people—not of the ruler. And the people's sovereignty was related to and in part derived from the fact of nationality. The development of capitalism, and its battle to take power from the feudal nobility (in which battle it needed mass support) gave birth to the *revolutionary idea of the nation*.

The political sovereignty of the people is the ideological essence of the great American Revolution as it is of the French Revolution and it is an essence which fundamentally threatened the power of every State in Europe. Because the very concept nation was revolutionary, the very word "patriot" connoted rebel. This is why, for example, the cause of the revolutionists in America was called the Patriot cause and their army the

Patriot Army. This was a word of horror and derogation to the tyrants of the world, but the rebels adopted it with pride, so that, for example, George Washington, in his last General Order to his Army, in April, 1783, said that the "suffering and danger" of the revolutionary forces had been "immortalized by the illustrious appellation of the *Patriot Army*." Similarly, the word "citizen"—as opposed to "subject"—was a revolutionary hallmark, a token of sedition, less than two hundred years ago.

It is because of the sovereignty of the people that there can be written constitutions—where the people are sovereign they can enumerate limitations upon and guides for power. Under the tyranny of a ruler who has subjects there cannot be a meaningful written constitution, for it is not possible to enumerate the powers of one who is omnipotent, and even if it were possible it would be useless, exactly because of his omnipotence. So, too, is the principle of the provision for the amendment of a constitution natural only where the people are sovereign, for this is a recognition of the fact that one generation cannot and should not bind another, and so the new generation, the new people, the new sovereign power, must have the possibility of amending the constitution as it sees fit.

Thus is changed the whole concept of the reason for government, and indeed, for human existence. In

contras
life no
place
faith,
into no
contin
tion w
rule. M
here ar
of life
should
should
himself
achiev
ernme
good g
a righ
create
them
right t
ernme
soever
this, c
Decla
explic
tions o
of it i
voluti
nation
birth
Nati
tion.
revolu
of feu
being
sense
transc
gle ag
tions
to, or
geosis

contrast to the ideology of feudalism, life now is not a vale of tears; a place of torment where, through faith, one establishes his right to get into heaven. Life now is not one of continual subjection and subordination where those divinely ordained rule. No, *the pursuit of happiness*, here and now, is the supreme object of life on earth, and man can and should rule himself and can and should create for himself and by himself governments which assist in achieving this happiness. Good governments serve this end, and only good governments are legal and have a right to exist. These governments created by the people are subject to them and therefore they have the right to change, alter or abolish governments as, when, and in whatsoever manner they please. All of this, of course, is the heart of our Declaration of Independence and is explicitly written into the Constitutions of most of our States. And all of it is eloquent testimony to the revolutionary origins of the concept of nation as well as the revolutionary birth of our own nation.

Nations, then, are born of revolution. They are born of bourgeois-led revolutions aiming at the breaking of feudal or colonial bonds. But in being born they are expressive of a sense of nationality which in fact transcends class lines and the struggle against feudal or colonial restrictions is not one which appeals only to, or benefits only, the rising bourgeoisie. Moreover, this bourgeoisie

to accomplish its revolution needs the active participation of the vast majority of the masses, and, being revolutionary, that bourgeoisie will, at that time, welcome (though with more or less trepidation) such support; and those masses moved by the reality of nationality, the desire for self-determination, and the desire to rid themselves of the burdens of feudal or colonial rule which press with special weight upon their backs, join in this movement.

Therefore the ideology of such revolutionary movements—mainly anti-feudal as in France, anti-colonial as in our country—are expressive of broadly humanistic and equalitarian and libertarian desires. The ideology, especially at the high point of revolutionary fervor (as the moment of our own Declaration of Independence) tends to play down the selfish needs and desires of the bourgeoisie and to stress rather the concept of the people's sovereignty, of brotherhood, of equality. Particularly in terms of the idea of the nation, the bourgeois revolutionary movement tends, at its origin, to stress that the people as a whole constitute the nation (in contrast to the feudal or colonial tyranny) and that with them alone lies sovereignty.

In fact, however, it is the bourgeoisie that rules, and even at the most fervent moment of their revolution they fear the masses and plan to control them. Moreover, the bourgeoisie rules because it owns the means of production and therefore

in fact does dominate the state and the social order, so that equality is formal and partial at best.

Yet the promise and the dream cannot be wiped out. And so capitalism grows, its replacement matures, amongst hundreds of millions of men and women.

Finally, something new comes into the world. It is described by Frederick Engels in a sentence written in 1878:

The possibility of securing for every member of society, through social production, an existence which is not only fully sufficient from a material standpoint and becoming richer from day to day, but also guarantees to them the completely unrestricted development and exercise of their physical and mental faculties—this possibility now exists for the first time, but it *does exist*.

The realization of this possibility will not be denied; hence the irresistible movement towards Socialism for the past one hundred years, culminating in the last generation in a sweeping, decisive revolutionary transformation affecting more than one-third of the world's population—over 900,000,000 people.

With this change, the people have possessed themselves of the means of production, and exploitation has been eliminated. No more wolf and sheep within one nation, making of each nation, as Disraeli confessed, really two nations, the rich and the poor. Then equality is real, not formal; then each man's freedom complements the other's freedom.

Then no one's freedom means the freedom to hold another as a serf or as a slave or as a wage worker.

With this change, too, certain servitors of the rich, perverting well-meaning wishes for "One World," begin to complain (even as Louis XIV and de Maistre did) that the idea of nations is absurd; that to continue the existence of Bulgaria and Albania and Poland and all these little separate entities is ridiculous and that what one needs is at least a United States of Europe, without nations, or, even better, a World Government, and the end of nations everywhere. When the Fascist dictator Horthy ruled Hungary, no cry was raised as to the absurdity of that nation, nor was there complaint when the landlords ruled Poland and Bulgaria and Albania, etc., and the resources of these nations were drained from their borders to delight "investors" in Paris and London and Rome and New York. Now that the workers and the peasants have taken power into their own hands and these countries are ruled by their own people, suddenly there should be no nations, or at least not such nations!

Elsewhere, in developed capitalist countries, as France, Italy, England, Canada, the imperialist power striving for world domination seeks to take over whole national economies and to swamp and pervert magnificent national cultures and traditions.

Note further that this bourgeoisie,

which in its youth proclaims the right of national self-determination, now in its last stage of imperialism labels as subversion efforts of colonially enslaved people to achieve independence. This bourgeoisie, which begins its career by overthrowing feudal and colonial power, now, in decay, constitutes the imperialist colonizing power and utilizes neo-feudal elements wherever they still exist—in Iran, in Formosa, in Kenya, in Guatemala.

* * *

Actually the "patriotism" of the rich has always been suspect and as the interests of the rich have departed more and more from those of the vast majority of the population, their "patriotism" has become increasingly dubious. It has ever been suspect because the very foundation idea of nation—the sovereignty of the people—has been suspect to the rich. The rich have always feared this, and as the interests of the possessors and the possessed have moved further and further apart, the suspicions of the rich have strengthened.

In fact, the well-to-do all along have despised and feared the masses. They have always considered the masses as not quite human, and have attributed poverty to the stupidity and incapacity of the poor. They have always assumed that the status quo was natural; that their rule coincided with evident necessity. And with this they have always felt that those who questioned the status quo

were agents of the devil (in an ecclesiastical age) or agents of a foreign power (in more secular terms and times).

All this has been necessary for them, since anything else would suggest the truth, that is, would suggest that the cause for the poverty lay in the exploitation, and that effective struggle against poverty required effective struggle against the exploitation.

Even in the best days the patriotism of the rich was garbed in money. When the bourgeoisie was leading in a revolutionary struggle, as in the days of Washington, the graft and dealing with the enemy made the Patriot's battle extra difficult, and when the industrial bourgeoisie led a coalition resisting the counter-revolutionary force and violence of the slaveowners, so widespread was the corruption and the shameless profiteering that it almost caused the death of the Republic.

With imperialism—during the period in which were fought the Spanish-American War and the two world wars—the graft and the profiteering very nearly dominated the whole conduct of the fighting, and, especially in the World Wars, illegal deals with the enemy cost the lives of tens of thousands of persons, including American soldiers.

There are moments, due to extraordinary pressure or lapses in public relations control, when certain of the tycoons have exposed something of the tinsel of their "patriot-

ism." During the Second World War, for instance, when public outcry against deals with fascists and nazis was at a high point, Mr. Eugene Grace, President of the Bethlehem Steel Corporation, remarked: "Patriotism is a beautiful sentiment, but it must not be allowed to interfere with our duties to our stockholders." In almost identical words, Pierre du Pont stated: "We cannot assent to allowing our patriotism to interfere with our duties as trustees for our stockholders." Charles E. Bedaux, multimillionaire, efficiency expert *par excellence* (the Bedaux speedup system), speaking to other businessmen, said: "A man loves his country. . . . He is a patriot, and a sincere one, but when his money is concerned, he blissfully commits treason." Shortly, thereafter, facing arrest for actual treasonable activity, Mr. Bedaux committed suicide.*

* * *

Outrageous profiteering, selling the armed forces putrid meat and defective telephone wire, trafficking with the enemy—notoriously in the case of international oil and chemical cartels—all these constitute the least of the treason of the rich. These are but the trappings to the deeper betrayal—the exploitation of the home population, unemployment, slums, the pitting of people against each other through anti-Semitism and Jim-Crowism—the whole putrid story of

deprivation and impoverishment in the face of the fact that there now does exist the means whereby to give all a fruitful and decent life; and the even more terrible exploitation of colonial peoples, where rule actually approximates enslavement as in much of Africa, Latin-America and the Near East. And to this is now added the ultimate treason to the nation and to all humanity, of fascism (and its twin, war)—a system concocted by the rich for the purpose of maintaining themselves in power by complete terror and brutality and through which whole countries and continents were made into shambles and slaughter-pens for millions of men, women, and children.

It is just when the bourgeoisie lose all sense of morality that their unctiousness and religiosity reach new heights; it is when the bourgeoisie have turned against elementary freedoms that they express a frenzy of demagogic devotion to "freedom"; it is when the bourgeoisie have become the canker within the nation and find their own needs antagonistic to those of the nation that they profess their fiercest, purest, one hundred and fifty percent "patriotism."

In our country, today, the monopolists and their political lackeys claim a water-tight patent on "Americanism." With this goes their insistence that views distasteful to them, and political or economic programs threatening their domination or their profits are, in fact, un-

* See *The New Yorker*, Oct. 13, 1945; H. S. Bagger, *See How, Private Enterprise* (N. Y., 1945), pp. 119-20.

American—the invention of alien-inspired traitors.

Sometimes, be it noted, when these super-patriots are pinned down and asked to define precisely what they have in mind when they speak of "Americanism" they will blurt out, as did Senator Boies Penrose, boss of the Pennsylvania Republican machine a generation ago: "Americanism? I'll be damned if I know what it means, but it brings votes."

Actually, however, they know well what it means in their mouths. It means what Eisenhower's Secretary of Defense meant when he said, "What's good for General Motors is good for the country."

They mean, as one of their leading propogandists back in the '20's, Charles N. Fay, wrote: "The welfare of business, especially of big business . . . necessarily means the public welfare." And stated another way, they hold, as James W. Prothro, Professor at Florida State University, has summarized their views in a recent book (*Dollar Decade*), "That promotion of the mass interest will destroy American freedom." The tycoons, points out Prof. Prothro, felt "an acute distrust of any power with a popular base," and were particularly hostile to any kind of organizational activity on the part of the working people. Thus, the President of the National Association of Manufacturers, in 1920, described strikes as "un-American conspiracies" and went on to declare that, "The time has fully come to suppress by

law all wholesale organization of labor."

The racket character of Big Business' cry of un-American is dramatically and rather amusingly demonstrated in terms of Ford's propaganda efforts to block the C.I.O.'s organizing drive in the late '30's and '40's. From 1937 to 1941 Ford's propaganda had one main line: The C.I.O. was un-American, was, in fact, a Russian plot. After, however, the thousands of un-American American workers did organize Ford in the United States, and when the organizing drive moved into Canada, Ford's propaganda directed at the Canadian workers held that the C.I.O. was un-Canadian, was really an *American* plot!

In fact, of course, this cry of "foreign agent" and "sedition" is as old as tyranny. Jefferson's Democratic Party was, according to his reactionary opponents, a "horrible sink of treason." The opposition to the Alien and Sedition acts of 1798 and to the continuance of the undeclared Naval War against France of 1799, was due to the work, said contemporary warmongers, of "secret enemies . . . whose proposed design is to subvert and overturn our holy religion and our free and excellent government." Trade unions, said a learned Judge in 1836, before sentencing workers to jail for "conspiracy," were "of foreign origin and . . . mainly upheld by foreigners . . . they are not American and are arbitrary and oppressive. . . ."

Indeed, do you remember the banks closing during the panic of 1929 and on into 1932? Well, said Joseph A. Broderick, the New York State Superintendent of Banks, this was all due to "a concerted campaign by Communists to undermine public confidence in all institutions," and the *Washington Post* found that the whole depression "was inspired by Moscow, as are all other Communist plots against the economic structure of the United States."

This idiocy and jingoism and lying, never absent from wealthy reactionary circles, is made into an all-pervasive system, and instrument of government policy in our own day, when imperialism reigns and fascism appears as a panacea to the rich.

* * *

While the "patriotism" of the rich and of the Right has always been at least suspect and has been usually false, that of the masses and of the Left has always been profound and true. The best interests of the masses are identical with the best interests of the nation and therefore the political heralds of the needs and aspirations of the masses—the radicals, the Left—have always been the most patriotic force in the nation. Today, with the rise of the working class and their democratic allies, including especially the toiling farmers and the Negro people, this identification of the masses' needs and that of the nation is perfect.

Some examples from American

history may be cited to substantiate these points. It is a fact, for example, that the very creation of our nation as an independent sovereignty was the demand first and foremost of the Left during the Revolutionary period. Most of the Tories, in the first place, were placemen of the Crown or otherwise quite rich and reactionary. And, within the Revolutionary coalition, most of the Conservatives, most of those who were opposed to independence from Great Britain, were of the upper bourgeoisie and were fearful of emboldening and releasing the energies of the masses. The policy of independence was not only the heart of the Revolutionary struggle; it was also the only policy which made possible a successful conclusion of the military conflict with Great Britain. It is this which led Major-General John Sullivan to write to John Adams, early in 1776, urging him to employ his talents and direct his influence towards independence and "to destroy that spirit of moderation which has almost ruined, and, if not speedily rooted out, will prove the final overthrow of America."

In the next great crisis confronting our country, again when its very existence was at stake, during the Civil War, it is the Abolitionists (including amongst them, Marxists), and the Radical Republicans—the Left—which is the most devoted and the most farseeing and the most patriotic. It is the Left which demands that the slavocracy's force

and vi
gressiv
part o
which
tral to
to des
and t
save t
Unite
the p
Only,
Unite
policy
interf
rather
a po
plant
the
will
with
spok
the
ernm
men
O
time
of
holo
thro
the
tory
C
wh
fou
firs
dur
Ho
stir
pa
ho
me

and violence be combatted by an aggressive revolutionary policy on the part of the Republic. It is the Left which points out that slavery is central to the Bourbons' treason and that to destroy the power of the Bourbons and thus defeat their treason and save the Republic requires that the United States adopt as its war policy the program advocated by the Left. Only, say the Abolitionists, if the United States turns its back on a policy of "moderation," or "non-interference" with slavery and adopts rather a policy of death to slavery, a policy of the destruction of the plantation system and the freeing of the four million slaves, only then will the country have the strength with which to save itself. The Left spoke truly and its policies became the policies of the beleaguered government and therefore that government was able to endure.

One sees, then, in the birthing time of our country and in the time of its sorest peril, when a slaveholders' counter-revolutionary effort threatened to destroy it, that it was the Left which had the key to victory and to national well-being.

Coming closer to our own day, who will deny that the program fought for by the Left, and in the first place by the Communist Party, during the terrible days of the Hoover depression and during the stirring days of the New Deal, was patriotic and vital? At the time, however, demands for unemployment insurance, for effective relief,

for large-scale public works, for organizing the unorganized, for a moratorium on debts, for full Negro equality, were widely denounced as the diabolical concoctions of alien Red agents. With the hindsight of the devastation created by fascism and World War II, is it not clear now that the struggles, led by the Left, against war and fascism, in the thirties, and the efforts then to construct such unity as to make the triumph of both scourges impossible—is it not clear that this effort of the Left was a manifestation of the highest patriotism?

Possibly an even clearer example of the intimate relationship between advanced and radical demands and the true interests of the vast majority of the people—true patriotism—is offered by an examination, no matter how brief, of the history of the Negro people.

Because this history has been so patently that of an oppressed people whose oppression came from the ruling class, it demonstrates particularly well the bogus character of the reactionary brand of "patriotism." The patriots of the Negro people are their persecuted leaders, and—since the Negro people are a persecuted people—their truest, noblest, most loyal leaders have been the most persecuted. This is true from Nat Turner, who died on the gallows, to Benjamin J. Davis, for years entombed in a jim-crow prison; from Frederick Douglass, political refugee from a slavehunting law, to Henry

Winston, political refugee from a fascism-breeding statute.

When Frederick Douglass said, as he did in 1850, that "the whole framework of the American government is radically at fault," was he being disloyal to the Negro people, to democracy, to the interests of the vast majority of the American people? When Charles H. Langston, Negro secretary of the Ohio Anti-Slavery Society, told a U.S. Court, in 1858, about to jail him for violating the Fugitive Slave Act: "I know that the courts of this country, that the laws of this country, that the governmental machinery of this country, are so constituted as to oppress and outrage colored men"—was he speaking falsely? Was he being disloyal to the best interests of his people and of his country? Was he not a truer patriot than the Judge who immediately thereafter condemned him to prison?

When President Buchanan sent U.S. Marshals to Frederick Douglass' home to arrest and question him after John Brown's heroic effort, was Douglass wrong in writing, from Canada: "I have no apology for keeping out of the way of those gentlemanly U.S. Marshals . . . I have quite insuperable objections to being caught by the hands of Mr. Buchanan"? Was Douglass "disloyal" because, as he wrote, he would never "assume the base and detestable character of an informer"? Who here was the greater patriot—the political refugee, or the President of

the United States?

* * *

Most certainly patriotism is not conformity. If conformity were the test there would be no United States, let alone the existence of any popular rights and freedoms within the United States. What advances have been made in popular power and welfare have come through struggle and through agitation—through non-conformity with things as they were and through the fighting demand that they be changed. When one defines patriotism in terms of the best interests of the vast majority, his definition carries with it the idea that patriotism entails struggle against reactionary powers in order to advance those interests.

Frederick Douglass, accused by "pure Americans" of lacking patriotism because he denounced the enslavement of the Negro people and those who, ruling this country, maintained that slavery, replied in this manner:

I, too, would invoke the spirit of patriotism; *not* in a narrow and restricted sense, but, I trust, with a broad and manly signification . . . *not* to hide our shame from the world's gaze, but utterly to abolish the cause of that shame . . . *not* to sustain an egregious wrong, but to unite all of our energies in the grand effort to remedy that wrong. . . .

Are we to conclude that Frederick Douglass was un-American? Certain it is that he would never have passed the tests for "patriotism" cur-

rent
their

W
think

T

T
The
rebe
it is
natio
dem
idea
over
cula

In
eign
in c
ity.

T
in
sho
ly
and
ach
acti

V
tion
"tw
flic

rent today in ruling circles and in their "investigating committees."

* * *

When we think of the nation, we think of Walt Whitman's lines:

*... the rapport of the People,
Those heart-beats of a Nation . . .*

The nation is born of revolution. The very word, "patriot," means rebel to the tyrants who hear it when it is first sounded. The concept of nation is tied, in origin, to that of democracy for it carries with it the idea of the sovereignty of the people, over against the tyranny of a particular person or of an oligarchy.

In our day the true and real sovereignty of the people is possible, and, in one-third of the world is a reality.

The nation is the people and now, in our time, the people can and should rule. They should rule directly and completely; they can do so and they will do so. Helping to achieve this is the most patriotic activity.

With the people in power the nation becomes really unitary. Disraeli's "two nations" disappear and conflicts in interest between rulers and

ruled cease. Then within nations will be brotherhood and among nations, big and small, will be equality and peace.

Under such conditions, there is still a special love of one's own country. But this is not exclusive, and it does not mean hatred for any other country, just as a parent loves with special warmth his own child, but this love does not carry with it hatred of other children; on the contrary, it helps develop the feeling of love for children in general.

Today, it is not the men of money who are the patriots. It is not a program of war and slums and high prices and mass unemployment, of the destruction of the Bill of Rights and the jailing of dissenters, of Jim Crow, which represents the true interests of the vast majority of the American people. No; today, as in the past, it is the program of the Left which represents the deepest aspirations and desires of the majority of Americans—that program demands and those people want: Peace, Prosperity, Equality and Freedom. To struggle for the implementation of this program is the highest form of patriotism.

To My Comrades

By John Williamson

On May 4, Comrade John Williamson, member of the National Committee of the Communist Party, was deported in a continuation of the government's persecution which had already resulted in his having served a five year prison term on a Smith Act frameup. In this July Fourth issue of Political Affairs, we are happy to bring our readers an article by Comrade Williamson, based upon the farewell address that he delivered in New York City on April 30th. In this article is delineated the life of a present-day, front-line American patriot.—The Editor.

AS A DEPORTEE, exiled with my family for my political ideas after nearly 42 years in the United States, my eyes instinctively turned to Bedloes Island as we sailed down the way on May 4th. Passing the Statue of Liberty I no longer saw the historic symbol that greeted each new immigrant with the words: "Give me your tired, your poor, your huddled masses, yearning to be free."

While the form of the famous statue remained, the McCarrans, Walters and McCarthys had temporarily succeeded in piercing the heart and blinding the eyes of Miss Liberty in their drive to destroy the traditional forms of democracy associated with the United States. They had replaced its torch of liberty with the sword of war; its book of law with the new code of the frameup and informer.

Make no mistake about it. I did not depart "voluntarily." I have been deported after a seven year fight—a fight that included defeating, through a hunger strike in 1948, the attempt of Attorney General Clark to deny bail to aliens; challenging in court for

three years the illegal actions of the Immigration service; refusing to become a party to these illegal practices at the deportation hearing in November 1952 at Lewisburg Penitentiary; and appealing until the Board of Immigration Appeals sustained the deportation order in 1953.

To be deported on the charge of "membership in the Communist Party" after 42 years in the United States, of which 37 have been in the working people's movement and 33 in the ranks of the Party, is another example of the use of the infamous McCarran Immigration Act as an instrument of political persecution. Never before in America have we seen such a brutal uprooting of families, where an alien parent who has established a life-time family relationship is confronted with the alternatives of leaving his family thousands of miles away and being separated for life, or of taking an entire family to a new and strange land.

It is one of the oldest American traditions that those who make their permanent homes in the United

States h
right to
Jeffers
who m
Americ
reaction
and d
lican"
for the
migran
man, u
settlers
even b
In 1
and M
upon
Nazis
while
have li
in the
uphol
Jeffers
And
Not b
comm
my li
robber
ple. N
peacef
fough
ticed
Negro
unem
work
again
force
on th
I a
been
years,
peopl
that

States have both a duty and a natural right to become citizens.

Jefferson fought for the right of all who made their permanent home in America to be naturalized, as against reactionaries who wanted to exclude and deport French "red republican" immigrants. Jackson fought for the same rights for the Irish immigrants. Lincoln, as a Congressman, upheld the idea that permanent settlers should have the right to vote even before being naturalized.

In 1955, the Walters, Brownells, and McCarthys have brought shame upon America by helping Hitler Nazis to become American citizens, while preventing this for those who have lived practically their whole life in the United States and actively uphold the democratic principles of Jefferson and Lincoln.

And why am I being deported? Not because I held up a bank or committed any other crime, since all my life I have fought against the robbery and exploitation of the people. Not because I failed to live a peaceful life, since all my life I have fought against those who have practiced force and violence against the Negro people, the foreign born, the unemployed in the '30s, the striking workers on the picket line, and against those who try to impose the force and violence of McCarthyism on this great land.

I am being deported, as I have been persecuted and jailed these last years, because of my lifelong working people's activities and ideas—ideas that emphasized that the interests of

Americans demand peaceful co-existence, and not war, either hot or cold; ideas that the threat of fascism endangers all Americans and that the majority must unite to defeat this threat and to restore the protection of the Bill of Rights to all; ideas that the nation's economy will continue to be threatened with crises as long as it is based on armament production and gets the jitters at the word "peace"; ideas that true Americanism calls for a relentless struggle for full equality of the Negro people; ideas that Socialism—a social system of production for use and not for profit—is the next forward step in history and must be fought for.

Failure by decisive sections of the people to unitedly defend the rights of the Communists to their ideas and activities, resulted in the pro-fascist forces—aided by both the Truman and Eisenhower Administrations—spreading these attacks to many non-Communists who were guilty of believing in the Bill of Rights. The roll-call of those jailed, deported, indicted, investigated, refused passports, subpoenaed to witch-hunt committees, fired from jobs under suspicion, and on suspect lists, runs into thousands. They would comprise a Who's Who of America. Trade unions are beginning to feel new blows from the Taft-Hartley Act and many unions are becoming concerned with the new crop of restrictive anti-union "Right to Work" state laws. They all should be as concerned by the threatening union registration features in the 1954 Communist Control

Act. Intellectual pursuit and the act of thinking are labelled suspect. Informers are blown up into synthetic heroes to the shame of America. This is McCarthyism—an encroaching, crawling, pro-fascist reaction—in the year 1955.

While the Communists have taken and are still taking the heaviest blows, the threat to all Americans demands the organizing of a broad non-party bloc that will conduct such activity as will defeat this fascist threat. The Communist Program of 1954 clearly defines this in the following words: "The unity of all democratic and peace-loving forces is needed—unity irrespective of ideological and political differences on other questions and on longer range goals. . . . If the dangerous trend toward fascism and war is to be checked and reversed . . . great popular movements must be built for peace, for democratic liberties, for equal rights, and in defense of the living standards of the people."

* * *

In preparing to leave the United States, it was dramatized to me that I am a very rich person. Don't get me wrong. These riches are not in material wealth, but in those values that really count in life.

I have in mind the warmth and sincerity of the "good-byes" of hundreds of Party actives throughout the country, in New York, and in our own community. Of particular significance were the expressions of neighbors, storekeepers, school teachers, and friends of our children in

the neighborhood. And these riches of mine were further shown in the hundreds of New Year's cards sent to me in Danbury but which were only given to me in March or the unearthing from a closet of some 700 letters sent to me in 1948 while I was on a Hunger Strike on Ellis Island. In a different, but still significant way, was my uncovering of a share of stock—not sold on the stock market—but among the industrial workers of the Midwest. This was a \$10 share of stock to help launch the *Daily Worker* in January 1924. I was then earning \$16 a week in the Dietzgen factory in Chicago. The new generation has yet to experience the pride of knowing that the *Daily Worker* has never missed a day of publication in its 31 years of life, although there have been many precarious moments. There is no more decisive task at this difficult moment in American history, than to guarantee that every member and friend, and many new thousands of trade unionists read the *Daily Worker* regularly. While there are technical difficulties, these can easily be solved if the ideological fight for the indispensability of the *Daily Worker* is won, as it can be won.

But these tid-bits about my riches have roots in raw ore. I think of how these 37 years have been packed with abundant experiences of working class activities and struggles, out of which I have learned much and contributed my best. Suffice it to mention only a few, without elaboration:

My
in the
includ
Unit
Tom
moven
ical pr
of the
light v
born
Atte
1923—
ventio
Comm
the fir
my co
Bill S
the N
Par
merou
mass
in Cl
and I
the m
throu
1933
Thom
of th
well
Light
was
Orga
drives
Fishe
work
the C
where
comp
with
terms
steel
where
jobs
Gus
Out
did e

My experiences as a shipyard worker in the militant Seattle Labor movement, including the first general strike in the United States, the protest strikes for Tom Mooney and the big amnesty movement to free Debs and other political prisoners from jail, and the refusal of the longshoremen to load the SS *Delight* with munitions to fight the newly born Soviet Republic.

Attendance at my first convention in 1923—the second YWL national convention held in Chicago. There I met Communist Party national leaders for the first time, became acquainted with my co-delegate from the Pacific Coast, Bill Schneiderman, and was elected to the National Committee of the YWL.

Particularly dear to me are my numerous direct experiences in the great mass struggles between 1930 and '41 in Chicago: among the unemployed and in the struggle for Negro rights, the mass parade of 40,000 unemployed through the Loop on Inauguration Day 1933, or the debate with Mayor Bill Thompson in Washington Park. Out of these struggles was recruited our well known Party leader, Claude Lightfoot. Equally significant to me was my participation as Ohio District Organizer in the mass unionizing drives in the mid-'30s in auto, with its Fisher Body sit-down strike where the workers officially consulted us daily; the Goodyear Rubber sit-down strike where the workers' confidence in us compelled the C.I.O. leaders to consult with the Party leaders in arriving at terms of a settlement; or the great steel strike in Youngstown and Warren where the most difficult organizing jobs had been given to the Communists, Gus Hall and John Steuben, to handle. Out of these struggles—and the splendid election struggles of Andrew Onda,

who repeatedly came within 200 votes of being elected City Councilman in Cleveland—many new working class Party leaders were molded.

There are many, many other rich experiences over the years, especially the struggle to win the war against Hitler fascism that threatened the very existence of the American nation; and the long 9 months trial in the court of the infamous Judge Medina where we defended not only the teachings, beliefs, and activities of the Party, but by this very act defended all Americans against the wave of McCarthyism that followed our conviction.

If brief mention is made of some aspects of Party history it is better to understand the indispensable role of the Party today and to emphasize that it will continue to be steadfast in its tenacious defense of the interests of the American workers. The further strengthening of a united party, under the leadership of Comrades Foster and Dennis, is the urgent need of the day.

If I made a small contribution to the many activities and struggles previously referred to, it has all been due to our Party. We speak of the Party as the vanguard, the organizer and political leader of the working folk. That is true. But it is also a mold of people. It took me as a young industrial worker of 19 years of age, with no schooling beyond the 8th grade. It taught me everything I know and developed in me whatever qualities I have. It has given me some challenging tasks that I feel I didn't always fulfill, although

I always did my best. And it was the Party membership, in each convention over the past 25 years, who have expressed confidence in me by reelected me each time to the National Committee. This, comrades, is my greatest of all riches—the comradeship and confidence of the membership throughout the nation and the association with my co-workers in leadership.

* * *

These remarks would not be complete without comments about some of our outstanding party leaders. First are my closest associates with whom I worked daily over the years—comrades Foster, Dennis, Hall, Winston, Flynn, Davis, Gil Green, Stachel, Gates, Winter, Thompson, Potash, and all the other National Committee members.

How vividly I recall when I first heard our Party Chairman, Bill Foster, speak in 1920 at the Seattle Labor Temple on the lessons of the great steel strike! And for over 30 of the succeeding years he has been at the post of Party Chairman, ever alert to our adhering to the principles of Marxism and being based among and alive to the needs of the workers, interpreting events daily, and contributing a great library of American working class history that enriches our country and our Party.

And 10 years later I was to meet a tall husky young fellow who had established himself as a leader of the agricultural workers' struggles in Imperial Valley and of the unemployed in Los Angeles. This, of

course, was Gene Dennis who became Party General Secretary in 1946. As helmsman he has steered the Party through many storms with their dangerous shoals, always guided by the navigation rules of Scientific Socialism, as double checked in the experiences and struggles of the American workers.

This core of Party leaders, surrounded and strengthened by all the other members of the National Committee, is the leadership that our membership correctly has confidence in to successfully meet the challenging problems of the months and years ahead.

* * *

We are the greatest humanists in the world today and people are our greatest assets. With this understanding let us never forget the comrades who are in jail and the fact that they are there because of their staunch fight for working class ideas and ideals. The fight for their release through amnesty and against the discrimination they are subjected to in prison is an important task of our Party. When I think of my comrades who are in jail or who are political refugees, I also never forget their wives and children. Too often their devotion, sacrifices and problems are not fully understood by some comrades who assume a bureaucratic, non-human attitude. These families are also on the fighting front.

No remarks of mine would be complete without mentioning the role of Mae in my life these past twenty years. As some of you know,

a Party leader's wife does not have an easy time raising children and fitting in a family life with the preparing of articles, speeches, tours, late meetings, week-end conferences and at the same time fulfilling her own Party responsibilities. Yet that is what we expect and what Mae has done in both Ohio and New York. Especially significant during these past four years was her ability to influence, guide and explain things satisfactorily to the children, while setting an example in neighborhood amnesty activity for all of us in jail. Side by side with that went activity among neighbors that has resulted in the most warm feelings and farewells. These people are average Americans, subject to the prejudices and fears prevalent in the country. But meeting Communists as neighbors and human beings, and together solving the little but common problems of everyday life, opens up for such people a better understanding of us Communists. Such work is also the best protection for our families against threats and hooliganism.

As an alien being deported I cannot forget the untiring efforts of the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born and its energetic secretary, Abner Green.

* * *

Today we are experiencing the sharpest attacks in our Party's history. We must never forget that because we live in an entire epoch of crisis for American capitalism, we will face a continuous stretch of rough

going in the years ahead, within which there will be ups and down. While increasing our activities to prevent a new trial for "membership in the Communist Party" confronting the members of the National Board of the Party, to reversing the conviction of Comrades Lightfoot and Scales, to the urgent task of having the people influence the Supreme Court to invalidate the infamous McCarran Registration Act, and to the securing of amnesty for all Smith Act victims, we must also take note of even the slightest indication of new developments.

Today there are some new currents and each of these must be welcomed—like the first blow against the informer system, and the freeing of Comrades Trachtenberg and Charney. But the decisive task is to develop such activities among the people as will unite these new currents into a new and powerful trend that will defeat the war making profascists, and return the nation to the path of peace and democracy.

This decisive task cannot be separated from other developments that merit the attention of everyone. The underlying sentiment for peace that forces even an Eisenhower to maneuver, is one of these. The series of strikes in the South are swallows in a Spring where bigger economic struggles can be expected nationwide during the coming year. The unification of A.F.L. and C.I.O. opens the door for new unionizing activities, for active labor intervention in the political life of the nation, and for

developing a fertile soil for a new and broader Left in the American trade unions, despite the wishes of Meany and Reuther.

On the world scene the forces of peace and democracy have the initiative and have delivered some staggering blows to the war makers and pro-fascists of the U.S.A. But no amount of success elsewhere can relieve the American workers—of which we Communists are an integral part—from the decisive responsibility of winning America for a policy of peaceful coexistence and for a policy of restoring the Bill of Rights to the Communists as part of the American people.

The deep spirit of working class internationalism has again been demonstrated by the broad and effective campaign waged in Scotland on my behalf by an organized Defense Committee. This movement was spearheaded by the Scottish Division of the Mineworkers Union and included representatives of many other unions, elected municipal officials and other democratic forces. It had numerous M.P.s raise the issue in Parliament and itself conducted a many sided campaign, one facet of which was the circularizing of a petition to collect one quarter of a million signatures, and which said in part: "We, the undersigned, regardless of political view . . . strongly protest to the U.S. government about the treatment of our fellow countryman John Williamson."

Upon my return to Britain I will

continue to devote myself, as I have done these last 37 years, to advancing the interests of the working folks of both Britain and the U.S.A.

With my family I have been deported from New York City on May 4th—the same port that I entered in 1913 when I was 10 years old. It is not easy to be so uprooted. I left the U.S. with both sadness and confidence. Sadness at being deported from amongst the people I am a part of; from the country where my family are citizens and where my children were born; from the Party of peace, democracy and Socialism in America that I helped build. But also with confidence. Confidence that the American workers and other democratic forces will in time and in their own way restore the democratic traditions that had their origin in the early revolutionary struggles of the U.S. and apply them to the 20th Century. At that moment I hope to return.

Writing this as the ship plows through the stormy ocean, my memory returns to the thought expressed by Gene Debs at his trial, when he said:

I never more clearly comprehended than now the great struggle between the powers of greed on the one hand and the rising hosts of freedom on the other. I can see the dawn of a better day for humanity. . . .

*Let the people take heart and hope
everywhere,
for the cross is bending,
the midnight is passing,
and joy cometh with the morning*

The Chicago Elections and 1956

By William Sennett

SOME OF THE CITY and state political battles this year revealed important national trends affecting the issues, tactics and alignments in the momentous elections of 1956. Such trends were evident in the Chicago municipal primary and general election campaigns during the spring months. The features of those campaigns provide many important experiences shown by the following results:

The main people's coalition forces gained in strength, resisting some of the most divisive factors which were ever brought into play in a Chicago election—although some of the liberal and middle-class elements were diverted from the main issues.

The labor movement took a big step forward toward a fuller independent role while still failing to change its traditional relationship to the Democratic Party of tailing after and giving uncritical support.

The Negro people were moved into action around a number of deep-going issues and emerged as a more powerful, united electoral force. The growing political strength of the Negro people provided the margin of victory for the labor-backed ticket and led to new gains in increased Negro representation.

The people's forces were able to win a victory in spite of the political liabilities which the Democratic Party brought with it and despite the attempt of the Republican Party

to present itself as the vehicle for "liberal" local policies and good government.

* * *

The five-month Chicago primary and general election campaign opened on the heels of last November's congressional elections. In those contests, Chicago voters defeated a number of McCarthyites and showed a marked dissatisfaction with the Eisenhower regime.

As the Chicago elections unfolded, the Formosa crisis developed, alarming the country and heightening the resentment against the reckless pro-war maneuvers of the Republican administration.

This was also the period of the Eisenhower betrayal on tax cutting, when the G.O.P. revealed so very clearly its allegiance to Big Business and its hostility to the people in the low-income brackets.

These events could hardly fail to have a bearing on the Chicago campaign. However, the Republicans attempted to emphasize local issues and to shut out national issues. They waged an aggressive and shrewd campaign which aimed at neutralizing the traditional Democratic tendencies of a large section of Chicago voters.

The Republican Party developed a "new strategy" based on dividing the people's forces through the use of "liberal" demagoguery. The Illinois G.O.P. noted carefully the successful

use of peace demagoguery in Eisenhower's 1952 campaign, and also the defeats suffered by the G.O.P. Old Guard in 1954. The so-called Eisenhower Republicans in the state laid out a campaign plan for capturing Chicago by means of new faces, new slogans and by using popular catch-phrases to becloud the real issues.

This strategy was imposed on the Old Guard Republicans, long dominant in Illinois, who have in the past shunned mass appeals and who openly proclaimed their reactionary program.

The Republicans, headed by Gov. William G. Stratton, went into the Chicago campaign with this plan of action:

1) To select a new type of candidate who could best present a demagogic line and blur the more fundamental issues.

2) To conduct a campaign which would drive a wedge into the ranks of the growing people's coalition, winning independent voters from among the middle class and to some extent from among labor and the Negro people.

3) To capitalize on the local crime-corruption issue and center the main attack on the entrenched Democratic machine.

4) To take full advantage of the dissatisfaction of the people with the local housing and school crisis, with inadequate transportation and poor city services, with the failure of the previous administration to curb the

repeated outbreaks of racist mob violence.

Robert E. Merriam, young Democratic alderman, was the new type of candidate chosen by the Republican Party. A protegee of U.S. Senator Paul Douglas, he was often at odds with the Democratic machine on local budgetary matters. Merriam broke with the Democratic Party last fall when the Party showed little interest in his strong ambition to become a mayoralty candidate this year at all costs.

Merriam was a member of the Independent Voters of Illinois, which is the state affiliate of Americans for Democratic Action. He had considerable support among good-government and civic groups but no significant backing in the labor movement and among the Negro people. Long planning to run for mayor in the city, he concentrated on getting widespread publicity as a fighter against crime and corruption.

He presented himself as Chicago's Fiorello LaGuardia and claimed he would do for the Windy City what the latter did as the New-Deal mayor of New York.

The "fusion" movement never quite came off because the main sections of the people's movement recognized the meaning of his alliance with the most reactionary forces of the Republican Party, backed by the dominant sectors of industry, the big banks and the large real-estate interests.

But the Republican strategy did

succeed in swinging considerable support from among independent voters in middle-class communities. As a result, the G.O.P. came closer to winning a city election than at any time since 1943. The 127,000 vote margin of victory by the Democratic candidate, Richard J. Daley, over Merriam (out of 1,300,000 votes cast) contrasts with Democratic majorities of over 390,000 in the city last November.

* * *

What was it that "saved" the Democratic Party from its first defeat in 24 years and prevented the city of Chicago from moving into the Republican column on the eve of the 1956 elections?

The decisive factor was the people's coalition forces, and particularly labor and the Negro people. Their unity on the main issues stood the test of the most confusion-ridden campaign in local election history. They saw the hand of reaction behind the Republican smoke-screen and recognized that the preferred party of Big Business would not provide a city administration responsive to the people's needs.

These coalition forces also saw the relationship between national policies and local issues and realized that the election outcome would have a bearing on 1956.

The *Chicago Sun-Times*, in a post-election lament over Merriam's defeat, noted that the Chicago voters expressed a "wish to keep political control of Chicago in the hands of

the Democrats to strengthen the Democratic Party nationally."

Undoubtedly, this was a key factor. This was a consideration with many voters who could not see any crucial differences between the Republican and Democratic programs on local issues.

The Democratic votes were cast by those who saw the Democratic Party as a better means for wresting concessions both locally and nationally. It was largely because of this approach that labor and the Negro people as a bloc rallied around the Democratic ticket, drawing with them other elements of the population.

Thus, the main considerations of the people's coalition forces were the same ones which led to the defeat of Republican McCarthyite congressmen last November. These considerations are still the main guide for the people's forces for 1956.

* * *

Labor's intervention in Democratic Party councils to demand a nominee for mayor other than the incumbent, Martin H. Kennelly, was unprecedented. Up until that moment, the Democratic organization was prepared to slate Kennelly for reelection, regardless of the rumblings of discontent among the people over his eight-year rule.

The organization choice in the primary race was officially decided by a slatemaking committee set up by the Democratic Party in the city. Labor went before the Democratic

slatemakers and demanded that Kennelly be dropped. In doing so they outlined a general program of local issues emphasizing that these issues should be a guide for the Democratic Party in choosing its candidate.

Delegations from C.I.O., A.F.L. and independent unions appeared before the Democratic Party nominating committee. Along with trade-union delegations, Negro and liberal groups also sent representatives to show how Kennelly had failed the people and to insist that he not be re-elected.

This kind of intervention was a big step forward for labor. It was a departure from the previous practice of waiting for the Democratic machine to name the ticket and then adding a rubber-stamp endorsement. And, due to this kind of pressure, the Democrats felt compelled to drop Kennelly as the official candidate. However, at this point, labor and its allies failed to make affirmative demands on the composition of the city ticket.

The result was the selection of County Democratic chairman, Richard J. Daley, as the organization candidate for mayor. The ticket had no labor or Negro representation for the top three city posts, nor was there a single trade unionist slated by the Democratic Party in any of the 50 aldermanic contests.

* * *

A.F.L.'s top leadership participated more strongly in this campaign than

in any previous election. They hailed Daley as a union member (he maintains his membership in the bakery drivers union) and as a politician who understands the problems of working people. However, because of some factional differences in the Chicago Federation of Labor, the A.F.L.'s election activity suffered in some serious respects.

A citywide A.F.L. Committee for Daley was set up with headquarters in three communities and in the downtown area. But this committee did not encourage rank-and-file participation. On the contrary, this top-level committee substituted for Labor's League for Political Education, which was put on the shelf for the duration of the campaign. Evident here was the resistance of some key A.F.L. leaders to the further building of L.L.P.E. as an independent body based on participation of the membership.

The bureaucracy preferred a set-up which could make a quick endorsement of the Democratic ticket, conduct an uncritical campaign as an extension of Democratic Party activities in the labor movement, rely on radio, newspaper ads, mailings and local meetings to publicize the candidates and simply inform the rank-and-file as to who were the labor-endorsed candidates.

In this respect, the A.F.L.'s political work took a backward step from its work in the 1954 congressional elections. At that time L.L.P.E. congressional district committees were

organized, they concentrated on pre-cinct activity in several districts and worked together with C.I.O. and other independent groups to tip the scales in several congressional contests. As a result of this campaign L.L.P.E. is in moth balls and the independent apparatus of labor is thereby weakened.

In spite of the bureaucratic set-up of the A.F.L. Committee for Daley this spring and the failure to conduct a more independent campaign, the political work of the A.F.L. did contribute materially to the Democratic Party's victory. The publicity job done by the A.F.L. was fairly extensive and the special rallies by a number of locals and district councils were very helpful. A few locals, in fact, did an outstanding job in helping to spell out the issues through their own election material and in special mailings to the membership. There is no doubt that the members knew where their unions stood and union-conscious members responded accordingly. But, many other union members did not see any great issues at stake in the election and even failed to register or to vote.

The A.F.L.'s campaign experiences are now the basis for a number of discussions among union leaders on the character of political action by labor.

It is clear, however, that progressives and other independent-minded union forces will need to take the initiative to help implement the oft-decreed program to build L.L.P.E.

as labor's independent political apparatus. For, if greater independent activity in the fight for labor's program is to be realized, there must be an extensive network of political activity to involve the membership on a local union, shop and community level.

C.I.O. activity in the municipal campaign was carried on mainly through its Political Action Committee apparatus. Unlike the A.F.L., C.I.O. raised funds for its own independent campaign, and not for the purpose of turning money over to the Democratic Party. C.I.O.-P.A.C. headquarters were set up in 12 areas and at least 300 of Chicago's 4,157 precincts were thoroughly canvassed by C.I.O. members using union literature. While C.I.O.-P.A.C. was not visibly strengthened and extended, C.I.O. stressed the need to build labor's own apparatus even as many of its members worked through the Democratic Party.

Unfortunately, factional differences between the officials of steel and other C.I.O. unions hindered a united approach to activity in the course of the campaign. These frictions have developed in a number of forms over the past two years, seriously threatening the unity of the county and state C.I.O. In the election campaign, the problems arose largely because the steel union leadership, which is the dominant force in C.I.O. in Chicago, takes a position of minimizing labor's independent role and of operating as an adjunct of

the Democratic Party. This was particularly harmful during the primary race when C.I.O. and all of labor took a hands-off stand on the matter of aldermanic candidates. C.I.O. thwarted a move by some trade unionists to challenge certain machine hacks by a decision not to endorse any candidates for the City Council.

Despite these serious weaknesses a number of C.I.O. local unions, and an important number of C.I.O. local leaders, notably in packing, auto and steel did an outstanding job in the mayoralty contest and in some wards behind liberal and Negro aldermanic candidates.

* * *

An important result of the Chicago election was the emergence of the Negro people as a more conscious and unified political force. The Negro population in the city is now estimated at nearly 650,000 or about 17% of the total. The impact of the Negro vote was never more evident than in the recent campaign.

It was the Negro community which gave most vigorous expression to the issues in the election. Even before the organization choices were being considered, the Negro community raised the slogan, "Kennelly must go!" They highlighted the need to develop an all-out joint struggle to defeat Chicago's racist and anti-labor mayor.

What were the factors that led to the strengthening of the Negro

people as an electoral force in Chicago?

1. The long continued outrage of Trumbull Park Homes brought to a head the resentment of the Negro people against the failure of public officials to deal with mob violence. Trumbull Park symbolized the most brutal pattern of racism which has developed in Northern cities in the post war years. The center of the outbreak here was a government-owned and city-administered housing project—and this tended to heighten the political implications of this struggle. The resentment of the Negro people was directed against Mayor Kennelly and also against the Republican state and federal administrations.

2. The Negro people registered their reaction to increasing exploitation of many types. The victimizing of Negro shoppers and tenants, the development of old and new swindles and economic discrimination brought a strong reaction. This was also the period of widespread layoffs in the Negro community.

While some of these grievances became direct factors in the city elections, there was considerable ferment developed around a city and state legislative program on these issues. During the campaign, the N.A.A.C.P. formulated a six-point program which called for a state F.E.P.C., curbs on discrimination in housing, hospitals, schools, public places and in insurance rates. The mayoralty candidates were

compelled to take recognition of this legislative program and to speak on these issues. The N.A.A.C.P. held a city-wide mass meeting on the six-point program at which mayoralty candidates and state representatives in attendance were pressed to give their position on the issues. Several Democratic ward rallies in the Negro community stressed the issue of Trumbull Park Homes and housing generally.

Undoubtedly, some of the factors that influenced the Negro vote against Merriam in the final election were the actions of Republican Gov. Stratton during the campaign in cutting relief funds and in denying that there was any need for a state F.E.P.C.

3. The attempt of Mayor Kennelly to make political capital out of racist attacks backfired. Kennelly was swamped in the vote of the Negro communities in the primary election. And the chauvinist attacks taken over by Merriam in the general elections also proved his undoing.

The slanders made by Kennelly and the G.O.P. candidate were that the Negro voters were puppets manipulated by Negro Democratic Congressman William L. Dawson, that the "Dawson machine" was trying to take over the city government, and that the Negro community was a chief source of crime and corruption.

These attacks fanned the resentment of the Negro voters against

Kennelly and Merriam. Instead of driving a wedge between the Negro people and "the Dawson machine," the attacks served to draw the Negro people even closer to the Democratic Party. It was this resentment that led to the defeat of the widely known and highly respected G.O.P. Alderman Archibald Carey who lost in his ward to another Negro, Democrat Ralph Metcalfe.

At the same time, the Kennelly-Merriam appeals to racial prejudice failed to achieve the desired effect among white voters largely because of the role of the labor movement in the campaign.

The growing awareness by the Negro people of the issues at stake in the election led to an increase in Negro representation in the 50-man City Council. Two additional Negroes were elected making a total of five Negro aldermen, all Democrats, in that body. While this is an important gain there are three other wards where Negroes are in the great majority but where white aldermen represent the area.

The potential of the Negro vote and the struggle for Negro representation has not yet been fully realized. In fact, while there was a slight proportional increase of the Negro vote in the city elections as compared with last November, there is still a lower percentage vote in the Negro communities as compared with the rest of the city. Despite the increased Negro population, there has been a continuing drop in registration re-

flected mainly in the Negro communities.

It is true that large numbers of Negro people are fed up with both parties, and they do not see the people's movement unfolding the kind of struggle for Negro rights that would be affected by the outcome of a particular election. There is also the fact that many Southerners, at least 20,000 a year, are coming to Chicago and they have not been integrated economically or politically. And the serious housing crisis keeps many Negroes from establishing permanent residence in time to register and vote.

The problem of registration is a major matter. In Chicago over 100,000 votes from among the Negro people could be added to the people's coalition in 1956 if the matter is given early and systematic political attention.

* * *

A series of divisive factors, well exploited by the Republicans, threatened to shatter the labor-Negro-liberal electoral alliance which had been developing more strongly and effectively up until the time of the city elections.

What were some of these factors?

1. The tendency to set aside an estimate of the Republican Party as the preferred party of Big Business, to concentrate on the individual G.O.P. candidate and to take him and his platform at face value, to discount the main influence in the Republican Party and the fact that

the G.O.P. takes over when the "liberal" standard-bearer wins.

2. The failure to see issues, movements and the unity of the people's forces as decisive. Instead, many liberals focused attention on the candidates as individuals regardless of their relationship to the two parties, the aims of their backers, and the consequences of splitting the coalition forces.

3. The tendency to focus on the shortcomings of the Democratic Party in such a one-sided way as to conceal the danger of G.O.P. reaction and to discount the possibility of winning concessions from a Democratic administration through struggle.

These factors were all present in the Chicago elections in such a way as to feed Republican reaction and its forceful bid for power.

Significantly, the leading forces of the people's coalition, namely labor and the Negro people, refused to chase any of these will-o'-wisps.

However, many of the liberals, middle class and professional groupings who have been part of the coalition did become diverted. Some of these traditional New Deal liberals failed to see the national implications of a local Republican victory or the long-term threat to the labor-Negro-liberal alliance. The extent of the confusion and the lack of a united people's campaign is seen by the crisis which developed in the Independent Voters of Illinois.

I.V.I. is well organized and highly

activ
in th
tus
out
even
A.F.
mun
pen
T
eral
with
ple's
over
lect
the
stro
end
Chi
me
A
I.V.
gar
ma
G.
ity
ba
Da
I
thi
sio
the
we
D
sta
th
m
m
de
cl
st

active in middle class communities in the city. It has a precinct apparatus which is experienced in getting out the vote. Last November I.V.I. even sparked the joint activity with A.F.L. and C.I.O. in several communities and raised the level of independent political activity.

This year, large numbers of liberals separated themselves from work with the main sections of the people's movement because of the split over Merriam's candidacy. The intellectuals and liberals who make up the main base of I.V.I. responded strongly to Merriam's slogans of ending machine politics and giving Chicago good and efficient government.

An executive Board majority of I.V.I. endorsed Merriam but the organization was divided. While the main effort was thrown behind the G.O.P. candidate, a sizable minority, including some top leaders, backed the candidacy of Richard J. Daley.

Later in the campaign, when the thinness of Merriam's liberal pretensions became more apparent, some of these straying elements returned to work with other forces behind the Democratic candidates. It was the staunch position taken by labor and the Negro people which won back many liberals and restored a great measure of unity in the campaign to defeat the aims of reaction.

The positive role of the middle class and liberal forces was also strengthened through an organiza-

tion in support of the Democratic ticket which operated independently of the Democratic Party. Known as the Volunteers for Daley, this organization undertook to win support particularly in non-labor circles. It made its main appeal the need to defeat reaction as represented by the Republican Party. It pointed out that the issues in the Chicago election were related to the national struggle against Big Business reaction and the forces behind Merriam were the same as those behind the Eisenhower administration and the McCarthyites. The five ward Volunteer organizations activated in the city enlisted wide support among many who had, earlier in the campaign, indicated support for Merriam because they believed he would put an end to crime and corruption. More than any group, outside of the Left, Volunteers for Daley placed the main issues in clear focus and helped to sweep aside and to expose the demagogy of the Republican "liberal" new look.

A dangerous diversion appeared in the Democratic primary campaign through the candidacy of Benjamin A. Adamowski, a maverick Democratic politician with strong connections mainly among Chicago's large Polish population.

The primary race was largely a contest between Daley and Mayor Kennelly, who decided to make a bitter fight for nomination even after he had been officially dumped by the Democratic organization at the in-

sistence of labor and its allies.

To some well-meaning liberals and progressives, Adamowski looked like a good "independent" candidate to support, even though it was generally conceded that he could not win in a three-way race.

The main forces of the people's coalition were supporting Daley in the primary, with extreme reaction backing Kennelly. Thus, the objective effect of Adamowski's candidacy was only to split the Daley vote and to increase the threat of a victory by Kennelly in the primary. Here again, it was only the staunch support of labor and the Negro people, which was not diverted by the Adamowski candidacy, that prevented a Kennelly victory.

The lesson here is in the importance of viewing candidates from the standpoint of uniting the people's forces in the struggle against the main danger. While in some cases third candidates as independents can help to clarify the issues and lead to greater independent activity, in other cases, where the broad people's forces have already made a choice, it can prove to be diversionary and a splitting factor which could only aid reaction.

The third dangerous tendency arose largely because of the shortcomings of the Democratic Party as a political instrument of the people. This tendency reveals itself in almost every two-party contest today, and will remain a problem as long as the people continue to express

themselves through one of the old parties instead of through a party of their own.

The Democratic Party in Chicago brought these major political liabilities into the campaign: (a) its long-time relations with some of the Big Business forces of extreme reaction; (b) its reputation as an entrenched machine which has connived in graft, crime and vice over the 24 years it has held power; (c) its record especially during the last two terms of the Kennelly regime, during which anti-labor employers, bankers, and racist realtors played an even more dominant role in the city administration.

Is it any wonder that "Defeat the Machine!" became the ringing slogan of the G.O.P., echoed by many good-government forces who were persuaded that a "reform" candidate in the party out of power was the only alternative?

The reactionary and corrupt elements in the Democratic Party were strengthened in the post-war years because labor and its allies failed to develop their own independent positions and fight for their own program within and without the party. Had there been a strong independent political apparatus bringing pressure to bear on the Democratic Party, there need not have been a Mayor Kennelly and the liberal, New Deal Democrats would have the dominant leadership over the corrupt machine hacks.

In the course of the municipal

campaign
maintain
Machin
candida
labor t
Where
liberal
the un
ple's fo
Democ
The
a victo
cause o
bribery
ance b
While
ward o
a bigge
based
ment
way in
election
forces
ers an
the ha
Merria
the D
practic
The
of the
pervad
were
Repub
proven
and it
perien
conces
minist
The
tion h
indep

campaign, the Democratic machine maintained an arrogant attitude. Machine hacks chose aldermanic candidates in most wards because labor took itself out of these races. Where challenges were made with liberal candidates they did not have the united backing of even the people's forces who were backing the Democratic candidate for mayor.

The Democratic Party did not win a victory, as the press contends, because of the machine vote based on bribery, habit or unthinking allegiance by those who vote Democratic. While it is true that strong party ward organizations help to turn out a bigger vote, the sentiment of voters based on a common area of agreement around issues determines the way in which most people vote. The election was carried by coalition forces and particularly by the workers and the Negro people who saw the hand of Big Business behind the Merriam candidacy. They voted for the Democratic ticket as the only practical alternative they could see.

These forces, although cognizant of the corruption and reaction which pervades the Democratic machine, were convinced however, that a Republican victory would be no improvement. On the contrary, labor and its allies, because of their experience, believe they can win greater concessions with a Democratic administration.

The events since the April election have shown the need for strong independent pressures on the Demo-

cratic administration. For, in spite of the role of the people's coalition in the election, there are as yet few indications of any real gains in housing, schools, equal rights, transit, etc. In fact, Mayor Daley has responded to the pressure of business interests in championing an increased sales tax and in soft-peddalling the real needs of the people in the city.

During the course of the election campaign, Daley was compelled to improve and strengthen his program wherever there was an effective mass movement around issues.

There was a broad coalition organized to end the crisis of double-shift and overcrowded schools. It was united around a comprehensive program and pressure was brought to bear to commit the candidates to this program. Daley responded by supporting the demands put forward by the mass movement on the school crisis. He also reflected the pressure of the broad movement against the Broyles bills by condemning and pledging to work for the defeat of this McCarthyite legislation.

The weaknesses in Daley's program were a reflection of the level of struggle in the trade union and other mass organizations around certain issues.

Daley did pledge to appoint labor, Negro and women citizens to important posts. Since election, he has named Chicago Federation of Labor President William A. Lee as chairman of the Civil Service Commission. This is the first time that a

representative of labor has been named to a post of "cabinet" rank in the city administration.

Clearly, however, the people's movement in Chicago has not yet learned the lesson of following up an election victory with the organization and pressure to demand delivery on pledges and a responsiveness to the people's needs.

And, while the people's forces are not vigorously pressing for action, the Big Business forces who backed Merriam are exerting their influences and pressures on the new city administration.

* * *

An important feature of the Chicago election was the complete absence of red-baiting. This came about because of the shellacking the McCarthyite candidates got last November and because both Democrats and Republicans were vying for the liberal vote. They realized that red-baiting was hardly the way to win support from people who are beginning to recognize that red-baiting is a reactionary weapon.

The Communist Party was active in the campaign as a factor of no small importance. The election showed that the Party can and did influence trends, issues and movements, working on the basis of a coalition policy for the defeat of reaction. Communists and other progressives were the first to show that the municipal election was not a purely local contest but part of the struggle against Big Business policies

and McCarthyism. Unfortunately, the progressive forces failed to do more than make a passing reference to the peace issue and show the relationship of Chicago's local problems to the fight for peace.

It is still true that as yet too few Communists participate in election campaigns. This was seen once again in the city contest. While the membership accepts the Party program as correct in general, it does not yet fully understand the application of this program in practice.

In this respect, the Illinois Party leadership did not sufficiently clarify the issue in the Chicago election and show the relationship of that particular campaign to the struggle for our objectives in 1956. Policy discussions failed to reach and mobilize all sections of the Party and the carrying through of political activity was relegated in the main to the specialized group of people doing electoral work. The elections were not seen in practice as a mass task which would lead to greater contact with people and could raise their understanding to a higher level.

Some Communists and progressives failed to participate in the elections because they were confused by the demagoguery of the Republicans and were themselves diverted into believing that the main issue at stake was "the destruction of the Democratic machine." Others were so isolated or so immersed in inner routine work that they never quite

found
to get

The
the p
with l
of the
of these
lems t
sives i
capitu
came
top-le
bureau
the w
candic
their
indep
fluenc
and th

A
work
ing co
portio
sat ou
the d
activi
electic

Wi
there
set a
1956
grow
activi
for

found the "handles" to enable them to get into the campaign.

There was less political activity in the progressive unions as compared with last November. This is a result of the weakened position of some of these unions and the special problems they faced. But many progressives in the C.I.O. and A.F.L. also capitulated to difficulties when they came up against the confusion and top-level operation of the labor bureaucracy. They complained about the weaknesses of the Democratic candidate, Daley, but failed to see their own role in helping to build independent political strength to influence the selection of candidates and the determination of program.

A small number of progressives worked actively and made outstanding contributions. But a greater proportion of Left and progressive forces sat out the election. This held back the development of greater political activity and limited the scope of the election victory.

With the city elections now past, there is a tendency in the Party to set aside political action until the 1956 campaign actually begins. This grows out of a concept that election activity is an end in itself. Support for a particular candidate which

leads to an electoral victory does not in itself mean a victory for the people's program. The election campaign must be seen as part of a struggle to bring greater unity of the people's forces, to raise the people's understanding of the issues involved and the need for struggle, and to put the forces of progress in a more favorable position to achieve the defeat of extreme reaction.

With the adjournment of Congress and the various state legislatures, a concerted effort must be made to strengthen the independent apparatus of the labor movement and its allies. Legislative and political action conferences on all possible levels need to be encouraged leading to the widest area of agreement on issues, candidates and campaign activity for 1956.

In Illinois, the primary election to decide major candidates for 1956 will be held next April. Candidates are already being groomed for key offices. If the people's movement is to make a bigger leap forward and deliver a major defeat to the Big Business administration and its profascist, pro-war orientation, then a new and higher level of all-embracing political activity must now be unfolded.

Mystification and Reality: the Economic Situation in France*

By Maurice Thorez

General Secretary, Communist Party of France

RECENTLY Mr. Douglas Dillon, U.S. Ambassador to France, made a curious speech in New York on the "problems and prospects of the French economy."

If he is to be believed, there is a "progressive improvement" taking place in our country; moreover, he claims that rarely has the combination of circumstances offered France such conditions for solving outstanding problems. Mister Ambassador announces that our country may well be on the threshold of a new economic and industrial revolution capable of leading to astonishing progress. At the same time he asserts that for the first time durable consumer goods are being made available to the less favored sections of the population, and that this opens up "new social prospects." Something like a definite promotion (of the working people) in the social order, it appears, is beginning in France. . . .

Speaking of the considerable increase in production in France, Mr. Douglas Dillon repeats the appraisal made by the Mendes-France government in the preamble to the 1955 draft budget. In this, Mr. Edgar Faure, former Finance Minister, bestows abundant self-congratulation

on what he calls "the return to expansion" and "the recovery of economic activity," which are alleged to result from the efforts of the authorities.

Quite to the contrary, the recent Central Committee meeting of our Party estimated that no "regeneration" of the French economy was possible so long as it continued to be oriented on war preparations. The Central Committee noted the rapid worsening in the condition of the working masses.

Let us see which of these diametrically opposed appraisals is confirmed by the facts.

HOW DOES PRODUCTION REALLY STAND?

According to UNO statistics, industrial output in France stood at 113 in 1953, taking the 1929 level as equalling 100. This is much lower than that of other capitalist countries (U.S.A.—226, Italy—136, and so forth), to say nothing of the enormous expansion of production in the Soviet Union. Moreover, one must take into account the increase in France's population (by over two million) between 1929 and 1953, which considerably reduces the total increase in output per capita of the population.

Particular emphasis should be laid on the fact that this index is distorted

* Reprinted from, *For a Lasting Peace, For a People's Democracy*, March 18, 1955, condensed text.

as a result of the progress made in some of the fuel industries, notably in oil, which it is very difficult to put entirely to the credit side of the country's balance sheet. Compared with prewar years, the output of French refineries has risen by about 250%. Half the oil that goes through them, however, is paid for in foreign currency, and this at a time when the country's balance of payments is so precarious; but the interests of U.S. exporters are thereby met.

On the other hand, there is no increase in the quantity of coal extracted: the 56 million tons mined last year is just about on a par with the 1929 output of 55 million tons.

There are, in fact, quite a number of branches in which output is lower than the maximum level of production in the inter-war period. This is the position in the building, textile and leather industries—all of them branches of industry that are primarily engaged in turning out mass-consumption goods.

Between 1913 and 1953 France's share in world output fell as follows: steel production from 6 to 4%, aluminum from 20 to 4.6%, automobiles from 7.5 to 4.7%, rayon from 23 to 4.9%. In these forty years France stepped down from fourth to fifth place in steel production, from second to fourth place in aluminum and automobile production and from third to seventh place in rayon manufacture.

In the same period, however, the population increased by more than 3,500,000!

If we compare the national production with that of foreign countries we see that whereas in 1929 industry in Britain and France produced practically equal quantities of steel, Britain has since increased its output by 28%, while France has remained more or less on the same level. Whereas in 1929, as in 1913, France was ahead of Britain and Germany in the automobile industry, she has now been outstripped by both these countries, which have roughly quadrupled their car output within 25 years, while France has barely doubled hers. . . .

To give a complete picture of the economic development we must say a word about agriculture. Here, too, the figures speak for themselves. Wheat production in France is barely maintaining a level comparable with that of 1913; on a world scale our country last year produced only 4.2% of the total output, as against 8.3% in 1919.

We were thus fully justified in speaking of the stagnation of the national economy. . . .

The greedy, egoistical big bourgeoisie, the men of the trusts, have long preferred, rather than make productive capital investments, themselves by means that were the furthest removed from any activity useful to the nation. They exported capital on a large scale (between the two wars the capital exported amounted to 15% of the national wealth); they plundered the colonies and dependent countries; they filled their coffers as a result of state loans and military

orders placed by the state. They were far more concerned with securing capital investments than with creating new opportunities for industry. The technical equipment of the country was the least of their worries.

In so far as they can dictate market prices and artificially maintain them at a high level, the men of the trusts are by no means always interested in introducing technical innovations. On more than one occasion the monopolies have put the brake on technical progress.

From a purely economic point of view, the positive development of France is incompatible with the continuance of the domination of the monopolies. No Frenchman who consciously loves his country can be anything other than the foe of monopoly capitalism, which is capitalism in decay, in its last stage of development.

INTENSIFICATION OF CAPITALIST CONCENTRATION

One of the principal characteristics of the present development of the French economy is the growth in the power of the monopolies and large enterprises.

Prompted by the desire to adapt the political economy of the proletariat (which teaches the truth) to the interests of the bourgeoisie, the revisionists have for more than sixty years now been citing quantities of "new data" on social life in order to "prove" that the Marxist theory of concentration has grown anti-

quated and is out of date. From Leon Blum to Jules Moch, this claim has not varied. Unfortunately for the opportunists, the "new data" have always confirmed Marxism, not refuted it.

The fact that there are still large numbers of small and medium-sized enterprises in France, especially in light industry, trade and agriculture, cannot be cited as an argument against the Marxist theory: that theory has in fact always explained that monopoly capitalism does not and cannot destroy the foundations of the old capitalism, which is itself linked with pre-capitalist economic formations. Nevertheless, in the principal branches of production a growing preponderance of the big enterprises is to be observed. . . .

We have official statistics for 1952 showing that over 48% of the total payroll is paid by 0.5% of the existing enterprises: these giant firms carry nearly as much weight as the 99.5%, or all the others put together!

In all this concentration of the power of the monopolies and growth of their profits, the bourgeois state plays a very active part.

Let us take nationalization as an example. Following the Liberation, when the working class was able to exert a measure of influence on the course of public affairs, nationalization could proceed in the direction of social progress and the national interest. Subsequently, having fallen exclusively into the hands of the capitalists, nationalization furthered the interests of the monopolies. This was

effected by a number of measures, the chief of which were:

In the first place, nationalization put the state to great expense in renewing the fixed capital in those industries that have a high organic composition of capital (coal, power etc.), the equipment of which was systematically neglected by private capital (1,860,000 million francs were invested between 1946 and 1954). As a result of this expenditure the price of coal and electricity rose, which means that the masses of consumers are paying for the equipment which the "expropriated" capitalists did not wish to finance.

Secondly, the compensation paid to the former companies far exceeded the original estimates, and the "victims" of nationalization were able once more to invest their capital in enterprises that play a leading role on the financial market.

Above all, the nationalized concerns began to supply monopoly capital with power, raw materials and services at extremely low rates, far below cost price. . . .

Besides being their obliging suppliers, the nationalized enterprises are also lavish clients of the trusts. They frequently sell their services to the monopolies at, say, an index of 14 compared with 1939, but buy equipment from them at an index of 31.

In other words, the state annually presents the trusts with a gift of hundreds of millions of francs. And to this it adds tax relief.

The statistics of the Ministry of

Finance show that, in 1953, 75% of all industrialists, tradesmen and artisans, with a total turnover of 1,658,000 million francs, paid tax on profits of 393,000 million francs, while 1.3% of the total, *i.e.*, the giants with a total turnover of 7,808,000 million francs, had to pay on only 242,000 million francs.

The recent relief in taxation on capital investments was a generous gift of some 180,000 million francs to the large capitalist firms. The tax relief on mergers of firms, reduced taxation on insurance companies, and many other measures, had the same aim.

As we know, American "aid" in the long run brought no real financial advantage to France; Mr. Dillon himself recognized this in the speech already quoted, in which he said that although America had contributed 67,000 million dollars to the French economy it had always to be borne in mind that France had spent on the Indo-China war (an element of U.S. strategy—*M.Th.Q.*) a sum almost equal to the whole of this American aid.

To be more precise, however, it should be added that it was *not those same French people* who had met the cost of the war in Indo-China who received the billions of American "aid." The debit, *i.e.*, the cost of the war in Indo-China, was charged to the account of the mass of tax payers, the people. On the credit side, the lion's share of American "aid" went to the trusts, particularly the iron and steel trusts. . . .

The Marshall Plan and the "Atlantic" policy, the fundamentally harmful nature of which we pointed out from the very beginning, imposed on France a general policy contrary to her national interests. But what was bad for the country as a whole, at the same time greatly benefited the monopolists thanks to the credits directly allotted to them and as a result of the consequent profit from the increase in arms orders. . . .

In face of the disintegration of the world market and the diminishing possibilities of access to world resources, the monopolies of France, like those of the other big capitalist countries, are resorting to militarization of the economy in order to assure themselves maximum profits. Nothing better exposes the parasitic and decaying character of an economy founded on the domination of the trusts.

To the above-mentioned means of enriching and strengthening the monopolies the Mendes-France government has added, in the name of "reconversion," a policy of systematic elimination of small enterprises and of accelerating the spontaneous process of concentration.

All the official statements on the rationalization of production, its specialization, the "reclassification" of enterprises and "rehabilitation" of the economy aim merely at preparing the way for the disappearance of firms which, in relation to the trusts, show themselves to be "non-competitive."

Under the capitalist system the

"rehabilitation" of the economy is, of course, a myth: the monopolies can exist only if there are markets, rivalry, anarchy of production, crises, with all the contradictions of capitalist production.

It is true that the monopolies increase the socialization of production as far as it is possible to do under capitalism. Lenin showed how monopoly capitalism prepares the material conditions for the substitution of Socialism for capitalism. The monopolists unite gigantic enterprises in one whole; they keep account of markets, sources of raw material, scientific and technical cadres, discoveries and improvements. The interdependence of different branches of the economy grows enormously. The large banks control nearly all the currency of the country.

At the same time the means of production remain the private property of the capitalists; and the state, the embodiment of the dictatorship of the financial oligarchy, directs its entire activity in the interests of the monopolies. It is striking evidence that *state monopoly capitalism* leads to the *subordination* of the state apparatus to the monopolies. In the last resort it is for the benefit of the big capitalist trusts that the state takes over any branches of production and assumes any economic functions (e.g. nationalization); this same state most actively helps in effecting the concentration and centralization of capital; it takes special measures to force the submission of

independent enterprises to the monopolies, and the monopolies use the budget to enrich themselves and plunder the people. The whole policy of the government procures colossal profits for the monopolies.

FURTHER IMPOVERISHMENT OF THE WORKING CLASS

Another consequence of the development of state monopoly capitalism is the aggravation of the absolute and relative impoverishment of the proletariat.

This is denied by the Social-Democratic "theoreticians." To justify their policy of class collaboration they want to make people believe that there is an improvement in the position of the workers under capitalism.

In 1947, the Socialist Premier Ramadier, determined to act as the tool of bourgeois policy in all spheres, used the wages question, on which the Communist ministers had defended the workers' demands, as a pretext for removing us from the government. The policy launched by Ramadier has borne fruit.

In France today the purchasing power of an hour's pay is, in general, nearly half what it was before the war. For instance, the actual hourly rate of an unskilled metallurgical worker in the Paris area is half its prewar value, while that of a worker in the electrical equipment industry is 57%, and so on. If the overall purchasing power of the workers has declined on the whole less than the hourly rate, this, as we

shall see, has taken place as a result of a greater consumption of labor power (as regards both duration and intensity of labor).

The share of wages in the national income fell from 45% before the war to 30% in 1952.

The considerable relative reduction in the number of skilled workers leads to a lowering of the average wage.

Even if we consider the actual overall wage of the workers, the level remains much lower than in 1938.

In 1938, a skilled metal worker in the Paris area worked 39 hours a week at an hourly rate of 11.77 francs, and earned 459 francs a week. Now, the same worker puts in 45 hours at 203 francs per hour. Taking into account the 20% increase for five additional hours, he earns 9,388 francs a week. His 1938 wages have increased 20.5 times.

In the same period, however, prices have gone up 32.5 times. This means a reduction of 38% in overall purchasing power, despite the fact that working hours have increased by 15%.

Here we see the part played by high prices and inflation in the impoverishment of the working class.

The main economic basis of this inflation is the fact that the state withdraws great quantities of goods from circulation in order to use them for military needs, by their nature non-productive, and in doing so purchases these goods at very high prices. Thus, an enormous

amount of money capital is created without a corresponding amount of additional real capital. As a result prices of consumer goods shoot up.

At the end of 1954 money circulation, the immense expansion of which is an indication of inflation, stood at the coefficient of 448, compared with 1913, an increase well above that of most of the big capitalist countries. The ratification of the Paris agreements, the remilitarization of Western Germany and the intensified arms drive can, if our people do not prevent it, only lead to greater instability and precipitate a fresh wave of price increases.

Today, more than ever before, the defense of the economic interest of the working people is directly linked with the struggle for a foreign policy of peace.

To supplement their miserable hourly rates the workers do overtime, and the employers make every effort to urge them to do so in order to increase the rate of surplus value. In the words of Marx, capital is merciless where the life and health of the worker are concerned. According to official figures themselves (the National Statistical Institute), in 1954, 66% of French workers worked 45 hours a week; 10% even worked more than 48 hours, and this despite the fact that the demand for an 8-hour working day goes back 90 years and has been defended by the proletariat in bitter struggles!

A long working day is also the lot of the agricultural workers, who are particularly exploited. Numbering

1,100,000 they receive a maximum of 19,000 francs a month.

The French working class is fighting for a return to a 40-hour working week from one of 45 or 48 hours, with existing wages being maintained.

Apart from lengthening the working day, the employers have another means of heightening the degree of exploitation—*i.e.*, by increasing labor productivity. As we know, the capitalist state supports them in this in every possible way. It was not by accident that one of the closest collaborators of M. Mendes-France was Gabriel Ardant, General Commissioner for Productivity.

The intensification of labor in France today shows quite well the rapacity of the employers in relation to the main productive force—the working class. . . .

The ruthless timing of jobs, "psychotechnique" and so-called "scientific organization of labor" lead to a serious increase in muscular and nervous fatigue. In the Bazar de l'Hotel de Ville in Paris an American engineer has "rationalized" the whole process of work in such a way that the effort required of the saleswomen is often beyond the limits of physical endurance.

Under such conditions it is no wonder there has been an increase in the number of accidents at work. The latest figures published show that 1,829,164 accidents took place in 1953 (of which 83,813 resulted in permanent incapacity), as against 619,003 accidents in 1938.

These figures do not include accidents in the pits, the increase in which is no less significant: for the same output of coal, the number of injured miners rose from 98,918 in 1931 to 144,729 in 1951.

Naturally it is not possible to speak of the extent of the impoverishment of the working class without taking unemployment into account.

Official propaganda seeks to persuade everybody that there is now "full employment" but this is a lie, pure and simple.

It is sufficient to know a number of industrial towns, Annonay for instance, to see that every tenth worker there is permanently unemployed.

Even according to the calculations of the National Statistical Institute the number of unsatisfied applications for jobs must be multiplied three or nearly three times to get an approximate figure of the actual number of unemployed. Using this rather modest method of calculation we can safely say that the actual number of unemployed is now around 530,000. . . .

The existence of a permanent army of unemployed is a law of capitalism. It is an important factor for lowering the wages of employed workers. At the present time, the French capitalists consider that even this army of unemployed is not large enough for them to manoeuvre sufficiently. Hence, their proposals for importing 500,000 Italian workers into our country, proposals determined upon during the joint visit

to Rome by former Premier Mendes-France and the leaders of the National Council of Employers.

Hit by the reduction in real wages and the high cost of living, exhausted by the speed-up and threatened with unemployment, the workers at the same time find the tax burden becoming increasingly heavy. Indirect taxation, which in France is a crushing burden, falls first and foremost on the masses. Workers, employees and officials pay a direct tax which cannot be evaded, namely, income tax.

Another factor depressing the workers' standard of living is the increase in rents, very much felt at the present time. For many of the workers a flat in a house for which a so-called reasonable rent is charged has become a luxury they just cannot afford: It seems as if they are doomed forever to a life in huts, barracks and even tents on waste land.

The worsening housing conditions are accompanied by an obvious deterioration in the quality of clothing. Because the cap, once worn by every worker, is too dear, people prefer the ordinary beret; overalls of poor quality material replace the working "blues" which cost several thousand francs; corduroy trousers, which were previously commonly worn, are now a prohibitive price.

As regards the quality of food, even official statistics confirm that this has deteriorated.

Thus, in recent times the gap between the two poles of society has

become even wider. The mortality tables are proof of this.

Whereas the infant mortality rate for children up to one year of age is 2.9 per thousand among the "industrial employers" and "higher officials," it stands at 51.9 among the "workers" and 61.7 among the "laborers." Among navvies the figure is as high as 73.6 and among miners 80.4.

Proof that poverty is the main reason for this strikingly heavy death rate among the working class is that "contrary to all expectation," workers' families in which the mother works have a lower infant mortality rate than those in which the mother remains at home. Thus a *subsistence* wage (in the proper sense of the word) can only be obtained at the present time by supplementing the wages of the father with those of the mother. . . .

In reference to new drugs—penicillin and so forth—it is often asserted that the general mortality rate, including that of the working people, has been reduced in the last century or century and a half. The progress of medicine and the measures taken to combat epidemics, which of necessity have been applied throughout society as a whole, have of course had their repercussions on the workers; but one thing that is passed over in silence is the fact that at the same time the health of the working class has become worse, *i.e.*, that the workers are suffering more from sickness, first and foremost from heart diseases, stomach ulcers,

mental disorders and all the nervous troubles which have assumed a mass scale owing to the intensification of the infernal speed-up methods. The longer average life span of the French people does not necessarily mean a better state of health for the proletariat.

It is said that social security has been developed. But it should be noted that accidents, disease and unemployment, *i.e.*, the evils for which it is supposed to be a palliative, have increased. Nor should it be forgotten that if the bourgeoisie does take some measures to safeguard the health of the working people, it only does so under pressure from the masses. It subsequently takes advantage of this to speed up labor, which quite naturally leads to a fresh deterioration in health: often, indeed, health and social measures are more than offset by intensified exploitation, and the final result is negative.

Poverty, slums, physical exhaustion, and the worsening of conditions of working people which is typical of capitalism, all lead to the spread of alcoholism. Our Party proposes effective measures to combat this scourge. The bourgeois state, on the other hand, regards the production and sale of alcohol as a source of revenue: in 1952 the sum of taxes and other levies from sales of alcoholic drinks totalled 54,000 million francs. In the same year blotters advertising alcoholic drinks were distributed in certain schools and similar publicity is used by the state on

match-
owned

We
proces
the co
ing r

The
larger
duce
consu
prices
peasa
the r
large
ing
milk
good

At
pove
redu
sale
the
hun
ruin
plus

In
actu
ing
hect
of
of
lan
of
try
obl
"tw
if
ter
I
pla
tra

match-boxes manufactured in state-owned workshops. . . .

We are witnessing a continued process of social differentiation in the countryside, and the ever-increasing ruin of the small peasants.

The monopolies exact an ever-larger tribute on agricultural produce at all stages from producer to consumer. By fixing low purchase prices to the detriment of the small peasant and raising retail prices to the maximum, they appropriate a large part of the incomes of working peasants. This happens with milk, meat, vegetables, fruit, tinned goods, etc.

At the same time the growing impoverishment of the working class reduces the demand and chokes the sale of agricultural produce. While the proletarians cannot satisfy their hunger, the small peasants are being ruined by the burden of their "surpluses."

In a country where 58% of the actual number of agricultural holdings—the small farms of less than 10 hectares—do not even own one-sixth of the land, whereas almost a third of it is in the hands of the great landowners who represent only 4% of the total owners, in such a country even bourgeois authors are obliged to recognize the existence of "two agricultures, with divergent—if not opposite—conditions and interests." . . .

In our country there is taking place a sharpening of all the contradictions inherent in capitalism:

the contradiction between labor and capital, between town and country, between the oppressed colonial peoples and imperialist France.

State monopoly capitalism cannot "renovate" the national economy or make it "healthier." The bourgeois state, far from being the determining force in the economy and directing it in a methodical planned way, is helpless in the face of the economic laws of capitalism, which operate like elemental calamities. The domination of monopolies greedy for maximum profit carries to extremes the chaotic character of the national economy.

The productive forces of society, and in particular the labor force, are being wasted and destroyed. The struggle against exploitation and super-exploitation of the proletariat, against the plunder of the working masses and above all against exhaustion and death, for health and a normal life for the people, is the only way to ensure the future of France. . . .

Our people must soon choose between two definite roads: either that of the policy of the Mendes-France, Pinays and Edgar Faures, which means the subordination of France to the interests of U.S. billionaires, rearmament of Western Germany, war economy and inflation, super profits for the monopolies, economic decline and social poverty; or else a change in foreign policy, on which all other developments depend.

This change can only come about

as the result of vigorous action by the masses.

The reactionary and cosmopolitan oligarchy of the men of the trusts, fearing the people's desire for progress, and their patriotism, are even trying to do away with universal suffrage. This is another reason for unity of all democratic and national forces, based on the united front of Communists and Socialists and on joint action of the proletariat, the direct antagonist of the capitalist class.

The Communists, vanguard representatives of the working class, explain to the masses that the defense of the economic interests of the working people is, today as never before, directly linked with the solution of the big political problems, with the general political struggle for peace and for an end to the armaments drive. This general struggle is being waged on the one hand against remilitarization of Western Germany and for a ban on weapons of mass destruction, and on the other hand for a general increase in wages and pensions, against speed-up, for democratic tax reform etc. . . . All these actions are merging into a single stream against the pernicious

course steered by the ruling sections of the French bourgeoisie, accomplices of the U.S. imperialists.

Life shows how true are Lenin's words: in fighting for better conditions of life the working class is maturing morally and politically, becoming more capable of defending the great causes which history entrusts to it.

The masses are becoming more and more aware of the soundness of our Party's policy. They approve and support its devoted struggle for democratic liberties and national independence, its fight for Socialism, the fundamental, historic aspiration of the working class.

Wherever Socialism reigns it secures, for all the people, an ever-developing well-being in contrast to the impoverishment of the working people under capitalism.

In France too, the working class, led by its Communist vanguard, will establish Socialism, replacing the anarchy and chaos of capitalist production by economic order, full use of all labor power and all resources, the harmonious development of production without crises and without interruption, the flowering of science and of technique.

LETTER FROM A READER

Edmonton, Alberta, Canada

Dear Editor:

This is the first time I have read your periodical and I find it difficult to see how I have gotten along without it all this time. I congratulate you on the production of the magazine under what I presume are considerable handicaps.

First, if you have any means of passing my regards to William Z. Foster I wish you could do so. I was given a copy of his *History of the CPUSA* a year or so ago and neglected to read it until this year. His chapters on the building of the C.I.O. and the part played by the Communists in it were an eye-opener to me. I have decided to pursue labor history further as a result of reading his book.

If you will excuse what may be the narrow outlook of an outsider, I have a suggestion to offer. It seems to me that the relation of Canada to the U.S. is a matter of at least some importance to your readers. I don't mean only the relation of the two governments, which can be expressed in a paragraph, or even the economic relationship, which is even simpler. What I have in mind is the consequence of these relationships, expressed in terms of political activity on the part of *Americans*. I suppose that the political and economic domination of my country by yours is of more direct concern to Canadian workers than to American, but I also think it is of more concern to Americans than they realize. . . .

We here often wish we could do something to help you in a personal way, but of course there is nothing we can do except slug away at the everyday jobs. If you are willing to keep fighting, there is all the more reason why we should, as we have a much easier environment in which to work, it seems.

Yours sincerely,

W. S.

* * *

Political Affairs is anxious to hear from its readers. Letters submitted for publication should not exceed 300 words.—*The Editor*.

FOUR NEW BOOKS

History of the Three Internationals

By WILLIAM Z. FOSTER

A comprehensive study of wor'd Communism during the past century, encompassing the history of the political struggles, movements and lessons of working-class political experience in all countries covering a span of more than one hundred years. *Price \$6.00*

•

The 13th Juror

By STEVE NELSON

The gripping personal story of an American Communist's fight against a political frameup, and his struggle against the machinations of the Pittsburgh trusts, the government, courts, and stoolpigeons.

Popular \$1.50; Cloth \$2.50

•

Labor Fact Book 12

Prepared by LABOR RESEARCH ASSOCIATION

A rich storehouse of indispensable information interpreting economic and social conditions and emphasizing intelligent social action. Covers labor, economic trends, farm facts, politics, civil rights struggles, the struggle for Negro equality, juvenile delinquency, etc. *Price \$2.00*

•

Women Against Slavery

By SAMUEL SILLEN

Sketches of sixteen outstanding women in American history who made inspiring contributions in the long struggle against slavery under conditions of widespread and intense discrimination against and degradation of women. *Popular \$.75; Cloth \$1.50*

•

Order at our local bookstore or from

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

ry,
ons
of
.00

ght
of
.50

nic
ers
ig-
00

ho
er
la-
50

Y.